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Abstract

Sexual assault is not a new topic of discussion. It has increasingly become a popular topic to discuss especially with larger cases being more prevalent in the media. However, the discussion about adult male victims has just begun. There has been little to no discussion about adult male victims and their experiences and it is important to do research. Research needs to begin looking at new topics that have previously been ignored. Some of these topics include adult male victims’ personal experiences, male rape myths, female on male victimization, and societal perceptions. This research attempts to examine societal perceptions about adult male victims. It asked college students if they believed adult males could be victims of sexual assault and used vignettes to gauge participants reactions and beliefs about male victims. This research shows that tact is necessary to obtain more accurate data from participants. Participants appear to state the socially acceptable response to direct questions but show their true beliefs to more indirect question. Respondents appear to believe that adult males can be victims and that the vignettes all show sexual assault. However, there were three things made clear through indirect questions: intoxicated victims, male victims, and victims with a female perpetrator were seen more often to not experience sexual assault.
Chapter 1: Introduction

When studying sexual assault victims, it is important to study both male and female victims equally. However, it seems that female victims tend to be studied more than adult male victims. This will be examined in the literature review to understand why adult male victims are studied less than female victims. This could be cause because of the rape myth males cannot be sexually assaulted or it could be due to societal perceptions surrounding traditional male gender roles. Traditional male gender roles in the United States have created a culture of toxic masculinity. Society’s traditional gender roles create toxic masculinity through strictly enforcing gender roles throughout an individual’s childhood and adulthood. This culture of toxic masculinity may be leading to the underreporting of male rape victims.

Currently there is very little research about adult male sexual assault victims. Part of this has to do with the fact that adult male victims tend to be ignored, overlooked, or even dismissed (Turchik & Edwards, 2012). The lack of research on adult male victims makes adequate resources scarce; resources like victim support groups, medical resources, and mental health resources. In one study they found that out of 30 different agencies that included police, hospitals, mental health facilities, medical facilities, rape crisis centers, and community crisis centers that 11 did not offer services to adult male victims. Ten were theoretically able to but had never helped any adult male victims and five had dealt with male victims. They also found that 19 agencies were willing to help adult male victims, but only four had ever helped a male victim. Among the agencies that did not offer services or could but had never helped an adult male victim the common census was that male victims could not be raped (Bullock & Beckson, 2011).
Mental health resources and survivor groups help victims heal from their trauma. So when these kinds of resources are not available it helps to make male victims unseen and unheard when it come to their victimization (Sleath & Bull, 2010). This is problematic because with a lack of adequate resources for victims to utilize they may not come forward as much as their female counterparts. Some researchers estimate that support systems, psychological help, and research on how to appropriately deal with male victims is more than 20 years behind their female counterparts. One reason for this is that police have very few records of male victims reporting their assault (Davies & Rogers, 2006). Another reason for this is because of the belief that men cannot be victimized and that male sexual assault victims are almost nonexistent (Light & Monk-Turner, 2009; Davies et al., 2012; Lowe & Rogers, 2017).

It has been estimated that 5-10% of all sexual assault victims are male. However, most research surrounding adult male victims tends to be exploratory in nature (Light & Monk-Turner, 2009; Turchik & Edwards, 2012). Other research shows that about 9-10% of all victims are males and that about 16% of male victims experience sexual abuse before the age of 18 (Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center, 2018). About 6-15% of all male victims are assaulted by a female perpetrator (Turchik & Edwards, 2012). Oudekerk and Truman (2017), that between 2005 and 2014 that males and females who experienced a second sexual assault in the same year were almost equal. Males experienced a second assault in the same year at 14% and females experienced it at 16%. However, when it comes to experiencing two or more sexual assaults in a year, males experienced it at a 45% rate and females experienced it at a 29% rate. Table 1 are
statistics from 2012 to 2016 generated from the Bureau of Justice Statistics using the National Crime Victimization Survey analysis tool.

Table 1: Number of Rape/Sexual Assaults by Sex, 2012-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victimization Type</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rape/ Sexual Assault</td>
<td>346,830</td>
<td>300,165</td>
<td>284,345</td>
<td>431,837</td>
<td>323,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>131,259</td>
<td>34,057</td>
<td>28,032!</td>
<td>62,916</td>
<td>51,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>215,570</td>
<td>266,107</td>
<td>256,313</td>
<td>368,921</td>
<td>272,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Male</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Female</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

! Interpret data with caution, based on 10 or fewer sample cases or the coefficient of variation is greater than 50% (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2018)

This table shows that rate of victimization for male victims on average between 2012 to 2016 was 18% which is much higher than the estimated 5% to 10%. It indicates that estimates about male victims are higher than initially thought. This means that more research into adult male victims must be done to gain an accurate scope of the problem. It also means that sexual assault can no longer be considered just a female issue. It means that society has to re-examine its traditional gender roles and begin making society as a whole more gender neutral. If society does not adapt, male victims are going to continue to be left out of survivor programs and have a more difficult time dealing with the medical and criminal justice system.

The first step to understanding why adult male victims do not report their victimization is historical research. The study of adult male victims seems to be left in the dark because of the societal belief that males cannot be victims of sexual assault. The reason this study is being done is to examine why more adult male victims don’t come
forward. It is important that male sexual assault victims feel safe and feel like they have the right to come forward without being ridiculed or judged which may contribute to underreporting of male sexual assault.

The study is broken down into five separate chapters. The first chapter introduces why this research is important. The second chapter is a literature review that examines different aspect of sexual assault: intoxication, rape myths, gender roles, toxic masculinity, cases found in the media, and what is missing in the literature. The methods for this study are explained in the third chapter. Survey data and its findings are examined in the fourth chapter. The final chapter consists of the conclusions, the limitations, and what can be done in the future.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Sexual assault is not a new concept. It has been going on for thousands of years, because of the belief that men are the aggressor and women are the victim (White & Robinson-Kurpius, 1999; Turchik & Edwards, 2012; Barglow, 2014). Research on female victims has predominantly been done since the 1970s. A lot of money, time, and effort have been spent researching female victims while neglecting their adult male counterparts (Davies, Rogers & Bates, 2008; Davies, Gilston & Rogers, 2012). This unfortunately framed sexual assault as female issue and swept the male victims under the rug (Lowe & Rogers, 2017). In recent years research on adult male victims has been slowly growing (Light & Monk-Turner, 2009; Davies et al., 2012; Lowe & Rogers, 2017). However, there is room for expanding on current research about male victims.

As research on male victims’ increases, it could begin to show that adult male victimization rates are higher than initially thought. There is also the societal assumption that most of the adult male victims of sexual assault are homosexual; which is why this is one of the rape myths male victims face. This has led some individuals in society to view male victimization as same-sex or homosexual rape (Davies & McCartney, 2003; Light, & Monk-Turner, 2009). This contributes to attitudes about male victims of sexual assault influencing the reporting of their victimization. It is not uncommon for males in US society to look down upon homosexual males; and therefore, consider any man who is sexually assaulted weaker or homosexual. Regardless of individual’s gender or sexual orientation their status of being a victim is no different (Davies et al., 2012; Clark, 2014).

In the last 10 years, however research has begun to explore male victims to better understand the prevalence of victimization and the best methods for helping the victims
heal (Davies et al., 2012; Lowe & Rogers, 2017). This is extremely important because regardless of a victim’s gender they should have the ability to get psychological help and be able to attend meetings designed to help victims heal without judgement.

Definitions
Definitions of sexual assault vary state by state. Each state has its own laws, statutes and policies when it comes to defining what sexual assault is and who is affected by sexual assault. In the United States, 47 states have written definitions of sexual assault where the language used is gender neutral regarding who can be a victim. This meaning that males, females, and transgender individuals can be victims of sexual assault. However, three states Maryland, Idaho, and Georgia the language in the laws state only females can be victims of sexual assault. When the states define who the perpetrator can be 48 states have it written that males and females can be perpetrators. Two states Idaho and Georgia have the language in their laws that state only males can be the perpetrators. When defining consent only seven states what consent is and 14 states have created an outline of what it means to act without the consent of the victim. When defining types of sexual assault 18 states define sexual assault, 17 define rape, 11 define sodomy, 28 define sexual conduct, and 14 define what constitutes an illegal sex act. No state has marital rape legal, but 19 states do have a different legal standard for marital rape (DeMatteo, Galloway, Arnold & Patel, 2015).

There are many different types of sexual assault: rape, date rape, marital rape, sexual assault, forced sex, coercion, threats, blackmail and childhood sexual assault are just a few of the many types of sexual assault there are (Zerbe-Enns, 2001; Littleton, 2011). The original definition of rape focused only on extreme cases; such as rape, child sexual assault, and rapes ending in death. Over time feminists got angrier and helped
change the definition of sexual assault and pave the way for the antirape movement (Zerbe-Enns, 2001).

The antirape movement has led to more sexual assaults to be reported and rapists being arrested. This is important because it helps make victims feel a little safer coming forward even with the problems victims still face. These include problems like being misbelieved, forced to continually relive their trauma, or treated as if they are lying. However, there are critics of the antirape movement who believe that normal sexual behaviors are being turned into definitions of sexual assault and that therapists are also helping create false memories for victims (Zerbe-Enns, 2001).

In 2012, the United States Justice Department changed their definition of sexual assault to include the phrasing “any gender” making the official definition of sexual assault for the country include male victims (United States Department of Justice, 2017). However, definitions of sexual assault still need to be more inclusive and broader when researchers study sexual assault victims. The Center for Disease Control (CDC) used to have an extremely narrow definition of sexual assault in their annual survey. Their study found in 2011, that 19.3% of women reported having been sexually assaulted in their lifetime while 1.7% of men reported being sexually assaulted and 6.7% of victims reported being forced or coerced into penetrating someone (Stemple, Flores & Meyer, 2017). When the CDC changed their definition and became more inclusive by including other types of sexual assault like forcing or coercing a victim to penetrate with or without intoxication, they found that females and males are sexually victimized at almost the same rate (Young, 2014; Stemple et al., 2017). This is why it is important for researchers like the CDC to be thorough in their research. This lack of comprehensiveness when
doing research continues to perpetuate the assumption that sexual assault is a problem facing only females; when in fact it is a problem both males and females face equally.

In 1992, an organization called The False Memory Syndrome Foundation (FMSF) was founded to combat false memory claims of sexual assault. The creators of this foundation were Pamela and Peter Freyd and a few other concerned individuals. The definition created by the FMSF for false memory syndrome was “A condition in which a person’s identity is centered around a memory of a traumatic experience which is objectively false but in which the person strongly believes. The memory is so deeply engrained that it orients the individual’s personality and lifestyle, in turn disrupting all sorts of other adaptive behavior” (Zerbe-Enns, 2001, p. 360).

However, the scientific community does not recognize this as an actual disorder since there is no evidence to support it. Sigmund Freud created a similar theory early on but abandoned it due to lack of evidence. One of the FMSF members Loftus claimed that poorly trained therapists are part of the problem. He stated that therapists are implanting false memories in the minds of victims, specifically, memories surrounding sexual assault during childhood (Zerbe-Enns, 2001).

Research has shown that verbal recollections don’t happen before the age of two, however, one study of children found that victims of childhood sexual assault often exhibit behaviors that reenact the trauma and/or have bodily memories of the trauma. One of the most important points that are stressed about False Memory Syndrome (FSM) is that there is no actual data showing that this occurs. Any research supporting FSM is purely circumstantial and has been a misstatement of the statistics (Zerbe-Enns, 2001).
When studying sexual assault culture in the United States (US) it is also important to examine or understand the falsities that have been given to the public. Zerbe-Enns does a great job of examining a major falsity that the public hears and some even believe. Claims like the FSMF spread not only hurt the cause of the antirape movement but also creates the problem of forcing victims to constantly relive their experience while having to continually state what happened to them. This leads to misconceptions about sexual abuse. As more victims come forward the society and culture must change to become more compassionate to the victims as well as meet their needs. In addition to that, society needs to become more focused on penalizing the offender and less focused on the victims clothing and actions in court cases.

**Training/ Treatment Programs**

Training programs have become more and more common in the US lately. The training programs tend to avoid the conversation about sexual behavior and rather they focus on the many forms sexual abuse takes (Zerbe-Enns, 2001). Almost every job now has sexual assault trainings to teach individuals to notice the signs if they are happening around the workplace or to themselves. However, due to the stigma surrounding sexual assault and its victims it is empirical to continue sexual assault trainings, especially more trainings focused on bystanders (Brown, 2018). Littleton (2011) states that programs should also focus less on dispelling rape myths and more on broadening individual’s minds to see sexual assault. This is done by providing facts about sexual assault which will also educate individuals about rape myths. Programs also need to need to express sexual assault as a societal problem and men can be part of preventing sexual assaults from occurring. Specifically, educating men that they do not have to believe in attitudes
that support sexual assault and can speak up to other men when these attitudes are being expressed (Littleton, 2011).

Training programs that help men understand they can be part of the solution instead of the problem are highly important. It seems many men don’t realize that if they don’t agree with another man’s positive attitude about supporting sexual assault that they have the ability to speak up. It seems in US society men fear speaking up against friends and dismiss it as just “locker room talk” without realizing that is part of the problem. Gilbert (1994) also suggests that treatment for female victims should be individualized because no victim has the same experience afterwards and everyone needs a different kind of treatment and time frame for healing. This is also true for male victims. Treatment in general should be individualized regardless of the gender of the victim.

Littleton (2011), also suggest that outreach programs are important for victims to give them the appropriate tools to help themselves through coping and normalizing their experience rather than just being a service provided. She also suggests the need for outreach programs specifically for men to teach men how to have appropriate consensual sex. Although, outreach programs specifically designed for victims, females, and males separately seems like a good idea it is in fact problematic. Outreach programs should be designed as a whole to help victims, females, and males simultaneously while putting emphasis on important areas for each. Teaching all three what constitutes sexual assault, how to combat it and how to combat societal attitudes should be the focus. Then have the program separate into resources for victims, teaching both male and females how to become better allies to victims and showing that both males and females can be victims.

There is also a lack of support programs and treatment for male victims. Although,
programs are slowly getting better and including male victims they are still far from being beneficial (Lowe & Rogers, 2017).

**Trauma and Sexual Assault**

Sexual assault is extremely traumatizing for the victims (Davies et al., 2012; Clark, 2014; Lowe & Rogers, 2017; Brown, 2018). The US has become increasingly more aware of sexual violence towards women and yet statistics show that the occurrence has remained high (White & Robinson-Kurpius, 1999; Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2001; Zerbe-Enns, 2001; Nagel, Matsuo, McIntyre & Morrison, 2005; Harrison, Howerton, Secarea & Nguyen, 2008). About 1 in 3 women and 1 in 6 men are sexually assaulted in their lifetime; and about 1 in 5 women have experienced a completed or attempted sexual assault (Richer, Fields, Bell, Heppner, Dodge, Boccellari & Shumway, 2017). Other research has shown that about 1 in 5 women and 1 in 59 men will experience an attempted or completed sexual assault in their lifetime. Research has also stated that 1 in 15 men have also reported being made to penetrate someone, approximately 1 in 9 men also reported experiencing some form of unwanted sexual contact, and approximately 1 in 8 men reported experiencing some form of non-contact unwanted sexual contact in their lifetime. In the same study 27.3% of the women reported experiencing some form of unwanted sexual contact, and approximately 32.1% of the women reported experiencing some form of non-contact unwanted sexual contact in their lifetime. In addition to that the study also found 12.5% of women and 5.8% of men reported experiencing sexual coercion in their lifetime (Basile, Smith, Breiding, Black & Mahendra, 2014). It has been estimated that roughly 17% of all women in the US are sexually assaulted in their life while only a small percentage of men are sexually assaulted (Barglow, 2014). Around 70% of women who are sexually assaulted will know
the perpetrator (Harrison et al., 2008). It has also been estimated that the prevalence of male sexual assaults to female sexual assaults is 1:2 (Burt & DeMello, 2002). Yet, the US still holds the firm belief that males are not victims of sexual assault and that both male and female victims contribute to their sexual assault instead of investigating whether it is still a necessary to believe it (White & Robinson-Kurpius, 1999; Littleton, 2011; Turchik & Edwards, 2012).

Attitudes like this about adult male victims of sexual assault have an influence on whether victims report their victimization. Even though the fear of being victimized is a realistic fear for women some believe feminists are creating more victims (Zerbe-Enns, 2001). There are also cultural differences among women surrounding sexual assault; minorities in the US tend to view sexual assault differently than their white counterparts (Lefley, Scott, Llabre & Hicks, 1993).

Many victims regardless of gender or sexual orientation have a hard time coming forward because of society stigmatizing victims of sexual assault (White & Yamawaki, 2009; Davies et al., 2012; Clark, 2014; Lowe & Rogers, 2017). This can add stress to victims who already have a higher rate of depression, anxiety, and other forms post-traumatic stress symptoms than individuals who have not experienced any form of sexual assault (Lefley et al., 1993; Gilbert, 1994; Nagel et al., 2005; White & Yamawaki, 2009; Davies et al., 2012; Turchik & Edwards, 2012; Barglow, 2014; Clark, 2014; Lowe & Rogers, 2017; Richer et al., 2017; Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center, 2018). Post-traumatic stress can lead victims to become hypersexual and/or lead victims to numb themselves. Victims tend to mentally and emotionally numb themselves during and after their experience to get through the trauma. Victims can experience anywhere
from minor numbing to severe numbing after their experience (Leiner, Kearns, Jackson & Astin, 2012; Turchik & Edwards, 2012; Roberts, 2013; Barglow, 2014). Numbing can increase a victim’s risk for drug addiction, alcoholism, anxiety disorders, and other psychological disorders (Gilbert, 1994; Barglow, 2014).

Adult male victims not only have the risk for addictions, anxiety disorders, and psychological disorders but also gender identity disorders. This is because of they lose the sense of what it means to be masculine (White & Yamawaki, 2009; Turchik & Edwards, 2012). Sexual assault also leaves long term effects on victims romantic and sexual relationships. The negative effects on victim’s romantic relationships can vary but may include emotional distancing, communication problems, and even sexual difficulties. Sexual relationships suffer negative effects in the form of lack of interest, avoidance of sex, and even actual sexual dysfunctions (Gilbert, 1994).

Therefore, it is important to treat survivors of sexual assault with the appropriate kind of therapy after victimization since every victim is different. Victims that numb severely may not trust therapists and may need more compassion and time to speak up whereas, victims that have less severe numbing may still need a lot compassion, but they may have an easier time speaking up. Forcing victims to speak when they are not ready to talk about certain parts of their experience can often lead them to regress (Barglow, 2014). The level of trauma each victim faces differs because victims are not going to experience the same types of victimization or level of trauma (Leiner et al, 2012; Clark, 2014). This is because of three different aspects of victim survival and normalization: the victim’s response to their sexual assault, the community’s response to the victim coming forward, and the level of stigmatization the victim receives (Clark, 2014). This makes
sense because each victim could receive a varying level of support or lack of support from the people and the support systems around them. How they deal with their victimization affect not only how they see themselves and live their lives but how others also view them.

There are two kinds of sexual assault victims, primary and secondary victims. Primary victims are those who are sexually assaulted, while secondary victims are family, partners and friends (Lefley et al., 1993; Nagel et al., 2005; White & Yamawaki, 2009). It is important to understand and study both types of victims to get a clear understanding of what sexual assault victims face. Lefley et al. (1993), found that family who support a family member who was sexually assaulted often seek vengeance; while family members who are not supportive often shun or shut the victim out. Seeking vengeance is also not conducive to healing a victim back to a proper psychological state which is something that needs to be taught to supportive families. Likewise, it is also important to teach unsupportive family members the importance of effective support.

People’s attitudes also often dictate how they accept victims. There are many pre-existing attitudes about sexual assault and victims. Additionally, many people may be uncomfortable with sexual assault victims talking about their experience. Some of these preexisting attitudes are learned through perceptions by peers based on the number of friends a victim has. The more friends a victim has the more positive attitudes and perceptions are; whereas, a victim who lacks friends receives more negative attitudes and perceptions. Attitudes are also socially and environmentally learned by an individual through the people around them specifically their own friends and family (Brown, 2018). One study found that males have more negative attitudes towards victims than females,
that older individuals have a more negative attitude towards victims than younger individuals and that the higher an individual’s education level was the more positive their attitude was towards victims (Nagel et al., 2005).

This would make sense because males have been part of the problem for an extremely lengthy time, thus causing them to not examine and productively talk about sexual assault. Females on the other hand have been discussing it in depth for decades so it would also make sense many would have more positive attitudes towards victims. It makes sense that age would be a factor in acceptance of sexual assault victims because many individuals in the older generations tend to be stuck in a mentality of how things were instead of how things should be, while younger generations tend to want to fight for any injustice. Education is important not just the level of education but also the variety of topics studied.

Another, study examined medical students’ attitude towards victims of sexual assault and found that males had a more negative attitude towards victims. This eventually led to the belief that females should be the only ones to treat victims (White & Robinson-Kurpius, 1999). Although, White and Robinson-Kurpius (1999) make a valid point that females should treat female victims it is also misguided. Yes, it can help make female victims feel safer and more willing to talk about the experience they have been through. It unfortunately does not educate males on how to appropriately interact and treat female victims which is problematic. This belief also helps to create the problem of ignoring how to treat male victims medically (Turchik & Edwards, 2012).

Another problem to why adult male victims are ignored medically is due in part to homosexuality being labeled a medical disorder in the past. It has led to little medical
research being done on male victims as well as a lack in training on how to deal with male victims. Even though hospital records show that between 3-12% of sexual assaults reported to them are male victims (Turchik & Edwards, 2012). The reason it is problematic is because it furthers stereotypes and fails at teaching male physicians to be more understanding and accepting. It also invalidates male victim’s status by creating negative attitudes about male victims which influence their willingness to report their victimization. A third study found that when people learn a victim has had negative reactions from family and friends they become less sympathetic towards the victim. Males tend to not only also believe rape myths more but harbor more sexist attitudes towards victims. One of the major differences that could be the cause of why men have more negative attitudes than women is because women have more experience discussing sexual assault (Brown, 2018).

The results of these studies are not shocking. It is not a stretch for Brown to suggest men’s negative attitudes come from not talking about sexual assault and its victims. When they are forced to discuss both they may not agree or understand but it slowly educates and teaches them which may potentially even increase understanding on sexual assault. Brown (2018) admits that one of the limitations of her research was that the research did not mirror real life. This was because individuals have pre-existing relationships with victims in some way and victims do not often reveal their status to acquaintances or strangers. This is an important limitation to acknowledge because it shows one of the major complexities when studying sexual assault culture. The limitation comes from society’s willingness to openly talk about sex, sex education, or sexual assault. Education creates awareness, understanding, and can even mitigate
ignorance. However, that is only if an individual is willing to learn. It would also make sense why Nagel et al.’s. (2005) study found that people who were more educated had a more positive attitude towards victims.

Another, reason why it may be difficult for victims to come forward is due to one of the major criticism’s victims face. One of the major criticisms that sexual assault victim’s face is the belief that they often lie and make false accusations (Zerbe-Enns, 2001; Littleton, 2011). This led feminists to a valid uproar and leading the charge in changing the definition of sexual assault to be more inclusive. This inclusivity helped in stopping to define sexual assault based on its extremes (Zerbe-Enns, 2001). Creating more inclusivity in the definition of sexual assault was important because it helped include activity that is sexual assault which was previously accepted like marital rape and made them illegal.

**Intoxication**

When studying sexual assault, it is important to also study the role of intoxication. Intoxication when being examined with sexual assault should be considered any form of drug or alcohol that inhibits an individual from giving verbal consent or removes an individual’s ability to withdraw their consent (DeMatteo et al., 2015). There are 24 states that have laws stating, “temporary incapacity to consent to sexual acts due to alcohol or drugs” (DeMatteo et al., 2015, p. 232). Only 11 states use the word intoxication in their definition and 7 states include voluntary intoxication. Another, 23 states require the defendant to know the victim’s status of intoxication, but only 2 assume that the defendant knows the victim’s status of intoxication (DeMatteo et al., 2015).

Responsible use of marijuana and alcohol should not be considered to inhibiting a person’s ability to give or withdraw consent. The reason for this is because marijuana
Nelson has been used medicinally for decades and to state any individual who smokes marijuana cannot consent would be a fallacy. Likewise, with alcohol many people drink responsibly so to state if someone drinks responsibly, they cannot consent would also be a fallacy. However, an individual given marijuana or alcohol without their consent should be considered sexual assault. Ingesting drugs and/or alcohol does severely increase an individual’s risk for victimization (Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2001; Nguyen, Kaysen, Dillworth, Brajcich & Larimer, 2010). One survey found that 75% of the men and 55% of the women surveyed had been using drugs or alcohol during the time of a sexual assault (Kaysen, Neighbors, Martell, Fossos & Larimer, 2006). Since college students can have the heavy alcohol use, they are more at risk for sexual assault (Kaysen et al., 2006; Nguyen et al., 2010).

Drug or alcohol facilitated sexual assault is problematic regardless of what gender the victim is. There are two main types of drug and alcohol facilitated sexual assault voluntary and involuntary. Voluntary means the victim voluntarily ingested drugs or alcohol, while involuntary means that the victim was given drugs or alcohol without their knowledge. If an individual overindulges voluntarily or is given drugs or alcohol without their consent and passes out it is considered to be incapacitated rape. This type of sexual assault usually happens at parties or in clubs (Nguyen et al., 2010; Richer et al., 2017). Alcohol is among the most common date rape drugs that are used in drug-facilitated rape and sexual assault (Horvath & Brown, 2005; Nguyen et al., 2010; Murugan & Bairagi, 2011).

Date rape drugs are various kinds of drugs that an individual can use to impair a victim without their knowledge and consent (Horvath & Brown, 2005; Adamowicz, &
Kala, 2010; Murugan & Bairagi 2011). One of the most common date rape drugs that is used and talk about in the media is Rohypnol (Horvath & Brown, 2005; Murugan & Bairagi, 2011). Rohypnol is processed quickly in the body and is usually out of the system within 60-72 hours after being ingested (Murugan & Bairagi, 2011).

A newer method for testing for date rape drugs using a sample of an individual’s hair can be used for up to 28 days after ingestion (Murugan & Bairagi, 2011). Tests for each unique date rape drug must be done separately. This is because there are 128 different drugs that sexual assault victims can be tested for when they seek medical help. The earlier a victim comes in and gets tested the more accurate the test is. Some date rape drugs can be tested for up to a week but the levels of the drug in the victim’s system dissipates. Medical personal urge victims to get tested as soon as possible if they believe a date rape drug may have been used (Adamowicz & Kala, 2010).

Programs such as Sexual Assault Forensic Examiner or SAFE have created trainings that help make the evaluation of victims both medically and forensically better allowing providers to have a better understanding of drug facilitated sexual assault (Richer et al., 2017). Many colleges and universities also remind college students about the risks and dangers that can occur at parties. However, as good as training programs are for medical personnel and police in regard to drug and alcohol facilitated rape and sexual assault more needs to be done. One potential solution could be to make college and universities require a yearly training for students. This could potentially reduce the victimization rate and teach students what to look out for to not only protect themselves but also protect their friends.
National Intimate Partner & Sexual Violence Study

In the United States there are millions of men and women affected by violence. The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence survey attempts to examine violence caused by three distinct forms of violence: sexual, intimate partner, and stalking. This survey studies these forms of violence to find patterns across the country to better understand the depth of the problems, raise awareness, and attempt to help states get more resources to deal with them. The 2010 to 2012 study’s results were released in 2017 and the results are important to look at when examining sexual assault of female and male victims (Smith, Chen, Basile, Gilbert, Merrick, Patel, Walling & Jain, 2017).

This study interviewed a total of 41,174 individuals over the three-year time frame and had 22,590 female respondents and 18,584 male respondents. The survey found that 36.3% or 1 in 3 women and 17.1% or 1 in 6 males were affected by sexual violence in their lifetime. It also found that 37.3% over 1 in 3 of women and 30.9% or nearly 1 in 3 men were victims of intimate partner violence. Lastly, the survey found that 15.8% or 1 in 6 women and 5.3% or 1 in 19 men were victims of stalking (Smith, Chen, Basile, Gilbert, Merrick, Patel, Walling & Jain, 2017).

The survey measured sexual violence through five difference items: rape, being made to penetrate someone else, sexual coercion, unwanted sexual contact, and non-contact unwanted sexual experiences. Their definition of rape included: completed or attempted unwanted (vaginal, anal, and oral) penetration through physical force, threats, unconscious, and intoxicated (drugs or alcohol). Being made to penetrate someone else was defined as being made to or an attempt to make an individual penetrate someone else. Sexual coercion was defined as pressuring and individual into unwanted sexual penetration through promises, lies, threats, or manipulation. Unwanted sexual contact
was considered any unwanted sexual experience involving touch but no penetration.

Lastly, non-contact unwanted sexual experiences were considered any unwanted experience that did not involve touch or penetration: flashing, forced to show body parts, forced to see or participate in sexual images or videos, and harassing (Smith et al., 2017).

The following three tables contain the survey’s results for sexual violence for both women and men. Table 2 is the average percentage of sexual violence for women and men based on the five measures. Table 3 is sexual violence found broken down by ethnicity. Table 4 shows two aspects the gender of the perpetrator and the relationship of the perpetrator (Smith et al., 2017).

**Table 2:**

2010-2012 The National Intimate Partner & Sexual Violence Survey (Sexual Violence Results)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Sexual Violence</th>
<th>Percentage of Women</th>
<th>Percentage of Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape completed or attempted forced penetration</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape drug/ alcohol facilitated penetration</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made to penetrate</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made to penetrate completed/ attempted</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made to penetrate drug/ alcohol facilitated</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual coercion</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted sexual contact</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contact unwanted sexual experiences</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data is a combination of two tables 3.1 & 3.5 (Smith et al., 2017)
### Table 3:
2010-2012 The National Intimate Partner & Sexual Violence Survey (Sexual Violence Results: Ethnicity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Type of Sexual Violence</th>
<th>Percentage of Women</th>
<th>Percentage of Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Contact sexual violence</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rape (made to penetrate for males)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-contact unwanted sexual experiences</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Contact sexual violence</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rape (made to penetrate for males)</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-contact unwanted sexual experiences</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Contact sexual violence</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rape (made to penetrate for males)</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-contact unwanted sexual experiences</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>Contact sexual violence</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rape (made to penetrate for males)</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-contact unwanted sexual experiences</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>Contact sexual violence</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rape (made to penetrate for males)</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-contact unwanted sexual experiences</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>Contact sexual violence</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rape (made to penetrate for males)</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-contact unwanted sexual experiences</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data is a combination of two tables 3.2 & 3.6 (Smith et al., 2017)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Victim</th>
<th>Type of sexual violence</th>
<th>Perpetrator Relationship</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Gender of perpetrator &amp; Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Intimate partner</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Made to penetrate</td>
<td>Intimate partner</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual coercion</td>
<td>Intimate partner</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unwanted sexual contact</td>
<td>Intimate partner</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-contact unwanted sexual experiences</td>
<td>Intimate partner</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Intimate partner</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Made to penetrate</td>
<td>Intimate partner</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual coercion</td>
<td>Intimate partner</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unwanted sexual contact</td>
<td>Intimate partner</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-contact unwanted sexual experiences</td>
<td>Intimate partner</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data is a combination of four tables 3.3, 3.4 & 3.7, 3.8 (Smith et al., 2017)
Table 2 shows the difference in percentages between female and male respondents with female victims at a higher rate than their male counterparts. Table 3, respondents’ ethnicity and gender shows that women of color have a higher rate of sexual assault. Furthermore, it shows that American Indian/Alaska Native and Multiracial women and men had the highest rates of victimization. Table 4 shows perpetrator information for contact sexual violence, rape, made to penetrate, and sexual coercion for both men and women had similar results. For contact sexual violence women and men had an almost identical rate of victimization by an acquaintance; women with a rate of 48.6% and men with a rate of 48.9%. Both and men and women had high rates of victimization by both intimate partners and acquaintances for the categories of rape and being made to penetrate. Similarly, in category of sexual coercion both men and women had high rates of victimization from intimate partner. With the category of unwanted sexual contact both men and women have high rates of victimization from acquaintances. However, men had higher rates at 52.5% than women at 47.6%. Lastly, with regards to non-contact sexual experiences men and women had similarly high rates of victimization from acquaintances and strangers. Women were mainly victimized by men, and men were victimized mainly by men in two categories; rape and non-contact unwanted sexual experiences. However, in three categories made to penetrate, sexual coercion, and unwanted sexual contact men were victimized more by women than men (Smith et al., 2017).

The last type of victimization stalking was viewed as unwanted following, harassing and/or contacting the victim. This study measured through the following
tactics: phone, email, gifts, and following in a few different ways. The study found that 15.8% or 1 in 6 women and 5.3 or 1 in 19 males experience stalking in their lifetime.

The following tables break down the study’s results of stalking by ethnicity, tactics, and perpetrator information (Smith et al., 2017).

**Table 5:**
*2010-2012 The National Intimate Partner & Sexual Violence Survey (Stalking Results: Ethnicity)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage of Women</th>
<th>Percentage of Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/ Pacific Islander</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/ Alaska Native</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data is a combination of two tables 4.2 & 4.7 (Smith et al., 2017)

**Table 6:**
*2010-2012 The National Intimate Partner & Sexual Violence Survey (Stalking Results: Tactics)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Tactic</th>
<th>Percentage of Women</th>
<th>Percentage of Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watch/ follow</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approached/ showed up</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left a strange item</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snuck into home/ car</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted messages/ calls</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted emails/ social media</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted gifts</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damaged property</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatening physical harm</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data is a combination of two tables 4.3 & 4.8 (Smith et al., 2017)
Table 7: 
The National Intimate Partner & Sexual Violence Survey  
(Stalking Results: Perpetrator Information)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Victim</th>
<th>Perpetrator Relationship</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Gender of perpetrator &amp; Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Intimate partner</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Intimate partner</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data is a combination of four tables 4.4, 4.5 & 4.9, 4.10 (Smith et al., 2017)

Intimate partner violence affects both male and females. This survey measured intimate partner violence through five different measures sexual violence, stalking, physical violence, psychological aggression, and control of reproductive or sexual health. Sexual violence was defined and measured as rape, coercion, unwanted sexual contact, non-contact unwanted sexual experiences, and being made to penetrate someone else. Stalking was considered any pattern of harassment or threatening tactics by a perpetrator that is unwanted and causes fear in the victim (Smith et al., 2017).

Physical violence was considered any form of violence that causes physical harm to the victim. Psychological aggression is any form of expressive aggression that is used to control or monitor an intimate partner. Lastly, control of reproductive or sexual health was considered lack of care towards an intimate partner’s sexual or reproductive health; like refusal to use a condom or purposefully trying to get pregnant or get a partner pregnant when they do not want to. This study found that 9.7% of women and 2.3% of men experience stalking by an intimate partner in their lifetime. It also found that 16.4%
of women and 7% of men would be victims of contact sexual violence; which includes rape, unwanted sexual contact, coercion, and being made to penetrate an intimate partner (Smith et al., 2017).

Tables 5 through 7 show stalking statistics for ethnicity both multiracial females and males have the highest rate of stalking. Women in all ethnicities still have higher rates of stalking than men. With regards to tactics three categories are high for both women and men: unwanted calls/messages, threatening physical harm, and damaged property. The main two types of perpetrators for stalking for both genders are intimate partner and acquaintances. Lastly, there is a striking difference for the gender of the perpetrator. Women had a high rate of male perpetrators; whereas, males had a higher rate of female perpetrators. However, male victims have an almost even percentage of male and female perpetrators.

All the statistics gathered in this study show that females have higher rates of sexual victimization than their male counterparts. Although the study was published in 2017 it would be interesting to see the study re-done. This is because male victims were not officially recognized until 2012 across the country when the federal law changed to become more inclusive (United States Department of Justice, 2017). So, data gathered from 2010-2012 would not be as inclusive as data gathered currently. This change is the definition could also influence a change in how the researchers interview males and females. Research on male victims is significantly behind female victims and this has to do with multiple moving parts.

**What myths exist?**

According to White and Robinson-Kurpius (1999) “since feudal times, men have assumed it was their right to victimize women. Over the ages, the prevalent belief
became that women wanted sex and, therefore, were not being victimized or raped” (989). This became one of the first rape myths about forced sex. Men strongly endorsed the myth that states women can prevent sexual assault if they try harder and if they are sexually assaulted it is their fault and they should take the blame. That the reason women are sexually assaulted is because they go out alone or late at night, by dressing in certain ways, or even by acting like a “good girl” over a “bad girl” (White & Robinson-Kurpius, 1999; Davies et al., 2012). Women also face the myth of when a woman says no, she really means yes (McGee et al., 2011). This is a myth woman face daily because it has been engrained in US society for so long.

It is important to state that men do not have any right to victimize men or women any more than women have the right to victimize men. That the mentality that one gender has the right to victimize the other in some way is wrong due to the assumption that their gender is superior in the current circumstance. Regardless, of whether an individual goes out late at night by themselves or with others it doesn’t give anyone the right to assault them. In addition to that, just because someone acts like or is a “good girl or boy” doesn’t mean that they cannot be sexually assaulted and vice versa just because someone is a “bad girl or boy” doesn’t mean they are going to be sexually assaulted. People from any ethnic or racial background, personalities, gender identities, and sexual orientations can be sexually assaulted. When stating myths, it is highly important to not just show research but also factually state why the myth is not true.

One of the biggest myths that victims face is that of victim blaming. This myth states that the victim deserved to be sexually assaulted, he/she was asking for it, and even only certain types of individuals are sexually assaulted. The myth essentially blames the
victim and takes away any responsibility from the perpetrator (Cowan, 2000; Viki, Abrams & Masser, 2004; Davies & Rogers, 2006). Victims who knew their perpetrator are blamed more harshly than victims who did not know their perpetrator (Viki et al., 2004; Davies & Rogers, 2006). Women tend to endorse this myth the most (Cowan, 2000). Other research shows that men tend to blame the victims more than women (Davies & Rogers, 2006; Harrison et al., 2008). Male victims are blamed more for their victimization more than female victims (Davies & McCartney, 2003; Davies & Rogers, 2006; Sleath & Bull, 2010).

Men and women also tend to blame homosexual men for their victimization more than women. However, males blame victims more than females. If an individual is homophobic then both heterosexual and homosexual men are blamed for their victimization more than female victims (Burt & DeMello, 2002). It makes sense that research would find both men blaming victims more than women and women blaming victims more than men. Based on the type of research, the phrasing of questions and types of questions being asked results can vary one way or the other. Having a difference in results is beneficial because it leads to a clearer understanding of the whole picture.

Another myth out there is the myth of sexual exchange, which states that if a man is paying for the date the woman is required to have sex with him. Both men and women agree with this belief more so if the man pays for an expensive date. Men believe this myth more than women do (Basow & Minieri, 2011). The reason this is a myth is because it does not matter who pays for a date no one owes anyone sex for a date. Just because an individual goes on a date with someone does not mean they are obligated to pay for the entire date. If it has been established during the date that an individual wants
to pay for the entire date and insists it still does not mean the other party owes them sex for the date.

Male rape myths like female rape myths tends to lead to the invisibility and marginality or male sexual assault survivors (Turchik & Edwards, 2012). Male rape myths have been linked with society’s traditional definition of masculinity and traditional gender roles (Davies & Rogers, 2006; Sleath & Bull, 2010; Turchik & Edwards, 2012; Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center, 2018). The most common myth out there for male victims is that men cannot be sexually assaulted, or only gay men are sexually assaulted (Davies et al., 2012; Turchik & Edwards, 2012; Roberts, 2013; Clark, 2014). One of the rape myths males face are that being sexually assaulted makes them less of a man, that they are more feminine or even homosexual. Another, myth male victims face is that they were vulnerable and therefore they cannot still be considered a man and have claims to manhood (White & Yamawaki, 2009; Sleath & Bull, 2010; Turchik & Edwards, 2012; Clark, 2014; Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center, 2018).

Another, myth that male victims face is that they weren’t strong enough or man enough to fight off their offender (Davies et al, 2008; Davies et al., 2012; Turchik & Edwards, 2012). Male victims are judged harsher than their female counterparts if they don’t fend off an attacker because they are strong enough to escape (Davies & McCartney, 2003). These attitudes about male victims of sexual assault might influence whether they report their victimization. Research must be done to examine if this is a factor in the underreporting of male sexual assault. Roberts (2013) with the help of NSW Health Education Centre Against Violence published a booklet to help men cope with
sexual assault and rape myths. This booklet helps guide men who are victims and their friends and family through understanding the reality of the situation. It also negates some of the common myth’s male victims face. The booklet later goes on to provide ways for friends and family to help with providing proper support.

A study by McGee et al. (2011) examined 20 different rape myths using 3,120 participants from phone interviews in Ireland. This study was well-rounded and examined myths surrounding six different areas: male rape myths, victim rape myths, perpetrator rape myths, motives behind sexual assault, myths about consequences, and accusation myths. This study looked at the overall agreement for these myths between men and women (McGee et al., 2011).

They found that roughly 10% of their study population agreed that men cannot be sexually assaulted, that a husband cannot sexually assault his wife and that when a woman says no, she means yes. They also found that between 35-40% of their study population agreed men who sexually assault men must be gay, men are less affected than women by sexual assault, sexual assault is not used to control or dominate someone and that it is committed because of sexual desire, and that accusations of sexual assault are often false. This would be a great well-rounded study for the US to recreate to see what the mentality in the US is. It could also lead to better correlation about myths allowing for better methods for educating the public about the myths and why they are false (McGee et al., 2011).

**Gender Roles**

Gender roles are societal constructs that have been created based on an individual’s gender. Society usually assigns gender to individuals at birth based on their genitalia. However, society is wrong to do this because an individual’s genitalia is
indicative of their biological sex and not their gender or gender identity. Only an individual can tell what their gender is based off how they perceive themselves. Their gender identity may line up with their biological sex or it may not (Helgeson, 1994).

Someone who identifies as the gender matching their biological sex is cisgender. Anyone who does not identify with the gender linked to biological sex is transgender. There are many groups under the category of transgender such as; male to female, female to male, gender fluid, and gender nonconforming to name a few. Transgender individuals do not adhere to the gender roles of their biological sex but rather the gender roles of their gender identity. Cisgender individuals adhere to the gender roles they are assigned at birth (Helgeson, 1994).

Gender roles for males surround the concept of masculinity. Gender roles for females surround the concept of femininity. Masculinity focuses on a multitude of aspects: strength, a lack of most emotions, competitiveness, and aggression are just some the aspects. Femininity on the other hand focuses on different aspects usually aspects opposite of masculinity like emotional, intelligent, and compassionate (Helgeson, 1994).

Gender is a social construct that is consistent throughout society, however, individuals’ personal gender identity grows and changes as they get older. Traditional masculinity and femininity are also closely related to gender stereotypes and gender roles (Kachel, Steffens & Niedlich, 2016). The idea that men are masculine, and women are feminine is gender stereotype theory. Gender stereotypes range from simple things like saying “ladies and gentlemen” to teaching children about gender. Gender and the roles of each gender are typically assigned to individuals based off their biological sex usually at
birth. The United States is especially focused on maintaining the concept of two sexes and two genders even though many cultures believe in more than two (Sprague, 2016).

Existing measures of masculinity and femininity have been criticized for being unidimensional. This criticism comes from two issues: the failure of existing methods to test for multidimensionality, and the lack of correlation between the subject’s definition of their gender and their results. This means that methods used to measure an individual’s gender typically only examine gender based on societal gender roles and societal stereotypes about each gender. The methods for measuring an individual’s gender also do not include measurements for an individual’s beliefs about their own gender identity. For example, they do not include questions about an individual’s voice, clothing, mannerisms, or behaviors and just based on personality traits like stoic (for males) versus emotional (for females) (Helgeson, 1994).

Gender also plays a role in how relationships function. In heterosexual relationships men are the man in the relationship, while heterosexual women are the women in the relationship. In homosexual relationships gay men and lesbians are often linked to having the same gender roles as heterosexual women. This is because socially gay men, lesbians, and women are all viewed as needing more protection than heterosexual men. However, both heterosexual relationships and homosexual (gay, lesbian, and bisexual) relationships operate the same way romantically. The only difference is the structure of gender roles in the relationship: heterosexual relationships have a male and female gender role, gay relationships have two male gender roles, lesbian relationships have two female gender roles, and bisexuals can have (a male and
female gender role, two male gender roles, or even two female gender roles (Sorenson & Thomas, 2009).

**Rape Myths**

Rape myths are beliefs an individual or a society has about sexual assault that are not true. These beliefs stem from personal ignorance that is learned from a person’s family or societal interaction. One of the biggest ways that rape myths are spread is through the media in the form of newspapers, television news, and the internet. Many myths are widely known to be false; yet, many people still believe them to be true (Ryan, 2004; McGee, O’Higgins, Garavan & Conroy, 2011; Clark, 2014). There are more than 20 different types of myths out there all with similar yet different falsities they spread (McGee et al., 2011).

In the US rape myths are endorsed at not only the institutional level, but also by a substantial portion of the population. It is also extremely important to constantly negate and challenge myths to continually enforce the reality the myths hide (Ryan, 2004; Clark, 2014). One of the biggest myths individuals in society believes is the myth of “stranger danger” which is largely due to the media. One study found that 93% of victims knew the perpetrator and 7% of victims were victimized by strangers (Spoo, Kaylor, Schaaf, Rosselli, Laake, Johnson & Jeglic, 2018).

Both men and women accept rape myths according to the rape myth scale. Men however tend to accept myths at a higher rate than women. Since men accept rape myths at a higher rate than women, they are also more likely to judge victims. This judgement tends to be harsher and based off societal gender roles. The rape myth scale however is written and geared mainly towards examining rape myths surrounding women do (Basow & Minieri, 2011; Davies et al., 2012; Turchik & Edwards, 2012). It is beneficial to study
rape myths surrounding both genders to examine how to best teach society these myths are false.

When an individual has first or second-hand experience with sexual assault, they begin to learn the reality of rape myths and why they are false. Individuals with no experience may have misconceptions about myths and the reality many people face because of the myths that are out there. First-hand experience can be considered as any individual who has been sexually assaulted. While second-hand experience can be experienced by family, friends or a partner and is bit more complicated (Nagel et al., 2005).

Secondhand experience gets complex is if the victim is sexually assaulted by a family member. Some of the family may side with the victim while others side with the rapist and thus negate the victims’ experience. The same outcome can also happen if the victim is sexually assaulted by a friend. However, a partner can only have second-hand experience if they are not the rapist. This is what makes second-hand experience complex and can either help or hinder a victim (Nagel et al., 2005).

Unfortunately, second-hand experience can also create negative attitudes and experiences for the victim from individuals they view as family and friends. This can lead to a secondary type of victimization in which the victim gets blamed for their assault, has their experienced minimalized, has their credibility questioned, and/or has their character defamed (Nagel et al., 2005). Some family members who experience sexual assault secondhand tend to seek vengeance which can victimize the primary victim (Lefley et al., 1993). Male victims also tend to create an internalized secondary
victimization due to internalized homophobia and other individuals’ reactions to their survivor status (White & Yamawaki, 2009; Lowe & Rogers, 2017).

It is important to understand the complexities of rape myths because they can be created or dismantled due to the experiences of the victim and those around them. There are many ways to both fight and enforce myths. People trying to dismantle rape myths that have been created by society might tell victims “you did nothing wrong” or “what you were doing or wearing isn’t important what is important is that you were a victim”. People trying to promote rape myths that have been created by society might tell victims “you were asking for it” or “what did you expect having a drink and wearing that”. Rape myths are only powerful if people stay ignorant to facts and buy into the falsities. Both males and females perpetuate and endorse rape myths, however, males tend to endorse myths more than females (White & Robinson-Kurpius, 1999; Cowan, 2000; Mcgee et al., 2011). Dismantling rape myths can benefit all individuals in the society not just those who have been sexually assaulted.

There are also racial differences in rape myth acceptance. One study found that Hispanic females were more likely to believe cultural rape myths especially myths around victim blaming than white females (Lefley et al., 1993). Women who tend to be hostile and hold negative stereotypes about other women are also more likely to endorse rape myths. This hostility creates a sense of rejection, isolation, and distrust between women preventing them from being cohesive in the fight against rape myths (Cowan, 2000). This lack of cohesion amongst women surrounding rape myths prevents unity amongst themselves and hurts all victims who face backlash because of the myths.
Rape myths around male victims tend to be surrounding their masculinity and sexuality (Cowan, 2000; Sivakumaran, 2005; Davies & Rogers, 2006; White & Yamawaki, 2009; Sleath & Bull, 2010; Davies et al., 2012; Turchik & Edwards, 2012; Clark, 2014; Lowe & Rogers, 2017). These myths tend to focus on emasculating the victims and focusing on their feminity or even linking them to homosexuality. Since neither feminity nor homosexuality equate to masculinity in society’s eyes (Sivakumaran, 2005; White & Yamawaki, 2009; Sleath & Bull, 2010; Turchik & Edwards, 2012; Clark, 2014; Lowe & Rogers, 2017). Many men fear being considered homosexual because of their status as victims. (Sivakumaran, 2005; Davies et al., 2008; Rumney, 2008; White & Yamawaki, 2009; Davies et al., 2012; Lowe & Rogers, 2017). Attitudes like these about male victims of sexual assault influence the level of reporting for male victimization.

This also causes many male victims to go through a fundamental crisis about their identity and society’s construction of masculinity. A study of male victims in Croatia and Norway found that victims had significant concerns about their masculinity. This occurs because many men link arousal and ejaculation to pleasure and if during the sexual assault this occurred, they begin to question their sexuality. Other myths for male victims focus on their experience making them vulnerable (Clark, 2014). Due to homophobia victims who are gay are often blamed for their victimization more than heterosexual men involved. Similarly, if the male victim did not try to fight back and resist, they get blamed more than victims who did fight back (Davies & McCartney, 2003; Davies et al., 2008).

**Toxic Masculinity**

Masculinity is observed differently depending on whether an individual is homosexual or heterosexual. The concepts of homosexual and heterosexual were
originally constructed by doctors between 1880-1920. Both terms still play a significant role in understanding masculinity today. During the time that these terms were constructed doctors stated that heterosexuality was normal, and homosexuality was abnormal. Doctors used medical literature and the media (radio and books) to normalize the idea heterosexual relationships were normal and homosexual relationships are abnormal and perverse. They linked homosexuality to femininity and therefore not masculine (Katz, 1983; Katz, 1995).

Prior to this, in the 1820s-1860s the Victorian concepts of “true woman” and “true man” were accepted (Katz, 1983; Katz, 1995). True women and true men were comprised of four different cardinal virtues. True women were comprised of piety, purity, submissiveness, and domesticity. True men on the other hand were comprised of devotion to hard work and material success, a pure controlled sexuality (though insistent), assertiveness, and the attributes of the benevolent patriarchal ruler (Katz, 1983). The concepts of true women and true man also strictly structured and divided male and female activities and roles. Simultaneously, they enforced that males and females were different and could not be the same. It further equated these two concepts to masculinity (true man) and femininity (true woman) and to biological sex (Katz, 1983; Katz, 1995).

If an individual did not conform to the gender and roles they were assigned (male and masculine, and female and femininity) then they were not considered to be part of that gender and were treated as abnormal (Katz, 1983; Katz, 1995). Furthermore, the gender roles society dictates lead to how men and women are socialized.

This strict gender socialization begins at an early age and continues throughout adulthood. Males learn what it is to be masculine while females learn about femininity and
that neither gender should conform to the other (Harrison et al. 2008; White & Yamawaki, 2009; Garbarino, 2000; Davies et al., 2012). In addition to this, individuals learn what stereotypes society has for men as and women neither of which are the same. This socialization process is learned from an individual’s family and enforced by the rest of society. One example of this is how society expects men to be sexual and promiscuous while it expects women to be virtuous (Harrison et al. 2008; White & Yamawaki, 2009; Davies et al., 2012). If an individual does not conform to their societal gender roles they are often judged harshly (Harrison et al. 2008; White & Yamawaki, 2009; Davies et al., 2012).

This type of mentality led early doctors to link mental capacity to gender. Specifically, that women and men had a different mental capacities, morality, and emotional qualities. Males and females’ mental capacities, moralities, and emotional qualities differ based on the traits distributed to each gender. Males were less emotional, strong, aggressive, and impulsive. Females were emotional, weak, not aggressive, and cautious. These traits essentially made it so that men and women were opposites creating a divide between the genders (Katz, 1995). Early sex researchers furthered this divide by publishing information stating that men were more intelligent than women; using systematic differences to back up their point surrounding male superiority. However, these early sex researchers completely ignored the cultural history of female oppression that helped to shape those beliefs (Sprague, 2016).

Not long after mental capacity was linked to gender and gender roles homosexuality was linked to femininity. Linking homosexuality occurred because of three moving parts. First, homosexual males were seen to be less masculine than
heterosexual males and therefore more feminine. Second, femininity is linked to women and there is a rich history of women being seen as less than men, subservient to men, and more emotional than men. Third, psychologists linked homosexuality to mental illness and femininity (Katz, 1995).

This separation of the genders, linking homosexuality to femininity, and the belief that women were less than men created the beginnings of toxic masculinity. Over time through the constant enforcement of the gender differences in this manner masculinity warped and divided into masculinity and toxic masculinity. Toxic masculinity takes the normal masculine behaviors and heightens them to the point of making males more aggressive and completely fearful of anything that could be perceived as feminine. This eventually leads to anything potentially feminine or feminine to be looked down upon and treated as lesser (Garbarino, 2000).

For the purpose of this study toxic masculinity and hyper-masculinity are the same. Toxic masculinity or hyper masculinity occurs due to society’s view and treatment of men. A man’s level of masculinity and manhood are equated to their continuous portrayal of what society believes to be masculine while rejecting anything that makes them appear as feminine or gay. Three of the main components identified that make a man masculine are: have power and status in relation to other men and specifically power over women (high levels of promiscuity and casual sexual encounters with multiple women), act tough, show no fear or pain, and lack sentiment and expression of feelings, and reject anything that society has deemed feminine (Danube, Vescio & Davis, 2014).

These attitudes about males influence their willingness to report sexual victimization, because the victims have the potential to be judged as less than “a man” for
failing to adhere to the strict standards of what it means to be masculine (Danube et al., 2014). Although, Danube et al. (2014) finds support for their research it is only the first step in examining toxic masculinity. The reason for this is because the study only examined the perspective of toxic masculinity from the male point of view and did not examine toxic masculinity from the perspective of females. This is important because females may or may not share the same beliefs as their male counterparts. Researching women’s perspectives on the subject could give a more well-rounded understanding of toxic masculinity. Danube et al.’s research is a starting point.

Hyper-masculinity is an exaggerated form of masculinity. It usually is portrayed through hostility, sexual promiscuity, domination, and gaining respect through aggression and lack of anything feminine. Hyper-masculine males often overlook or ignore communication about appropriate sexual cues and consent (Shafer, Ortiz, Thompson & Huemmer, 2017). According to Ryan (2004), hyper-masculinity is created solely by men based on their belief that to be a man they have to be macho, aggressive and hypersexual. This belief shows that masculinity and femininity are on a spectrum in which hyper-masculinity and masculinity are two different points and are not the same. She states that masculinity itself falls somewhere between hyper-masculinity and femininity on the scale. Although Ryan makes the distinction between masculinity and hyper-masculinity, she does not differentiate them other than saying masculinity is a multi-dimensional construct that can be considered somewhere in between femininity and hyper-masculinity. In addition to that, stating only men create hyper-masculinity through the idea that men should be macho, aggressive, and hypersexual is problematic. Society is
made up of both men and women both of which create and perpetuate stereotypes about gender and gender roles.

Boys learn how to be masculine at home through their parents, family, and home life. They also learn toxic masculinity through the level of violence and aggression at home. Both masculinity and toxic masculinity are retaught and enforced by the neighborhood, community, and school environments. Appropriately correcting aggressive and violent behavior through strong and effective discipline, support, and positive role models can help reduce the risk factors for violence and toxic masculinity.

One of the key components to correcting aggression is listening to boys and teaching them to express their emotions in healthy ways. However, a lack of appropriate discipline, lack of support, threats, and negatively treating their violent behavior increases their risk for violence and toxic masculinity (Garbarino, 2000).

In addition to that, constantly teaching children especially young boys to look for negative social cues over positive ones prevents them from seeing the good in themselves and others and therefore prepares them to be aggressive. Simultaneously, teaching young boys to be super aggressive and teaching them that fighting is a way to show dominance and masculinity promotes toxic masculinity. That when they fight winning is the only option and that they have to win at all costs and that they are less masculine if they lose further perpetuates toxic masculinity (Garbarino, 2000).

Gender specific treatment like what Garbarino mentions often starts at early childhood and is continually reinforced throughout children’s lives until they reach adulthood. Once children become adult’s society reinforces the beliefs of what make a man “a man” and a woman “a woman” throughout the rest of their adult lives. Not all
men and women conform to society’s views and standards. Since there are so many societal views for how men should act and treat both women and men it is important to look at these views.

In order to reduce the aggression and levels of toxic masculinity several methods can be used. These different methods include therapy, intervention programs, proper education programs, creating more positive family environments, and strong and positive community environments with assist in raising boys. Therapy can assist boys through discussing their lives, own victimization, and personal experiences in a safe environment to promote healing from trauma and proper mental and emotional health development. A proper education program assists boys with their mental development, promote learning, and creates a safe space away from dysfunctional homes. Teaching parents how to create positive family environments even if a parent is missing promotes stability and benefits mental and emotional development. A strong positive community assists family in teaching young boys right from wrong, builds a sense of community, promotes proper mental and emotional development, and creates safe spaces if a home is dysfunctional (Garbarino, 2000).

These methods can assist in reducing aggression because “boys are routinely taught to ignore or deny their feeling by parents and others who are training them to be men in a culture that demands male stoicism” (Garbarino, 2000, p. 86). Emotions and emotional territory are not unfamiliar to boys they are just taught to place their emotions in boxes, hide them away, not consciously think of how they feel, and even regard feelings of pain and sorrow as dangerous to their masculinity. By feeling emotions like
pain, fear and sorrow they are less masculine and should never show or speak of these emotions (Garbarino, 2000).

Boys are also taught that failure is not an option and that they must succeed at any cost; even at the cost of themselves. Currently, they lack the feeling part of morality due to being taught to close off and lock away their emotions. This prevents them from learning empathy; which is important to moral feeling allowing them to become hyper-aggressive. Their hyper-aggressiveness takes many forms some of which are taking power over others, impulsiveness, self-centeredness, and violence. Their hyper-aggressive attitudes and behaviors are not just a family, relationship, and community problem it is also a societal problem. Society has to deal with the consequences of this hyper-masculinity or toxic masculinity in many forms, sexual assault being one of them. In order for toxic masculinity to change, society has to change and teach boys to have proper emotional development like girls are taught. One of the key aspects of proper emotional development is empathy. Teaching boys’ empathy supports their mental and emotional development and allow for a shift in the culture of aggression and violence (Garbarino, 2000).

In order to do this, it is important to combine traditional masculine and feminine traits, attributes, and behaviors to show young boys it is normal. This combination of masculinity and femininity is generally referred to as androgyny (Garbarino, 2000). Part of learning to have more androgynous traits, attributes and behaviors is learning empathy (Garbarino, 2000). Teaching boy’s how to be empathic through the acceptance of androgyny leads to proper emotional and mental development. Teaching boys to be more androgynous and empathy is not just responsibility of parents but also the rest of society
(educational institutions, medical institutions, and the community). Furthermore, teaching boys that having self-esteem, compassion, empathy, and selflessness does not make them less masculine is important to creating a more wholesome society over a toxic and violent one (Garbarino, 2000).

It also allows for boys who are victims of childhood abuse and sexual abuse to have an easier time talking about their emotions. This requires more positive male role models, support, and more programs to fully combat toxic masculinity. It also means that teaching boys that failing and rejection are normal and to learn from it. This encourages boys to utilize more methods than just aggression and violence to reduce toxic masculinity. If boys continue to learn that being masculine is better than being feminine, to hold their emotions in, violence, and aggression nothing can change (Garbarino, 2000).

This form of strict socialization helps prevent male victims from coming forward because they view their victimization as an incident that took away their manhood and made them less of a man in society’s eyes (Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center, 2018). Male victims are treated more harshly because if they are sexually assaulted by other males, they are breaking traditional gender roles surrounding their masculinity, specifically their strength. Gender roles which are always meant to be followed and endorsed (White & Yamawaki, 2009).

Both males and females perpetuate toxic masculinity. The only difference is the methods in which they perpetuate it. Males can perpetuate toxic masculinity in many ways one of the ways is by harassing other guys who do not outwardly talk about sex with women. Females can perpetuate toxic masculinity in many ways one of the ways is more subtle they do it by telling guys they reject or humiliate that they do not look strong
or masculine enough. Although, sex is becoming more common there is still a societal divide on how men and women should engage in sex (Littleton, 2011).

Females who willingly engage in copious amounts of sex may be labeled as easy or a slut while their male counterparts are doing what is expected of them. Females who receive labels like slutty or easy tend to have more advances by men, and males often view them as having less of a right to refuse their advances. This can lead to males becoming overly aggressive and forcing themselves and sexual acts upon females with labels like slutty or easy (Littleton, 2011). This mentality that males are expected to sleep with as many girls as they can and if the girl refuses, they can take what they want is a form of toxic masculinity. It promotes violence and aggression instead of promoting respect and empathy.

With technology advancing rapidly it makes it easier to see just how bad toxic masculinity is in society. One of the newest trends in video blogging is sexual assault social experiments in which bloggers post videos on YouTube of a female and male taking turns sexually harassing each other with minor forms of assault like grabbing, unwanted touching, and attempts at hugs and kisses. In these videos the girl harassing and assaulting the guy gets away with the harassment and assault, while many bystanders just watch and ignore the assault. The bystanders that do say anything usually comment about how pretty the girl is and that the guy should want it (Saleh, 2015; Trollstation, 2015; Best Pranks, 2016; Salads, 2016). Some bystanders call the guy a loser and say that he is a guy and should want to have sex with an attractive woman (Salads, 2016). Bystanders in a different video also laugh at the guy being harassed and one even says he does not feel the need to do anything because he is a man and can stand up and defend
himself (Trollstation, 2015). In a different video a bystander even tells the guy “just tell her yea, don’t be gay” (Best Pranks, 2016, 1:52). It is important to understand that these types of videos can show how people in society think. However, this type of data has not been research and tested for validity and must be considered as experimental until evidence proves it worth.

When the video switches to the guy harassing the girl, many bystanders intervene and tell him to leave the girl alone. They even go as far to pull and push the guy away reinforcing that a guy should not assault a girl (Saleh, 2015; Trollstation, 2015; Salads, 2016. When the guy states that she was doing it earlier and no one said anything most bystanders shrug it off or do not acknowledge it (Saleh, 2015; Salads, 2016). One girl even admits to saying its wrong both ways but only saw him harassing her (Salads, 2016). In one video the cops get called on the guy and both he and the girl explain about the social experiment, at which point one of the cops admits to seeing the girl harassing the guy earlier but did nothing (Saleh, 2015). In other videos a bystander is about to call the cops right as the blogger stops and starts explaining about the experiment (Trollstation, 2015; Best Pranks, 2016).

These types of videos show that society believes men should always be able to defend themselves and that their masculinity depends on it. If they do not defend themselves, they are viewed as weaker or even gay. They also show that men should always want to have sex with attractive girls because it is what guys do. The videos also enforce that men do not have the right to assault women. However, the videos also show that society does not believe women can assault men because men can defend themselves.
These notions are part of the problem of toxic masculinity in society. They create a sense of structure based on traditional gender roles surrounding masculinity that state men can always defend themselves and if they cannot defend themselves, they should not be considered a man. This prevents male victims from coming forward out fear, ridicule, judgement, and the fear of being considered homosexual. Simultaneously, it gives female perpetrators a free pass to assault men without the repercussion of bystanders stepping in because they assume men can defend themselves and want to sleep with every hot girl they meet. This constant reinforcement of masculine gender stereotypes contributes to the culture of toxic masculinity by negating the emotions of men in society.

**Cases Publicized in the Media**

In 2012, Caleb Byers was a 20-year old from Iowa who was sexually assaulted. Seeking an older male role model, he found he eventually found a 60-year old man he connected with. The two become friends. One night after a graduation party he decided to meet his role model. He went over to the man’s house and was having fun. He felt that the atmosphere in the place shift but stayed because he was having fun. His role model made him a drink and they began talking like usual. After, an awkward situation he excused himself to the restroom (Crowder, 2017).

Upon, reentering the room the older man forced himself on Byers. He left as fast as he could until he arrived home where his twin brother learned about the sexual assault and did not believe him at first. A week later he began seeing a therapist where he explained he had been experiencing anger, depression, and confusion. That he was living off alcohol, nicotine and caffeine. Eventually numbing himself his personality changed and he began cutting himself. It took a year and half before he had the courage to report his sexual assault. The police did not believe him and berated him by constantly asking it
the incident really happened. The Chief of the Council Bluffs police department stated that the behavior of the officers was not indicative of the departments view and treatment of victims (Crowder, 2017). The behavior of the police is similar to the behaviors female victims often face. This shows that regardless of gender a victim’s status is the same.

Two years later Byers created WeAreNotPowerless.com was a site dedicated to helping male victims. The site is setup for people to read, share, and swap stories. He advocates for male victims and states the best thing for male victims is to believe them when they talk about their victimization. One of his biggest messages he teaches is that everyone has a past, and it does not have to define them. That every victim can go from victim to survivor if they have the help they need (Crowder, 2017). Byers message and actions are significantly powerful because they teach not only male victims that they can ask for help but that there is also a safe place for them to share their experiences. It is important to show male victims that asking for help is not a weakness and that they are stronger for asking and getting the help they need.

In 2016, a young man in the UK name Sam Thompson was sexually assaulted by two men. He went out drinking with a friend and they got separated and he lost his phone. After that, he met some new people and was invited out for more drinking. Soon he found himself in a hotel room being sexually assaulted while going in and out of consciousness. Walking back to his house after the sexual assault left him in shock, as he thought about suicide. Ultimately, thinking about his family he decided to go home and tell his girlfriend. Until that moment neither he nor his family ever thought men could be sexually assaulted. One of the biggest challenges he faced when reporting his victimization was that the police did not know how to handle dealing with a male victim
of sexual assault. This was because they were not used to dealing with male victims since so few victims report their victimization (Kale, 2017; Petter, 2017).

Eventually, he wound up at St. Mary’s hospital where they took forensic evidence. It was at that moment he felt like he was being taken seriously (Petter, 2017). His attackers were also not convicted like many others. He struggled hard with an inner conflict on getting help and talking versus how a man would and should act (Kale, 2017; Petter, 2017). Thompson’s inner conflict surrounding traditional gender roles show that toxic masculinity is taught through society and that there is a fear of breaking them.

Breaking the traditional roles of masculinity by doing anything feminine makes a man less of a man and can potentially make them appear homosexual.

Once Thompson’s inner conflict resolved itself, he decided that he should stand and fight against tradition gender roles which lead to toxic masculinity. He stated that the roles are outdated and need to be changed and that anyone can be a victim of sexual assault (Kale, 2017; Petter, 2017). He began to work at a nonprofit organization that supports male survivors of sexual assault. It helps with therapy and works alongside with police to make encounters better for male victims (Petter, 2017). Organizations that help sexual assault survivors are significant in helping male victims and teaching police. They are important because it allows police to grow and better assist male victims as well as teaches male victims, they do have the right come forward.

Jensen III (2017) interviewed 43 male survivors of sexual assault. These male survivors had different stories to tell. The stories contained many different types of sexual assault including threats, coercion, force, manipulation, drugs, and alcohol. The victims were sexually assaulted by family members, friends, acquaintances, strangers,
straight men, gay men, lesbians, and women. Some of the victims reported their sexual assault to the police and others did not. The victims who went and got psychological help also had mixed reactions. They found either appropriate support and help or no support at all from the psychologists they saw. Victims also found that they were laughed at or even told various forms of traditional male gender roles that lead to toxic masculinity.

These stories show why it is important to examine traditional gender roles and toxic masculinity and how they affect adult male victims. Male victims because of their experiences with these gender roles and toxic masculinity suffer from depression, anxiety, PTSD, thoughts of suicide, exile, the feeling of being alone, and the feeling of having to be quiet (Jensen III, 2017). These stories show why studying gender roles and toxic masculinity is a start to changing how society sees victim’s especially adult male victims. It can also point to research about how to change gender roles for the better and give males the ability to express themselves healthily and lead to better treatment of males and females.

Oakley (2018) interviewed six males in the UK who were victims of sexual assault that were perpetrated by women. She found that all the victims had anger, annoyance, depression and felt used in some way. Some of the men did not even know they were sexually assaulted while others had no one believe them because of the belief that men cannot be sexually assaulted. The victim’s stories all also involve different types of sexual assault; incapacitated, alcohol-facilitated, threats, and coercion (Oakley, 2018).
These short interviews showed that male victims experienced the same emotions that female victims experienced after their victimization. This shows that no matter the gender of the victim that all victims experience a common set of emotions and thoughts. Male victims just like females experience the same types of sexual assault and scenarios.

**What is Missing?**

A lot of the research has been primarily geared towards the study of female victims and how men have a more negative attitude towards victims than females. There are two significant gaps in sexual assault research that can be noted. The first gap is the lack of research about male victims. This could be due to not enough adult male victims coming forward. Clark (2014), states that men’s stories are often unheard or left out which is why male victims must be studied. He also states that men also do not share their stories often with friends or family for the fear of being judged as less masculine often leaving them to feel isolated.

The other gap is the lack of appropriate research into negative attitudes among women about victims. This gap has mainly occurred due to research focusing primarily on men’s attitudes versus women’s attitudes. Instead of focusing on both genders attitude equally. Leading to the view that males have more negative attitudes and societal interactions with both women and sexual assault victims. This is a problem because it excludes looking at negative attitudes and societal interactions of females with sexual assault victims (Turchik & Edwards, 2012; Stemple et al., 2017).

Another problem with current research is that many medical professionals and police do not take adult male victims seriously. This is caused by a culture of denial surrounding the belief that adult male victims cannot be sexually assaulted. If a male is sexually assaulted it solely cause by a male perpetrator. That is not the case, adult male
victims can be sexually assaulted by both males and females and their victimization like females is not gender specific. Any gender can be both victim and perpetrator (Turchik & Edwards, 2012; Stemple et al., 2017).

This research is examining the first gap in research about sexual assault. It focuses solely on adult male victims and the problems they face. It is important to note that this research is being done not only because there isn’t much research out there but also because it seeks to prove that the societal belief in the US that men cannot be sexually assaulted is false. Adult male victims are a little more common than current research may suggest and pave the way for research about male victims. The concept of male victims is not new; there have been reports of adult male victims in many other countries and they are more widely accepted and studied (Clark, 2014).

In the US and some other countries adult male victims have not been taken as seriously as their female counterparts. One example of this, is that the United Kingdom did not officially recognize adult male victims until 1994 (Clark, 2014; Lowe & Rogers, 2017). The US followed suit later that year and began to recognize that adult males could be victims of sexual assault. The official federal definition did not change and stayed the same (Rumney, 2008).

One of the other main reasons adult male victims have been ignored for so long is due to a significantly higher stigma surrounding being a victim (Clark, 2014; Lowe & Rogers, 2017). It has been estimated that 5-10% of all sexual assault victims are male; however, most research surrounding male victims tends to be exploratory in nature (Light & Monk-Turner, 2009; Turchik & Edwards, 2012). Other research estimates that 9-10% of all victims are males and that about 16% of male victims experience sexual abuse
before the age of 18 (Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center, 2018). Some research has even shown that about 6-15% of the male victims had female perpetrators (Turchik & Edwards, 2012). This inconsistency in data is cause for concern.

In a study of 1,215 individuals there were 541 males surveyed. Of the 541 the researchers found that 22.2% or 119 males had been victims of sexual assault (Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2001; Light & Monk-Turner, 2009). It has also been estimated that for every 2 female victims there is one male victim (Burt & DeMello, 2002). However, much research into male victims is lacking because of a serious level of underreporting by male victims (Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2001; Turchik & Edwards, 2012; Lowe & Rogers, 2017). It has been estimated that 90-95% of male victims do not report their victimization (Roberts, 2013). Society’s gender roles and constructs of masculinity play an important role in male victims not reporting their victimization (Sivakumaran, 2005).

Adult male victims do not receive much attention even internationally due to the lack of organizations that advocate and lobby the importance of the problem. Women’s rights and LGBT rights movements have been silent about adult male victims. Two prominent movements that could talk about male victims choose not to for various reasons. Women’s rights movements believe that adult male victims are not under the issues that the movement and feminists are concerned with. This is because they believe male victims are unnecessary to study when examining sexual assault. The LGBT movement avoids talking about adult male victims because they do not have much of an international voice and they do not want to create the impression only homosexual men are sexually assaulted (Sivakumaran, 2005).
Richer et al. (2017) states that “due to a complicated combination of sociocultural, legal, and psychological issues, including the lack of attention to male sexual assaults outside of prison, male sexual assault continues to be underrecognized and undertreated” (1536). This quote shows why the research being done is important and must be done to help accurately portray statistics, as well as, lead to male victims gaining recognition and treatment. Rumney (2008), agrees that police treatment of male victims creates underreporting. However, he believes that the treatment is getting better than it was. Lowe and Rogers (2017) goes on to state that police treatment of male victims is another reason why their victimization goes underreported. Heterosexual men who report get slightly more sensitive treatment than gay men, but both heterosexual and gay men receive poor treatment. Male victims who have reported to the police often receive hostility and disbelief. This hostility usually comes in the form of homophobic reactions and attitudes; as well as, negative judgements (Davies & McCartney, 2003).

Research Question and Hypotheses
RQ: How do college students perceive male victims of sexual assault?

This research question was created because college students may learn about sexual assault in their classes or learn about it through the course of their degree. It is important to gage how college effects individuals’ perceptions about adult male sexual assault to be able to compare it to the general public which may not be as educated about the subject. Looking at the perceptions about adult male victims has been minimally researched. That is why this research question was chosen.

H1: Higher levels of masculinity decrease the likelihood of recognizing male sexual assault.

H2: Intoxication level increases the chances of recognizing sexual assault.
H3: Gender of the perpetrator will influence recognition of sexual assault.

H4: Gender of the victim will influence recognition of sexual assault.

H5: Victims of sexual assault are more likely to recognize other situations of sexual assault.

H6: College students believe male rape myths.
Chapter 3: Methods

There are two main types of research. The two main types of research are qualitative and quantitative methods, both of which have benefits and challenges. Qualitative research gains in-depth experiences of the individuals being examined to understand and explain social issues. The main challenge with qualitative research is how to interpret the data in order to accurately discern patterns. Qualitative data can be gathered through interviews, oral history, participant observation, and ethnography. Both types of research are important to see data from more than one perspective allowing a larger glimpse into any research question. However, researchers view qualitative research as having greater validity and quantitative research as having more reliability (Lanier & Briggs, 2019).

Quantitative research provides statistical evidence to understand and explain social issues. It does this by separating data gathered into three categories nominal, ordinal, and interval/ratio. Nominal data is data that cannot be ranked and has no numerical values. Ordinal data is data that can be ranked but lacks a true zero. Interval/ratio data is data that is purely numbers and has a true zero. It is also the highest level of measurement for quantitative research. Data can be gathered through interviews and survey questionnaires (Lanier & Briggs, 2019).

For this research, quantitative methods were used to obtain the data. This data was gathered using surveys through survey software known as Qualtrics. Qualtrics sends out the survey, collects the data, and creates graphs and charts (Snow, 2006). The research itself utilizes a three-part survey consisting of vignettes, a standard survey, and a masculinity-femininity scale. This survey is comprised of three different forms. Each
form is laid out the same: vignettes, demographic questions, and the masculinity-femininity scale. The vignettes have the same layout one intoxicated victim and one non-intoxicated victim. The difference between the vignettes is perpetrator and gender of the victim: male on male sexual assault, female on male sexual assault, and male on female sexual assault. This is to not only gauge participant’s responses for scenarios about sexual assault but also create a comparison for examining the hypotheses of this research. The vignettes in this research and the way in which they are going to be carried out make the research experimental.

Factorial surveys are usually experimental in nature and only use a few dimensions and only use a few levels within each different dimension. Determining what dimensions and levels to utilize is important and can take time since there are and infinite amount of possibilities for research. A researcher can create the dimensions and levels themselves or utilize a computer-generated set of dimensions and levels (Rossi & Anderson, 1982). This research utilizes researcher generated dimensions and levels to gather data about the proposed hypotheses involving recognition of sexual assault. These types of surveys may appear to be limited on the surface, but they inherently are not limited. This type of research design can be made orthogonal to observe the factors and their effects as purely as possible (Rossi & Anderson, 1982). “Factorial surveys more faithfully capture the complexity of real life and the conditions of real human choices and judgements and at the same time provide the ability to identify clearly the separate influences of the many factors that go into such judgements and choices” (Rossi & Anderson, 1982, p. 16). This makes factorial surveys useful for social sciences because of their versatility (Rossi & Anderson, 1982).
A factorial design uses a set of scenarios or vignettes to describe any type of situation or event. After the participant reads the vignettes, they are asked a series of questions based off of what was just read (Rossi & Anderson, 1982; Sorenson & Thomas, 2009; Atzmüller & Steiner, 2010). Depending on the research design the number of vignettes and variables varies. A fractional factorial design uses all the vignettes but separates them so that one participant does not read all of the vignettes created (Sorenson & Thomas, 2009; Atzmüller & Steiner, 2010).

Using a factorial design is beneficial when doing research studying participant attitudes. This type of survey design is beneficial at grasping how individuals think and judge the vignettes (Rossi & Anderson, 1982; Liebig, Sauer & Friedhoff, 2015). “Factorial surveys can help to reveal how respondents differentiate when judging whether something is just or not” (Liebig et al., 2015, p. 430).

The vignettes for this research are the same except for the variables that are changed to answer the researcher’s hypotheses or research question. There were three different vignettes that Qualtrics randomly assigned participants: male on male victimization (Form A), female on male victimization (Form B), and male on female victimization (Form C). There was no form to study female on female sexual assault since the focus of the study is male victimization. The main variables that are being examined are the offender’s gender, victim’s gender, and alcohol consumption. For the sake of length, drug consumption was left out to prevent the survey from taking too much time. These variables are discussed in greater length in the vignette section.

**Participants**

The survey was conducted in the Spring of 2019. Internal Review Board approval was obtained for this study see appendix 1. The survey sample consists of criminal
justice majors at Bridgewater State University (BSU). There are approximately 950 BSU CJ students. These students received an email with a Qualtrics link. Data was downloaded to SPSS and any IP address data was erased immediately. This was done to keep respondents’ information confidential. Students were emailed 3 times over a 3-week period to increase the response rate.

Criminal Justice faculty were also emailed so they were aware that their students were asked to complete the survey. There are little to no risks in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life. There was no reward offered for participants who took the survey. Due to the nature of the research being sexual assault the scenarios might cause discomfort to some of the participants. To assist any student who was feeling discomfort from the scenarios the Bridgewater State University Campus Wellness Center’s phone number was given at the beginning and end of the survey, as well as in the thank you email the students who participate received.

**Vignettes**

The vignettes for this survey were created in order to gauge participant’s responses surrounding adult male victims of sexual assault. They may generally be used when qualitative research is being done (Atzmüller & Steiner, 2010). “A vignette is a short, carefully constructed description of a person, object, or situation, representing a systematic combination of characteristics” (Atzmüller & Steiner, 2010, p. 128). Vignettes have been around for more than 50 years and are used in multiple disciplines. Some of these disciplines include social work, nursing, criminal justice, education, and psychology. They can be used to explore moral codes, people’s beliefs, people’s attitudes, complex processes, and people’s perceptions. Vignettes can also be used for any type of research regardless of what type of research is being studied (Bradbury-Jones
According to Spaulding and Phillips (2007) there are three bases to vignettes development: snapshots, portraits, and composites.

The “three bases for vignette development: (1) ‘snapshots’ of something the researcher had seen; (2) ‘portraits’ used to represent participants’ character and experience; (3) ‘composites’ drawing on a wide range of examples from different sources” (Bradbury-Jones & Herber, 2014, p. 431-432). Snapshots create the opportunity for discussion and reflection. Portraits give a voice to participants and increase the trustworthiness of a vignette. This is portraits are less about the observation of the researcher and more on what has been stated. Lastly, since composites are made up of combining different sources it creates authenticity (Bradbury-Jones & Herber, 2014).

Vignette research is often accompanied by a traditional survey. There are generally three types of vignettes: between-subjects designs, within-subjects designs, and mixed designs. Between-subjects designs make participants judge only one vignette. Within-subjects designs all participants judge the same set of vignettes. Lastly, mixed designs separate the participants into groups and each group receives a different set of vignettes. This is called partitioning, the vignettes (Atzmüller & Steiner, 2010).

The type of vignettes that were used in this research were within-subjects mixed design, because it can elicit the most comprehensive results for the research being done. The vignettes consisted of the same type of scenario but with different variables. There were three different forms: male on male, female on male, and male on female. This was to gauge how participants respond to different sexual assault scenarios. All information gathered by the vignettes was analyzed by looking for patterns and themes related to gender role identification and victim status.
Form A Vignettes

1) Jack is a 21-year male, college student who is going to a house party with friends. As previously discussed, Jack is the night’s designated driver and he picks up his friends Alex, Joe, and Jon for an evening of fun. After arriving at the party Jack’s friends drink beer and mixed drinks, and they all have a good time playing darts and talking. Jack has known Alex since his freshman year (3 years ago) and they have a great time hanging out. After a few hours of having fun at the party Jack goes to the restroom in one of the upstairs bedrooms. When he comes out there is another guy in the room and the door is shut. At first, he doesn’t recognize the guy in the room until he gets closer. He realizes that it is his friend Alex. Alex pushes him down on the bed and proceeds to make out with him. Jack tries to resist and push Alex off of him. Alex holds Jack down as he forces himself into Jack. When Alex finishes he leaves and Jack is just left lying there trying to figure out what to do. Jack quickly dresses and finds the friends he is driving and tells them he wants to leave.

Variables:

a. Offender’s Gender (Male)
   i. This variable is measuring participant’s perception to see if gender of perpetrator effects view of sexual assault.
   ii. Measures hypothesis 3.

b. Victim’s Gender (Male)
   i. This variable is measuring participant’s perception to see if gender of victim effects view of sexual assault.
   ii. Measures hypothesis 4.

c. Alcohol Consumption (No)
   i. This variable is measuring participant’s perception to see if level of alcohol consumption effects view of sexual assault.
   ii. Measures hypothesis 2.

2) Matt is a 21-year male, college student who is going to a bar with his friend Brian. After having several beers and getting tipsy, Matt and Brian decide to go back to Brian’s apartment down the block. When they arrive at Brian’s, they proceed to have a few more drinks and begin to make out. Matt decides that things are moving too fast and wants to stop the physical contact. Brian becomes aggressive and puts his hands into Matt’s pants. Matt pushes him away and goes to pour more drinks and find a movie for them to watch. He doesn’t want the night to end because he likes Brian and would like to keep seeing him. After the movie is over, Brian kisses Matt again and starts pushing him toward the bedroom. Matt resists, but Brian is stronger and overpowers him. Once Brian finishes, he tells Matt that he can stay the night if he wants.

Variables:

a. Offender’s Gender (Male)
   i. This variable is measuring participant’s perception to see if gender of perpetrator effects view of sexual assault.
   ii. Measures hypothesis 3.
b. Victim’s Gender (Male)
i. This variable is measuring participant’s perception to see if gender of victim effects view of sexual assault.
   ii. Measures hypothesis 4.
c. Alcohol Consumption (Yes)
i. This variable is measuring participant’s perception to see if level of alcohol consumption effects view of sexual assault.
   ii. Measures hypothesis 2.

Form B Vignettes
1) Jack is a 21-year male, college student who is going to a house party with his friends. As previously discussed, Jack is the night’s designated driver and he picks up his friends Alex, Joe, and Jon for an evening of fun. After arriving at the party Jack’s friends drink beer and mixed drinks, and they all have a good time playing darts and talking. Jack has known Alexandra since his freshman year (3 years ago) and they have a great time hanging out. After a few hours of having fun at the party Jack goes to the restroom in one of the upstairs bedrooms. When he comes out there is a woman in the room and the door is shut. At first, he doesn’t recognize who is in the room until he gets closer. He realizes that it is his friend Alexandra. Alexandra pushes him down on the bed and proceeds to make out with him. Jack tries to resist and push her off of him. Alexandra holds Jack down as she forces herself on him. When Alexandra finishes she leaves and Jack is just left lying there trying to figure out what to do. Jack quickly dresses and finds the friends he is driving and tells them he wants to leave.

Variables:
a. Offender’s Gender (Female)
i. This variable is measuring participant’s perception to see if gender of perpetrator effects view of sexual assault.
   ii. Measures hypothesis 3.
b. Victim’s Gender (Male)
i. This variable is measuring participant’s perception to see if gender of victim effects view of sexual assault.
   ii. Measures hypothesis 4.
c. Alcohol Consumption (No)
i. This variable is measuring participant’s perception to see if level of alcohol consumption effects view of sexual assault.
   ii. Measures hypothesis 2.

2) Matt is a 21-year male, college student who is going to a bar with his friend Lily. After having several beers and getting tipsy, Matt and Lily decide to go back to Lily’s apartment down the block. When they arrive at Lily’s, they proceed to have a few more drinks and begin to make out. Matt decides that things are moving too fast and wants to stop the physical contact. Lily becomes aggressive and puts her hands into Matt’s pants. Matt pushes her away and goes to pour more drinks and
find a movie for them to watch. He doesn’t want the night to end because he likes Lily and would like to keep seeing her. After the movie is over, Lily kisses Matt again and starts pushing him toward the bedroom. Matt resists, but Lily is stronger and gets on top of him. Once she finishes, Lily tells Matt that he can stay the night if he wants.

**Variables:**

a. Offender’s Gender (Female)
   i. This variable is measuring participant’s perception to see if gender of perpetrator effects view of sexual assault.
   ii. Measures hypothesis 3.

b. Victim’s Gender (Male)
   i. This variable is measuring participant’s perception to see if gender of victim effects view of sexual assault.
   ii. Measures hypothesis 4.

c. Alcohol Consumption (Yes)
   i. This variable is measuring participant’s perception to see if level of alcohol consumption effects view of sexual assault.
   ii. Measures hypothesis 2.

**Form C Vignettes**

1) Lindsey is a 21-year female, college student who is going to a house party with her friends. As previously discussed, Lindsey is the night’s designated driver and she picks up her friends Alex, Joe, and Jen for an evening of fun. After arriving at the party Lindsey’s friends drink beer and mixed drinks, and they all have a good time playing darts and talking. Lindsey has known Alex since her freshman year (3 years ago) and they have a great time hanging out. After a few hours of having fun at the party Lindsey goes to the restroom in one of the upstairs bedrooms. When she comes out there is a guy in the room and the door is shut. At first, she doesn’t recognize who is in the room until she gets closer. She realizes that it is her friend Alex. Alex pushes her down on the bed and proceeds to make out with her. Lindsey tries to resist and push him off of her. Alex holds Lindsey down as he forces himself on her. When Alex finishes he leaves and Lindsey is just left lying there trying to figure out what to do. Lindsey quickly dresses and finds the friends she is driving and tells them she wants to leave.

**Variables:**

a. Offender’s Gender (Male)
   i. This variable is measuring participant’s perception to see if gender of perpetrator effects view of sexual assault.
   ii. Measures hypothesis 3.

b. Victim’s Gender (Female)
   i. This variable is measuring participant’s perception to see if gender of victim effects view of sexual assault.
   ii. Measures hypothesis 4.

c. Alcohol Consumption (No)
This variable is measuring participant’s perception to see if level of alcohol consumption effects view of sexual assault.

Measures hypothesis 2.

Sarah is a 21-year female, college student who is going to a bar with her friend Brian. After having several beers and getting tipsy, Sarah and Brian decide to go back to Brian’s apartment down the block. When they arrive at Brian’s, they proceed to have a few more drinks and begin to make out. Sarah decides that things are moving too fast and wants to stop the physical contact. Brian becomes aggressive and puts his hands into Sarah’s pants. Sarah pushes him away and goes to pour more drinks and find a movie for them to watch. She doesn’t want the night to end because she likes Brian and would like to keep seeing him. After the movie is over, Brian kisses Sarah again and starts pushing her toward the bedroom. She resists, but Brian is stronger and overpowers her. Once Brian finishes, he tells Sarah that she can stay the night if she wants.

**Variables:**

a. Offender’s Gender (Male)
   i. This variable is measuring participant’s perception to see if gender of perpetrator effects view of sexual assault.
   ii. Measures hypothesis 3.

b. Victim’s Gender (Male)
   i. This variable is measuring participant’s perception to see if gender of victim effects view of sexual assault.
   ii. Measures hypothesis 4.

c. Alcohol Consumption (Yes)
   i. This variable is measuring participant’s perception to see if level of alcohol consumption effects view of sexual assault.
   ii. Measures hypothesis 2.

**Table 8: Vignettes Frequencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vignette 1 Form A</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 2 Form A</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 1 Form B</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 2 Form B</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 1 Form C</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 2 Form C</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were three questions asked after each vignette the first question *rate what just happened* asked respondents to rate the vignettes. For rating the vignettes Form, A had a response rate of n= 26 and the second vignette on form A had a response rate of n= 21 for rating the vignettes. The first vignette on Form B had a response rate of n= 28 and the second vignette on form B had a response rate of n= 26 for rating the vignettes. The first vignette on Form C had a response rate of n= 34 and the second vignette on form C had a response rate of n= 27 for rating the vignettes. The second question *in your own words briefly describe what just happened* asked respondents to describe what occurred in the vignettes. For describing the vignettes on Form, A had a response rate of n= 24 and the second vignette on form A had a response rate of n= 18 for describing the vignettes. The first vignette on Form B had a response rate of n= 23 and the second vignette on form B had a response rate of n= 20 for describing the vignettes. The first vignette on Form C had a response rate of n= 28 and the second vignette on form C had a response rate of n= 23 for describing the vignettes. The last question *what should ... do* asked respondents to suggest what the victim should do. For suggesting victim response Form A had a response rate of n= 23 and the second vignette on form A had a response rate of n= 19 for stating what the victim should do. The first vignette on Form B had a response rate of n= 24 and the second vignette on form B had a response rate of n= 21 for stating what the victim should do. The first vignette on Form C had a response rate of n= 30 and the second vignette on form C had a response rate of n= 24 for stating what the victim should do.

The vignettes for this research asked respondents three questions: rating the vignettes on a scale of 1 to 10, describe what they believe occurred in the vignette, and
what should the victim’s response be. This was to gage participants reactions about sexual assault victims. These questions were gaining data to answer hypotheses two through five. The first question rate what just happened asked respondents to rate the vignettes. It was done on a scale on 1-10 where 1 was labeled pleasurable experience, 5 was unwanted sexual experience, and 10 being sexual assault. This was recoded for analysis so that 1-4 was coded as 1 for pleasurable experience, 5 was coded as 2 for unwanted sexual experience, and 6-10 was coded as 3 for sexual assault. The following chart shows what the respondents rated the vignettes as. When asked to rate the vignettes the respondents agreed that the victims in the vignettes experienced sexual assault. There was a little variation when it came to the vignettes where alcohol was present, where the gender of the victim was different, and where the gender of the perpetrator was different

The second question in your own words briefly describe what just happened asked respondents to describe what they believed occurred in the vignettes. It was an open-ended response question allowing respondents to describe what they believe occurred in the vignettes. The responses were coded into two categories, sexual assault and other. This was coded as 1 for sexual assault and 2 for other. The respondents agreed the victims in the vignettes experienced sexual assault. However, there was more variation in the explanations than the ratings more respondents were more likely to describe the vignettes as something other sexual assault. The other category had responses like sexual harassment, two friends had intercourse, and victim should have left.

The third question what should ... do asked respondents to state what they believe the victim should do after the assault. This question was an open-ended response question and it allowed respondents to state what they believe the victim should do. The
respondents had various beliefs about what the victims should do after their assault occurred. The beliefs were comprised into six groups after patterns were discovered. The four groups were: 1) report the incident to police, 2) confront the offender, 3) confront the offender and 4) report to the police, and other. These were coded as 1-report the incident to police, 2- confront the offender and report the incident to police, 3- confront the offender, and 4- other. Most of the respondents wanted the victim to report the incident. However, in every scenario one of the other common responses was to confront the offender. Other responses included tell someone (the someone was not specified), seek help (help from where and whom was not specified), and not tell the victim what they should do.

Survey
The survey for this project consisted of 14 questions and a masculinity-femininity scale. There were a total of six demographic questions asked: gender identity, age, race, sexual orientation, major, and classification level. There were four questions asking about the male sexual assault myth that males cannot be raped: straight male victimization, gay male victimization, bisexual male victimization, and transgender male victimization. There was one question asking about the rape myth that all male victims of sexual assault are homosexual. There was one question about the male rape myth females cannot sexually assault males. Lastly, there were two questions asking about personal victimization and time since victimization. Out of the two questions about personal victimization the follow-up question about was not used for analysis. The personal victimization questions were meant to assist with determining if prior victims of sexual assault can recognize sexual assault more than individuals who have not been
sexually assaulted. These questions about male sexual assault were used to determine if individuals believe male sexual assault exists.

The survey was open for 3 weeks. Once this period of time was over and the survey was closed. The responses were downloaded and analyzed using both Qualtrics data and SPSS. As soon as the data was downloaded to SPSS the Qualtrics file was erased so IP addresses were longer be associated with the data. Once this was done all data was coded for analysis. The masculinity-femininity scale had 30 questions each of which was coded separately so that each line had only one trait. These traits belong to one of three categories masculine, feminine, or androgynous. Lastly, the questions were re-coded by the three categories.

**Masculinity-Femininity Scale**

Masculinity-Femininity scales were first created by Sandra Bem in 1974. Her original scale was called the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI). The original BSRI had 400 different attributes in it. There were 200 masculine and feminine attributes and 200 gender neutral attributes. Bem created her scale because she was a proponent for androgyny theory and recognized individuals can express both masculine and feminine traits and attributes. Bem eventually reduced the scale to a 40-attribute scale containing 20 masculine and 20 feminine items (Davis, 2017). Bem’s scale utilizes a 7-point Likert scale. The scale was reworked again down to 30 characteristics and split them evenly between the three categories again (Bem, 1974; Helgeson, 1994; Hoffman, 2001).

The BRSI has been highly criticized for its reliability. Although, it is one of the most common masculinity-femininity scales still used today its reliability has not changed. The Cronbach’s alpha remains between a .75 to .90. Reliability scores for androgyny were never discussed. Validity of the scale has also been questioned to
determine whether it should continue to be used. Perceptions on masculinity and femininity have changed since the scale was constructed in 1974. As culture changes the definitions of what is means to be masculine, feminine, and androgynous change and the original scale male become less relevant (Hoffman & Borders, 2001).

Janet Spence and two of her colleagues created the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) around the same time Bem was creating her sale. PAQ was more in-depth than the BSRI. It added characteristics that were enjoyed by both sexes and added a third scale. It eventually led to, masculinity and femininity being recognized as two independent dimensions, where both sexes could possess and demonstrate the same characteristics. Spence became the first researcher to suggest that masculinity and femininity should be conceptualized as gender identity. That individuals overtime develop their own sense of self, leading them to discover their own masculinity and femininity (Helgeson, 1994; Hoffman, 2001).

PAQ uses 24 attributes to examine masculinity and femininity and like the BSRI is an instrument to measure instrumentality (masculinity) and expressiveness (femininity) creating a gendered view of the world. This gendered view of the world does not match up with how individuals determine what is masculine or feminine. This creates validity problems as the individuals and society change the definitions of what it means to be masculine and feminine. Both scales assume individuals adhere to and follow traditional gender roles based off the sex roles given to each gender. Examples of this would be how the attribute of athletic was assigned to males is no longer just an attribute of males (Hoffman & Borders, 2001).
Both types of scales used Likert scales to obtain data. Likert scales were created in 1932 by Rensis Likert to measure participant attitudes. There are two typical types of Likert scales: 5-point scales and 7-point scales. Both types of scales usually collect ordinal data. Ordinal Likert scales rank items using many different terms: agree to disagree and often to never are the two groups of terms used. Likert scales can also use interval ratio data in which the same groups are used but they are given numbers to allow for the data to be measurable (Sullivan & Artino, 2013). There are two types of Likert data: Likert-type and Likert scales. Likert-type data analyses each question by itself giving multiple scores, while Likert scales combines all of the questions together to get a single score for all of the data. Likert scales are used to analyze character or personality traits (Boone & Boone, 2012).

The masculinity-femininity scale created for this survey used a combination of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire and attributes from the Bem sex-role inventory. This scale used a 5-point Likert scale like PAQ to obtain data instead of a 7-point Likert scale like BSRI (Helgeson, 1994; Hoffman, 2001). It contained 30 short questions in which participants chose answers from a scale of 1-5; where 1 equaled strongly disagree and 5 equaled strongly agree. This used Bem’s 30 attribute concept with PAQ’s scale of 1-5 to trim the two unnecessary points used in Bem’s scale.

The scale was set up so opposing attributes like impulsive and patient are not across from each other allowing respondents to have the ability to rate highly on opposing questions to get a more well-rounded view on the spectrum of masculinity-femininity. The 30 attributes were chosen from adjectives that are used to describe masculinity, femininity, and androgyny. All the adjectives were chosen based on the
gender they are most assigned with. This is being done for two reasons: first the original BSRI list is part of Bem’s original manual and must be purchased (Hoffman & Borders, 2001), and second all adjectives that were chosen were chosen because of traditional links to each specific gender. The only exceptions to the attributes chosen were the substitution of looking at an individual’s perception of their voice and attire. The reason for this is that besides personality traits an individual’s voice and attire is part of how they perceive themselves. This was done because as Hoffman and Borders (2001) suggests the original scale may be less relevant and there are an extensive number of attributes that can be chosen. To test the reliability of this scale a Cronbach’s alpha was obtained. The Cronbach’s alphas for this scale were as followed masculinity at .80, femininity at .75, and androgyny at .46. These were obtained by combining the 10 traits from each specific scale. The masculinity scale contained the following traits: masculine, masculine attire, masculine voice, independent, ambitious, dominant, strong, active, competitive, and assertive. The femininity scale contained the following traits: feminine, feminine attire, feminine voice, emotional, compassionate, submissive, weak, passive, not competitive, not assertive. The androgyny scale contained the following traits: neither masculine nor feminine/ both, androgynous attire, androgynous voice, flexible, empathetic, adaptable, balance, free-thinking, individualistic, and neutral.

When looking at the Cronbach’s alphas of the masculinity and femininity scales, they match up to prior research which states that typically the alpha for the scales should be between .75 and .90. Although androgyny has a low alpha it is hard to compare it to a prior alpha because no research has stated what the alpha for an androgyny scale should be. To increase the alpha two traits androgynous attire and androgynous voice were
dropped from the reliability analysis to increase the alpha. This brought the alpha for the androgyny scale up to .54 which still did not meet the standard .75 to .90. To increase the alpha further two more traits were dropped neutral and neither masculine nor feminine/both the alpha increased again and went up to .65. Although, it still does not meet the standard .75 to .90 alpha for masculinity and femininity scales it gives a starting based to improve the scale for future research and attempt to create a more functioning scale. This requires four new traits of androgyny to be chosen and tested to match the 10 traits of the other two scales.

The masculinity-femininity scale being used collected data to answer the first hypothesis: higher masculinity decreases the likelihood of recognizing male sexual assault. This is meant to show that the closer an individual is to society’s idea of masculine and masculinity the less likely they are to acknowledge sexual assault regarding male victims. To calculate the mean for each of the scales the 10 traits were added together, and the mean was determined using the SPSS compute variable function. This was done to analyze hypothesis one and test the reliability of the scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Androgynous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>Neither/both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Masculine Attire</td>
<td>Feminine Attire</td>
<td>Androgynous Attire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Masculine Voice</td>
<td>Feminine Voice</td>
<td>Androgynous Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td>Empathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>Submissive</td>
<td>Adaptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Free Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Not Competitive</td>
<td>Individualistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>Not Assertive</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4: Results

A total of 110 respondents took the survey administered through the Qualtrics anonymous survey link. Of the 110 respondents 70 respondents answered the question about gender identity. There were 20 males, 47 females, and 3 non-binary individuals who took the survey. Race was broken down into three categories white, black and other. Only 66 respondents answered the question about race. There were 44 white individuals, 14 black individuals and 9 individuals who identified as either Asian or Hispanic. These 9 individuals were placed into a category labeled “other” for analysis purposes. There were 71 respondents who responded to the question about age; 48 respondents were between the ages of 18-25, 14 respondents were between the ages of 26-33, and 9 respondents were over the age of 34. Of the 71 respondents 62 of them were heterosexual and 9 were LGBTQ. There were 63 respondents who were in criminal justice major and 7 respondents had a duel major. The student classification level was as followed: 5 freshmen, 8 sophomores, 22 juniors, 22 seniors, and 14 graduate students. This can be seen in table 10.
Table 10: Demographic Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age n= 71</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34+</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race n= 67</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender n= 70</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Binary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Orientation n= 71</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major n= 70</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duel</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Classification Level n= 71</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey was separated into three parts vignettes, demographics, and a masculinity-femininity scale. The results for each of the six hypotheses will be discussed after the demographics are presented. The first section of the survey was comprised of two vignettes that were separated into three forms. The first form (Form A) contained a two male on male sexual assault vignettes in which the control variable was intoxication. The second form (Form B) contained a two female on male sexual assault vignettes in which the controlled variable was intoxication. The third form (Form C) contained a two male on female sexual assault vignettes in which the control variable was intoxication.
**H1: Higher levels of masculinity decrease the likelihood of recognizing male sexual assault**

The independent variable for this hypothesis is respondent’s level of masculinity and/or femininity and the dependent variable is recognizing male sexual assault victims. It was hypothesized that the higher the level of masculinity an individual has the less likely it would be for the individual to recognize male victims of sexual assault. There was no analysis run for this hypothesis for two reasons. Firstly, it is possible that a larger sample size may produce enough variation to run an analysis to determine whether or not an individual’s level of masculinity decreases the recognition of male sexual assault. The second reason this hypothesis was not analyzed was because the respondents overwhelmingly agreed the vignettes were sexual assault and there was very little variation. If there was more variation in victim responses a t-test could be run with the size of the sample. See table 11 for the mean and standard deviations for the vignettes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11: Vignettes Mean and Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>n= 110</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 1 Form A: n= 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Alex &amp; Jack, male on male, not intoxicated</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 2 Form A: n= 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Brian &amp; Matt, male on male, intoxicated</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 1 Form B: n= 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Alexandra &amp; Jack, female on male, not intoxicated</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 2 Form B: n= 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lily &amp; Matt, female on male, intoxicated</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 1 Form C: n= 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Alex &amp; Lindsey, male on female, not intoxicated</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 2 Form C: n= 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Brian &amp; Sarah, male on female, intoxicated</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**H2: Intoxication level increases the chances of recognizing sexual assault**

The independent variable in this hypothesis is intoxication level and the dependent variable is recognizing sexual assault. It was hypothesized that victims who are not intoxicated would be viewed as victims of sexual assault more than individuals who were intoxicated. This was hypothesized because victims who come forward are often asked whether they were intoxicated at the time of their assault. It is important to understand that regardless of a victim’s intoxication level sexual assault should still be considered sexual assault. This was measured by alternating the intoxication level of the victim across the three forms. Form A, B, and C had one victim not intoxicated and one victim intoxicated. This was analyzed using a cross tabulation and examining the frequencies between vignette 1 and vignette 2 for each of the forms. The data was obtained through three questions rate the vignette, describe what happened in the vignette, and what should the victim’s response be. The following tables show the results of these analyses for each question.

Table 11 shows the mean and standard deviations for each form and the responses for rating the vignettes. The respondents rated the vignettes on a scale of 1-10. The lower end of the scale was labeled as 1 for pleasurable experience and the higher end of the scale was labeled 10 for sexual assault. The means were all between the range of 8-10 showing that respondents believed the scenarios were sexual assault. When looking at Table 11 there is not much difference between the means and standard deviations within each form. However, the vignettes that were lower in each form were the vignettes which had intoxicated victims. This shows that when respondents rated the vignettes that victims who were intoxicated were rated slightly differently than non-intoxicated victims.
Table 12 shows the frequencies for each form and the responses for describing what occurred in the vignettes. The open-ended responses were coded into two categories sexual assault and other. Any response that mentioned sexual assault, rape, or forced sexual experiences were coded as sexual assault. Responses that called it anything else was coded as other. When examining this question respondents were less likely to call the vignettes sexual assault when a victim was intoxicated respondents view sexual assault. This shows that respondents might state the socially acceptable thing over what they believe. One example of this is when directly asked respondents were more likely to say the males could be victims of sexual assault, but when indirectly asked they were more likely to state a victim experienced an unwanted sexual experience or even a pleasurable experience. One respondent stated in regards to a vignette with a male “two friends had intercourse” even though they stated it was sexual assault when directly asked.

Table 12: Frequency Table Describe the Vignette

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>n=</th>
<th>Sexual Assault</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 1 A</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 2 A</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 1 B</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 2 B</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 1 C</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 1 C</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for Non-intoxicated:</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for Intoxicated:</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 shows the frequencies for each form and the responses of the victim in the vignettes. The responses were coded into four groups: report the incident to the police (report, report to the police, police), report the incidence to the police and confront the offender, confront the offender, and other (any response that did not fit the other categories). When examining this question respondents were less likely to suggest the victim report the incident to the police when the victim was intoxicated and more likely to suggest confronting the offender or something else. This shows that respondents might state the socially acceptable thing over what they believe. When directly asked respondents stated the vignettes were sexual assault but when they were indirectly asked what the victim should do respondents began to suggest victims who were intoxicated or male not report to the police. When it gets broken down by each form there is a little support for this hypothesis. All three questions lend some support to the hypothesis that the intoxication level of victims influence whether respondents view a scenario as sexual assault.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vignette 1 Form A: n= 23</th>
<th>Report Incident to Police</th>
<th>Confront the Offender &amp; Report Incident to Police</th>
<th>Confront the Offender</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 2 Form A: n= 19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 1 Form B: n= 24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 2 Form B: n= 21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 1 Form C: n= 30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette 2 Form C: n= 24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for Non-Intoxicated:</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for Intoxicated:</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H3: Gender of the perpetrator will influence recognition of sexual assault

The independent variable in this hypothesis is the gender of the victim and the dependent variable is recognizing sexual assault. It was hypothesized that the gender of the perpetrator impacts whether a scenario is considered sexual assault. This was hypothesized because female perpetrators are rarely talked about when sexual assault is discussed. Males are typically considered the perpetrator and females are typically considered victim. Two of the three forms had male perpetrators and one of the forms had a female perpetrator. This was measured by changing the gender of the victim in one of the three forms. Form A, and C had male perpetrators, while Form B had a female perpetrator. This was analyzed using a cross tabulation and examining the frequencies between Forms A and B versus Form C. The data was obtained through three questions rate the vignette, describe what happened in the vignette, and what should the victim’s response be. The following tables show the results of these analyses for each question. The results are shown in tables 11-13.

The first question rate what just happened asked respondents to rate the vignettes. When comparing the frequencies between Form A and B for rating the vignettes respondents were slightly more likely to rate the scenario with a female perpetrator as an unwanted sexual experience N= 5 or pleasurable experience N= 3 versus the male perpetrator N=2. Comparing the frequencies between Form B and C for rating the vignettes respondents were more likely to rate the scenario with a female perpetrator as an unwanted sexual experience N= 5 or pleasurable experience N= 3 versus a male perpetrator N= 1.

The second question in your own words briefly describe what just happened asked respondents to describe the vignettes. When comparing the frequencies between Form A
and B for describing the vignettes respondents were slightly more likely to describe the scenario with a female perpetrator N= 11 as something other than sexual assault versus male perpetrator N= 10. Comparing the frequencies between Form B and C for describing the vignettes respondents were more likely to describe the scenario with a female perpetrator N=11 as something other than sexual assault versus male perpetrator N= 7.

Lastly, when asked what should ... do respondents believed the victim should do after the incident respondents were slightly more likely to suggest that the victim of the female perpetrator do something other than report the incident versus victim of the male perpetrator (Form B v. A: N= 20 v. N=12, Form B v. C: N=20 v. N=15). Overall there is support to show that the gender of the perpetrator does affect whether respondents view a scenario as sexual assault. Specifically, that if a perpetrator is female respondents are less likely to view a scenario as a situation the victim should report to the police.

**H4: Gender of the victim will influence recognition of sexual assault**

The independent variable in this hypothesis is the gender of the victim and the dependent variable is recognizing sexual assault. It was hypothesized that the gender of the victim impacts whether a scenario is considered sexual assault. This was hypothesized because male victims are rarely talked about when sexual assault is discussed. Males are typically discussed when talking about the perpetrator and not the victim. Two of the three forms had male perpetrators and one of the forms had a female perpetrator. This was measured by changing the gender of the victim in one of the three forms. Form A, and B had male victims, while Form B had female victims. This was analyzed using a cross tabulation and examining the frequencies between Forms A and B
versus Form C. The data was obtained through three questions rate the vignette, describe what happened in the vignette, and what should the victim’s response be. The following tables show the results of these analyses for each question. The results are shown in tables 11-13.

The first question *rate what just happened* asked respondents to rate the vignettes. When comparing the frequencies between Form A and C for rating the vignettes respondents were slightly more likely to rate the scenario with a male victim as an unwanted sexual experience \( N = 2 \) versus the male victim \( N = 1 \). Comparing the frequencies between Form B and C for rating the vignettes respondents were more likely to rate the scenario with a male victim as an unwanted sexual experience \( N = 5 \) or pleasurable experience \( N = 3 \) versus a female victim \( N = 1 \).

The second question *in your own words briefly describe what just happened* asked respondents to describe the vignettes. When comparing the frequencies between Form A and C for describing the vignettes respondents were slightly more likely to describe the scenario with a male victim \( N = 10 \) as something other than sexual assault versus female victim \( N = 7 \). Comparing the frequencies between Form B and C for describing the vignettes respondents were more likely to describe the scenario with a male victim \( N = 11 \) as something other than sexual assault versus female perpetrator \( N = 7 \).

Lastly, when asked *what should ... do* to respondents believed the victim should do after the incident respondents were slightly more likely to suggest that the victim of the female perpetrator do something other than report the incident versus victim of the male perpetrator (Form B v. A: \( N = 20 \) v. \( N = 12 \), Form B v. C: \( N = 20 \) v. \( N = 15 \)). Overall there is support to show that the gender of the perpetrator does affect whether
respondents view a scenario as sexual assault. Specifically, when a perpetrator is female, and the victim is male respondents are more likely to view a scenario as a situation the victim should report to the police.

**H5: Victims of sexual assault are more likely to recognize other situations of sexual assault**

The independent variable in this hypothesis is prior victims of sexual assault and the dependent variable is recognizing sexual assault. It was hypothesized that prior victims of sexual assault would recognize sexual assault more than individuals who have not been victims of sexual assault. Out of the 110 respondents N= 71 of them answered the question about prior victimization. Out of the 71 respondents N= 25 or 35.21% of the respondents answered yes to prior victimization. All 25 respondents who answered yes to prior victimization were female respondents 25 out of N= 47 or 53.19% of female respondents had prior victimization. That is a ratio of 1:1.88 female respondents being prior victims of sexual assault which is higher than the national average of 1 in 4. There were N=3 non-binary respondents who answered this question.

Only n= 20 male respondents answered this question and none of them answered that they had been victims of sexual assault. A male response of interest regarding the question *What should Matt do?* was “Contact the authorities or councilors or nothing. If it was me and I liked the girl I probably wouldn’t care that much and wouldn’t do anything or talk to her about it.” This quote shows a problematic view that could explain why a male respondent might not report a prior sexual assault or even define a prior event as sexual assault. It is imperative to teach males that regardless of if they like a girl or not sexual assault is still sexual assault and should be treated as a problem and not something to ignore. These results can be seen table 14.
Table 14: Personal Sexual Assault Victimization Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28.17%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28.17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35.21%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Binary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No analysis was done for this hypothesis because all respondents agreed that the scenarios, they read were sexual assault. A larger sample size might reveal more differences between prior victimization and non-victims recognizing sexual assault. As previously stated, the only interesting result found was 35.21% of the sample had prior victimization. This was a much higher rate found than what was expected because of what previous research on sexual assault has found.

**H6: College students believe in male rape myths**

The independent variable in this hypothesis was college students and the dependent variable was male rape myths. It was hypothesized that college students would believe three of the most common male rape myths. The first myth is that males cannot be victims of sexual assault. This was tested by asking individuals four separate questions: three based on sexual orientation of victims: straight, bisexual, gay and one based on gender identity: transgender individuals. The second myth is that all males who are victims of sexual assault are homosexual. This was tested by asking if respondents believed all male sexual assault victims were homosexual. The third myth tested was females cannot sexually assault males. This was tested by asking respondents if they believe a female could sexually assault a male. The results of this hypothesis were
analyzed by examining the frequencies for all six of the questions asked. Table 15 shows frequencies for the six rape myth questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15: Straight Male Victimization Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n= 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses to Rape Myths n=71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rape Myth 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can straight males be victims of sexual assault?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can bisexual males be victims of sexual assault?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can gay males be victims of sexual assault?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can transgender males be victims of sexual assault?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rape Myth 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe that all male victims of sexual assault are homosexual?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rape Myth 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can females sexually assault males?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no analysis done for this hypothesis. The respondents all agreed that that these are myths and that males can be victims of sexual assault. The respondents also agreed that not all male victims of sexual assault are homosexual and that females
can sexually assault males. A larger sample size is needed to see if college believe these myths. This population should contain individuals from other majors. This is important because it appears that criminal justice majors are well educated about sexual assault. Since criminal justice majors gain knowledge from the classes they are required to take. There is also the possibility that respondents are saying the socially correct answer and not what they believe. This could lead to criminal justice majors learning the socially acceptable responses and how to hide their biases. Reworking the questions or having follow up questions might be beneficial to see if this is the case in future research.
Chapter 5: Discussion

Sexual assault is a significant problem in the United States and has been around for thousands of years. Research since the 1970s has focused predominately on female victims and rarely researched adult male victims. Many researchers and feminists have framed sexual assault as a female issue creating the space for adult male victims to be researched less. It has been estimated that research about male victims is more than 20 years behind research about female victims. Besides having sexual assault framed as a female issue there are also other reasons why research on male victims is behind.

One of these issues is surrounding traditional gender roles. One traditional gender role often discussed with male rape myths is that men are strong and tough. Therefore, men cannot be sexually assaulted because they can fight off an attacker. Another traditional gender stereotype for men is that men are promiscuous. That they will sleep with any girl especially if she is attractive. This can lead to males not knowing they can be sexually assaulted by women when they have been (Davies et al, 2008; Davies et al., 2012; Turchik & Edwards, 2012). Like female victims’ male victims are also victimized by someone they know. This can be a family member, acquaintance, or even an intimate partner (Smith et al., 2017).

Most researchers have estimated that the percentage of male victims is between 5-10%. However, what many of the researchers have failed to recognize in research prior to 2012 is that the federal sexual assault law only defined sexual assault as penal to vaginal penetration. It excluded male victims and excluded female perpetrators due to the extreme narrowness of the legal definition. In 2012 the definition was changed and became more expansive to include multiple forms of sexual assault and pave the way for
male victims to officially begin to be recognized (United States Department of Justice, 2017). This can be seen when using the Bureau of Justice Statistics analysis tool and examining sexual assault reports from 2012-2016 where the average rate of male sexual assault was 18% (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2018). It is significantly higher than the estimation of 5-10% which means that there is something going on that research needs to examine.

This research attempted to look at societal perceptions among college students about adult male sexual assault victims. This was done by using vignettes, survey questions, and a masculinity-femininity scale. The first area in which this research attempted to examine is if higher masculinity levels decreased the ability to recognize sexual assault. Next, it looked at whether or not intoxication level, gender of the perpetrator, and gender of the victim mattered. Lastly it looked at three common rape myths to see if college students believed in male rape myths. Understanding these areas could help shed light into whether or not societal views could affect whether or not male victims come forward and report their assaults. This research was attempting to shed light onto a topic that has not been fully researched some answers were gained. However, more questions than answers have been found. Expanding the knowledge about male victims is important if any real solution to sexual assault is to be found. Education is a key component to the growth of society and must be done.

Most of the hypotheses for this thesis were not supported. There were not enough differences in respondents’ answers to analyze hypothesis one: higher levels of masculinity decrease the likelihood of recognizing male sexual assault or hypothesis five: victims of sexual assault are more likely to recognize other situations of sexual assault.
There was no support for hypothesis six: college students believe male rape myths. Lastly, there was a little support for the remaining three hypotheses: intoxication level increases the chances of recognizing sexual assault, gender of the perpetrator will influence recognition of sexual assault, and gender of the victim will influence recognition of sexual assault. Initially there appears to be no support for these hypotheses. When respondents are directly asked what occurred in the vignettes they appear to respond with the socially acceptable answer. However, when respondents were asked two indirect questions: in your own words briefly describe what just happened and what should ... do. Respondents’ unconscious biases begin to show. When it came to intoxicated victims, male victims, and the female perpetrator respondents were less likely to view the vignette as sexual assault and were less likely to suggest the victim report the incident to the police. This was especially the case when it was a female perpetrator and a male victim who was intoxicated.

The concept of an unconscious bias is not a new idea and has been researched since the 1970s. Unconscious bias come from repressed memories, subconscious phobias, and subconscious thoughts that were learned and/or unlearned. Individual’s conscious and unconscious biases are difficult to detangle since the civil rights era and respondents wanting to say the socially acceptable answer over what they truly believe. This is due to respondents wanting to accept their unconscious biases, but not discuss the biases due to the uncomfortable nature that can be presented. This is especially true surrounding racial issues (Banks & Ford, 2009).

In order to eradicate unconscious biases society needs to address them and openly discuss them. To create change and solutions by refusing to acknowledge and openly
discuss unconscious biases society will not progress towards equality. Unconscious bias
does not just affect race it also affects gender, gender identity, and sexual orientation. It
is deeply rooted in issues surrounding minorities and equality. It leads respondents to say
the socially acceptable answers instead of their true beliefs. This is due to society
condemning racist, sexist and even homophobia views, sentiments, and comments and
pressuring individuals into being respectful to everyone regardless of their race, gender,
or sexual orientation. This represents how society operates, and that individuals will
show their biases only when they can get away with their biases. If they are unable to get
away with their biases, they attempt to hide them (Banks & Ford, 2009).

In order to view these unconscious biases individuals are trying to hide
researchers have begun to examine biases in subtle indirect ways instead of direct ways.
This allows the researcher to see biases that would normally be hidden through socially
acceptable answers. Much of this is to do with the courts creating laws to prevent
discrimination. The federal statue Title VII prohibits discrimination in the workplace
which is one of the major laws that influence biases. It also does not discern between
conscious and unconscious bias (Banks & Ford, 2009).

This means unconscious bias was affecting respondents’ answers to the questions
of the vignettes. When directly asked to rate the vignettes, respondents answered in the
socially acceptable way. However, when respondents were indirectly asked to describe
what occurred in the vignettes and suggest what the victim should do after their
experience their responses were more interesting. Respondents were more likely to show
bias when a victim was intoxicated, male, or a female perpetrator. Victims who were
intoxicated were more often seen as experiencing something other than sexual assault and
were often told to confront the offender. Adult male victims were seen as experiencing something more pleasurable and told to confront the offender. When there was a female perpetrator, respondents were more willing to believe the victim experienced a pleasurable experience and should not report her to the police. This was more so the case when there was a male victim who was intoxicated with a female perpetrator. This can be seen in some of the responses: “two friends had intercourse”, “unwanted kissing”, “confront the offender”, and “don’t do anything it will affect his relationship with her” are just a few.

Besides unconscious bias affecting what was found. Another reason these results were found was because of society changing. With sexual assault being talked about more in the media and with information readily available through the internet society is becoming more educated. Major sexual assault cases draw media attention and society hears about sexual assault and victim’s experiences. They are also learning what does and does not constitute as sexual assault. This causes individuals in society to easily point out what sexual assault is, but not necessarily share what they believe. This is why the future of sexual assault research must contain indirect questions to get at how society truly looks at sexual assault victims.

This research shows that there is a need for more research to be done when it comes to understanding adult male victimization and societal perceptions about male victimization. This is the only way to ensure male victims get recognized at an equal level as their female counterparts. It is also the only way to close the almost 20-year gap missing in research about male victims. Although, this research learned a small amount
of information about perceptions on male victims it is in no way complete. There were various limitations to this study, and they should be addressed for future research.

**Limitations**

There are various limitations to this study. The first limitation comes with how the survey was passed out. Although, Qualtrics is a great survey tool using only the anonymous survey link to pass out the survey created an issue with collecting respondents. Next time using the QR code and passing out some surveys in person to gain a greater number of responses is necessary. This can be seen when looking at missing data in the survey responses. The email with the survey link went out to 828 students, yielding 110 responses that is a 13.3% response rate. Out of the 110 respondents 40 respondents didn’t fill out the second half of the survey and only answered the vignettes. If the response rates are low, then the results will not be representative of the group being studied. Furthermore, researchers have debated over what an adequate response rate for surveys should be. Many researchers believe that an adequate response rate should be around 50% (Nulty, 2008). Gathering data also took a long time using just the anonymous survey link. It took a little over five weeks to get to over 100 respondents which delayed analysis. One of the major problems with online surveys is that they tend to have lower response rates than paper surveys (Nulty, 2008). It could have taken 1-2 weeks to go to 10 classrooms and collect 100 respondents. It would have taken 1 week to input data and code it.

The next limitation is that due to 40 respondents not filling out the entirety of the survey examining any data with the gender of the respondents is not as definitive as hoped. This is evident by having 47 female respondents, 20 male respondents, and 3 non-binary respondents. This makes it hard to say which gender believes rape myths
more than the other. Although, having more female respondents over male respondents believe in rape myths about male victim’s shows that there might be something going on. Further research must be done to either prove or disprove this. If further research proves that females believe the male rape myth that all male victims are homosexual more than their male counterparts, then it brings in new information that has not previously been discussed. This same limitation also creates the problem of not fully knowing the depth of how individuals view the difference between male and female victims and male and female offenders. Although, there was slight evidence to show that the gender of the perpetrator and gender of the victim do matter the depth of how much they matter cannot be addressed.

Another limitation to this study was surrounding the population of the study. All of the students surveyed were either criminal justice majors or duel majors (criminal justice and other major). This does not give a well-rounded attitude of college students since other majors were not sampled. It is important to obtain information from multiple majors to see how much education affects perceptions of sexual assault. This would allow for research to examine if any specific majors in college affect whether individuals can identify sexual assault and recognize male sexual assault victims. This limitation does not apply to the responses to the vignettes because the vignettes are experimental. However, since they are experimental a higher population size could reveal if sample size matters for vignettes. This limitation applies mainly to the questions about male sexual assault myths because the students are all criminal justice majors, they are being taught and learning about sexual assault in their classes. This could cause them to say the socially acceptable response and not what they believe.
Lastly, the final limitation was to the creation of the masculinity-femininity scale. It was not a tested scale but rather a new scale created. This was chosen as the best course because research has suggested trying to build upon and find a more reliable set of attributes to accurately measure the spectrum of masculinity and femininity (Hoffman & Borders, 2001). Although, the Cronbach’s alphas for the masculinity and femininity scales match up to prior research (prior research stating the alpha should be .75 and .90 (Hoffman & Borders, 2001) the androgyny scale did not match up to prior research (this is because there has been no alpha stated for an androgyny scale). The highest alpha the androgyny scale received was .65 after the removal of four traits. This is a problem because the scale needs to have a total of ten traits and must be reevaluated to create a function scale. This is to match research stating the reliability of masculinity-femininity scales needing a alpha of .75 and .90. In addition to that, the masculinity and femininity scales should also be improved upon to become more reliable and current with society’s views of masculinity and femininity.

What is next?

More research needs to be done to address and understand societies perceptions about male victims and learning about why male victims do not come forward as much as their female counterparts. In one of the responses to the female (perpetrator) on male (victim) victimization a male respondent stated that if he were in the same shoes as the male victim in the scenario that he would not care and would not report it especially if he liked the girl. This shows that more education needs to be done to explain to males two important issues. The first issue surrounds the ability of males to show emotions. Males need to be taught to be comfortable with themselves and their own emotions and accept their own victimization when it occurs and have the freedom to report it. The second
issue surrounds the idea that males should want to sleep with any girl that wants to sleep with them even if they do not want to. Regardless of gender no one is required to sleep with anyone without their consent and just because males are expected to sleep with girls, they still need to give consent.

Research needs to be done with the general public and college students more to gather a clearer picture about how society perceives male victims. Research on college students needs to be expanded to see if education from different majors plays a part in identifying male sexual assault victims. Comparing this research to research done by the general public allows for a more cohesive understanding if there are societal beliefs and pressures that male victims face. This could help to identify societal pressures that could lead to the underreporting of male victims without more information it is hard to state accurately what pressures exist and how they affect male victims. In addition to that, interviews with male victims needs to be done to understand why they choose to or choose not to come forward. There is no evidence currently looking at male victims any why there is a significant underreporting of their victimization.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

This research has shown that more data needs to be collected about male victims. There needs to be modifications to the vignettes to make them clearer to understand. The masculinity-femininity scale needs to be modified to strengthen the reliability of the scale. Research needs to contain more than criminal justice majors to see if major affects views about male sexual assault victims. There also needs to be a longer time frame for data collection to get more responses. In addition to that, to try and get a better understanding of people’s beliefs and minimalize unconscious bias more indirect
questions need to be asked. When studying social perceptions on male sexual assault
victims it appears that respondents are programmed to say the socially acceptable answer.
Male victims of sexual assault also need to be interviewed in order to get their
perspective and see why they are or are not reporting. Below is a list of potential
questions to investigate for future research.

- Does major in college influence male sexual assault recognition?
- Does education level influence male sexual assault recognition?
- Who will recognize male sexual assault more college students or the general public?
- How much does gender of the perpetrator matter?
- Why do male victims of sexual assault not report?
- Do traditional gender roles impact male victims from reporting?
- Who believes male rape myths more college students or the general public?
- Does higher levels of masculinity, femininity, or androgyny affect male victim recognition.

These are just a few questions this research has led to. It is important to continue to
create new questions to research to continue to fill the gaps in research. This is the only
way to address issues in society that lead to sexual assault and attempt to create solutions
to those issues.
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Appendix B

Masters Thesis Sexual Assault Survey 2019

Survey Flow
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BlockRandomizer: 1 -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard: Form A (6 Questions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard: Form B (6 Questions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard: Form C (6 Questions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Standard: Demographics (12 Questions) |
| Standard: Personal Victimization (2 Questions) |
| Standard: Masculinity-Femininity Scale (30 Questions) |
| Standard: End of Survey Statement (1 Question) |
Start of Block: Survey Consent

Q66 Do you consent to participating in this survey?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Skip To: End of Survey If Q66 != 1

End of Block: Survey Consent

Start of Block: Sexual Assault Definition

Q48 Sexual Assault: Sexual assault is defined as any sexual act committed against a person without their consent. It consists of the following according to the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (2018):

- **Completed or attempted forced penetration of a victim**
  Includes unwanted vaginal, oral, or anal insertion through use of physical force or threats to bring physical harm toward or against the victim.

- **Completed or attempted alcohol or drug-facilitated penetration of a victim**
  Includes unwanted vaginal, oral, or anal insertion when the victim was unable to consent because he or she was too intoxicated (e.g., unconscious, or lack of awareness) through voluntary or involuntary use of alcohol or drugs.

- **Completed or attempted forced acts in which a victim is made to penetrate someone**
  Includes situations when the victim was made, or there was an attempt to make the victim, sexually penetrate a perpetrator or someone else without the victim’s consent because the victim was physically forced or threatened with physical harm.

- **Completed or attempted alcohol or drug-facilitated acts in which a victim is made to penetrate someone**
  Includes situations when the victim was made, or there was an attempt to make the victim, sexually penetrate a perpetrator or someone else without the victim’s consent because the victim was too intoxicated (e.g., unconscious, or lack of awareness) through voluntary or involuntary use of alcohol or drugs.

- **Nonphysically forced penetration which occurs after a person is pressured to consent or submit to being penetrated**
  Includes being worn down by someone who repeatedly asked for sex or showed they were unhappy; having someone threaten to end a relationship or spread rumors; and sexual pressure by misuse of influence or authority.

- **Unwanted sexual contact**
  Includes intentional touching, either directly or through the clothing, of the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thigh, or buttocks of any person without his or her consent,
or of a person who is unable to consent. Unwanted sexual contact also includes making a victim touch the perpetrator. Unwanted sexual contact can be referred to as “sexual harassment” in some contexts, such as a school or workplace. Noncontact unwanted sexual experiences includes unwanted sexual attention that does not involve physical contact. Some examples are verbal sexual harassment (e.g., making sexual comments) or unwanted exposure to pornography. This occurs without a person’s consent and sometimes, without the victim’s knowledge. This type of sexual violence can occur in many different settings, such as school, the workplace, in public, or through technology (Center for Disease Control and Prevention, 2018).


End of Block: Sexual Assault Definition

Start of Block: Form A

Q48 Jack is a 21-year male, college student who is going to a house party with friends. As previously discussed, Jack is the night’s designated driver and he picks up his friends Alex, Joe, and Jon for an evening of fun. After arriving at the party Jack’s friends drink beer and mixed drinks, and they all have a good time playing darts and talking. Jack has known Alex since his freshman year (3 years ago) and they have a great time hanging out. After a few hours of having fun at the party Jack goes to the restroom in one of the upstairs bedrooms. When he comes out there is another guy in the room and the door is shut. At first, he doesn’t recognize the guy in the room until he gets closer. He realizes that it is his friend Alex. Alex pushes him down on the bed and proceeds to make out with him. Jack tries to resist and push Alex off of him. Alex holds Jack down as he forces himself into Jack. When Alex finishes he leaves and Jack is just left lying there trying to figure out what to do. Jack quickly dresses and finds the friends he is driving and tells them he wants to leave.
Rate what just happened.

- [ ] Pleasurable sexual experience  1 (1)
- [ ]  2 (2)
- [ ]  3 (3)
- [ ]  4 (4)
- [ ] Unwanted sexual experience  5 (5)
- [ ]  6 (6)
- [ ]  7 (7)
- [ ]  8 (8)
- [ ]  9 (9)
- [ ] Sexual assault  10 (10)

Q49 In your own words briefly describe what just happened.

________________________________________________________________________

Q50 What should Jack do?

________________________________________________________________________
Q51
Matt is a 21-year male, college student who is going to a bar with his friend Brian. After having several beers and getting tipsy, Matt and Brian decide to go back to Brian’s apartment down the block. When they arrive at Brian’s, they proceed to have a few more drinks and begin to make out. Matt decides that things are moving too fast and wants to stop the physical contact. Brian becomes aggressive and puts his hands into Matt’s pants. Matt pushes him away and goes to pour more drinks and find a movie for them to watch. He doesn’t want the night to end because he likes Brian and would like to keep seeing him. After the movie is over, Brian kisses Matt again and starts pushing him toward the bedroom. Matt resists, but Brian is stronger and overpowers him. Once Brian finishes, he tells Matt that he can stay the night if he wants.

Rate what just happened

☐ Pleasurable sexual experience 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ Unwanted sexual experience 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

☐ 7 (7)

☐ 8 (8)

☐ 9 (9)

☐ Sexual assault 10 (10)
Q52 In your own words briefly describe what just happened.

________________________________________________________________

Q53 What should Matt do?

________________________________________________________________

End of Block: Form A

Start of Block: Form B

Q54
Jack is a 21-year male, college student who is going to a house party with his friends. As previously discussed, Jack is the night’s designated driver and he picks up his friends Alex, Joe, and Jon for an evening of fun. After arriving at the party Jack’s friends drink beer and mixed drinks, and they all have a good time playing darts and talking. Jack has known Alexandra since his freshman year (3 years ago) and they have a great time hanging out. After a few hours of having fun at the party Jack goes to the restroom in one of the upstairs bedrooms. When he comes out there is a woman in the room and the door is shut. At first, he doesn’t recognize who is in the room until he gets closer. He realizes that it is his friend Alexandra. Alexandra pushes him down on the bed and proceeds to make out with him. Jack tries to resist and push her off of him. Alexandra holds Jack down as she forces herself on him. When Alexandra finishes she leaves and Jack is just left lying there trying to figure out what to do. Jack quickly dresses and finds the friends he is driving and tells them he wants to leave.
Rate what just happened

- Pleasurable sexual experience 1 (1)
- 2 (2)
- 3 (3)
- 4 (4)
- Unwanted sexual experience 5 (5)
- 6 (6)
- 7 (7)
- 8 (8)
- 9 (9)
- Sexual assault 10 (10)

Q55 In your own words briefly describe what just happened.

________________________________________________________________

Q56 What should Jack do?

________________________________________________________________
Q57 Matt is a 21-year male, college student who is going to a bar with his friend Lily. After having several beers and getting tipsy, Matt and Lily decide to go back to Lily’s apartment down the block. When they arrive at Lily’s, they proceed to have a few more drinks and begin to make out. Matt decides that things are moving too fast and wants to stop the physical contact. Lily becomes aggressive and puts her hands into Matt’s pants. Matt pushes her away and goes to pour more drinks and find a movie for them to watch. He doesn’t want the night to end because he likes Lily and would like to keep seeing her. After the movie is over, Lily kisses Matt again and starts pushing him toward the bedroom. Matt resists, but Lily is stronger and gets on top of him. Once she finishes, Lily tells Matt that he can stay the night if he wants.

Rate what just happened

- [ ] Pleasurable sexual experience 1 (1)
- [ ] 2 (2)
- [ ] 3 (3)
- [ ] 4 (4)
- [ ] Unwanted sexual experience 5 (5)
- [ ] 6 (6)
- [ ] 7 (7)
- [ ] 8 (8)
- [ ] 9 (9)
- [ ] Sexual assault 10 (10)
Q58 In your own words briefly describe what just happened.

Q59 What should Matt do?

End of Block: Form B

Start of Block: Form C

Q60 Lindsey is a 21-year female, college student who is going to a house party with her friends. As previously discussed, Lindsey is the night’s designated driver and she picks up her friends Alex, Joe, and Jen for an evening of fun. After arriving at the party Lindsey’s friends drink beer and mixed drinks, and they all have a good time playing darts and talking. Lindsey has known Alex since her freshman year (3 years ago) and they have a great time hanging out. After a few hours of having fun at the party Lindsey goes to the restroom in one of the upstairs bedrooms. When she comes out there is a guy in the room and the door is shut. At first, she doesn’t recognize who is in the room until she gets closer. She realizes that it is her friend Alex. Alex pushes her down on the bed and proceeds to make out with her. Lindsey tries to resist and push him off of her. Alex holds Lindsey down as he forces himself on her. When Alex finishes he leaves and Lindsey is just left lying there trying to figure out what to do. Lindsey quickly dresses and finds the friends she is driving and tells them she wants to leave.
Rate what just happened

- Pleasurable sexual experience 1 (1)
- 2 (2)
- 3 (3)
- 4 (4)
- Unwanted sexual experience 5 (5)
- 6 (6)
- 7 (7)
- 8 (8)
- 9 (9)
- Sexual assault 10 (10)

Q61 In your own words briefly describe what just happened.

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

Q62 What should Lindsey do?

____________________________________________________________________
Q63 Sarah is a 21-year female, college student who is going to a bar with her friend Brian. After having several beers and getting tipsy, Sarah and Brian decide to go back to Brian’s apartment down the block. When they arrive at Brian’s, they proceed to have a few more drinks and begin to make out. Sarah decides that things are moving too fast and wants to stop the physical contact. Brian becomes aggressive and puts his hands into Sarah’s pants. Sarah pushes him away and goes to pour more drinks and find a movie for them to watch. She doesn’t want the night to end because she likes Brian and would like to keep seeing him. After the movie is over, Brian kisses Sarah again and starts pushing her toward the bedroom. She resists, but Brian is stronger and overpowers her. Once Brian finishes, he tells Sarah that she can stay the night if she wants.

Rate what just happened

- Pleasurable sexual experience 1 (1)
- 2 (2)
- 3 (3)
- 4 (4)
- Unwanted sexual experience 5 (5)
- 6 (6)
- 7 (7)
- 8 (8)
- 9 (9)
- Sexual assault 10 (10)
Q64 In your own words briefly describe what just happened.

________________________________________________________________

Q65 What should Sarah do?

________________________________________________________________

End of Block: Form C

Start of Block: Demographics

Q2 What is your age?

- 18-25 (1)
- 26-33 (2)
- 34-41 (3)
- 42-49 (4)
- 50-57 (5)
- 58+ (6)

Q3 What is your race/ethnicity?

________________________________________________________________
Q4
What is your gender identity?
Cisgender refers to an individual who identifies as the sex they were born as.

- Cisgender Male (1)
- Cisgender Female (2)
- Non-binary (3)
- Transgender Male (4)
- Transgender Female (5)

Q5 What is your sexual orientation?

- Straight (1)
- Gay (2)
- Bisexual (3)
- Pansexual (4)
- Asexual (5)
Q6 What is your major w/ concentration?

________________________________________________________________

Q7 What is your current student classification?

  ○ Freshman (1)
  ○ Sophomore (2)
  ○ Junior (3)
  ○ Senior (4)
  ○ Graduate Student (5)

Q8 Can straight males be victims of sexual assault?

  ○ Yes (1)
  ○ No (2)
  ○ Unsure (3)
Q9 Can bisexual males be victims of sexual assault?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- Unsure (3)

Q10 Can gay males be victims of sexual assault?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- Unsure (3)

Q11 Can transgender males be victims of sexual assault?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- Unsure (3)
Q12 Do you believe that all male victims of sexual assault are homosexual?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- Unsure (3)

Q13 Can females sexually assault males?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- Maybe (3)

End of Block: Demographics

Start of Block: Personal Victimization

Q14 Were you ever sexually assaulted?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)
Q15 If so how long ago?

- 0-1 years (1)
- 1-2 years (2)
- 2-3 years (3)
- 3-4 years (4)
- 4-5 years (5)
- 5+ years (6)
- Not Applicable (7)

End of Block: Personal Victimization

Start of Block: Masculinity-Femininity Scale

Q18 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe yourself as masculine? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q19 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe yourself as feminine? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q20 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe yourself as neither masculine or feminine/both? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q21 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe how you dress as masculine? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you describe how you dress as feminine? (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Neutral (3)</td>
<td>Agree (4)</td>
<td>Strongly agree (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____________________</td>
<td>______________</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>_____________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q23 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would you describe how you dress as androgynous? Androgynous means having</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or portraying characteristics of both sexes. (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q24 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would you describe your voice as masculine? (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q25 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe your voice as feminine? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q26 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe your voice as androgynous? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q27 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe yourself as independent? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q28 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe yourself as emotional? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q29 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe yourself as flexible? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q30 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe yourself as ambitious? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q31 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe yourself as compassionate? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q32 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe yourself as empathetic? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q33 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe yourself as dominant? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q34 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe yourself as submissive? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q35 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe yourself as adaptable? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q36 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe yourself as strong? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q37 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe yourself as weak? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q38 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe yourself as balanced? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q39 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe yourself as passive? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q40 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe yourself as active? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q41 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe yourself as free thinking? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q42 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe yourself as competitive? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q43 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe yourself as not competitive? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q44 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe yourself as individualistic? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q45 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe yourself as assertive? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q46 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe yourself as not assertive? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q47 Rate yourself on a scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you describe yourself as neutral? (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End of Block: Masculinity-Femininity Scale

Start of Block: End of Survey Statement

Q49 Dear Bridgewater State University Student, Thank you for completing my survey it is appreciated. Just a reminder if this survey has upset you in anyway and would like to talk to someone, there are counselors available at Bridgewater State University Counseling Services located in the Wellness Center, ground floor, Weygand Hall. Their phone number is 508-531-1331

End of Block: End of Survey Statement