

University of Mississippi

eGrove

Honors Theses

Honors College (Sally McDonnell Barksdale
Honors College)

Spring 4-30-2021

Examining Bystander Blame in Rape and Sexual Assault

Katherine E. Purdom

University of Mississippi

Follow this and additional works at: https://egrove.olemiss.edu/hon_thesis



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Purdom, Katherine E., "Examining Bystander Blame in Rape and Sexual Assault" (2021). *Honors Theses*. 1725.

https://egrove.olemiss.edu/hon_thesis/1725

This Undergraduate Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Honors College (Sally McDonnell Barksdale Honors College) at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of eGrove. For more information, please contact egrove@olemiss.edu.

EXAMINING BYSTANDER BLAME IN RAPE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT

by

Katherine Elise Purdom

A thesis submitted to the faculty of The University of Mississippi in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Sally McDonnell Barksdale Honors College.

Oxford
April 2021

Approved by

Advisor: Professor Carrie Smith

Reader: Professor Joseph Wellman

Reader: Professor Laura Johnson

© 2021
Katherine Elise Purdom
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my advisor, Dr. Carrie Smith. Without her guidance, encouragement, and great deal of patience, this project would not have been possible. I would also like to extend my sincerest gratitude to my committee members, Dr. Joseph Wellman and Dr. Laura Johnson. The time they have dedicated to my defense is much appreciated. I am extremely grateful for Dr. John Samonds, who assisted me in finding a thesis advisor at such short notice. Many thanks to the Sally McDonald Barksdale Honors College for fostering my success on this project.

ABSTRACT

KATHERINE PURDOM: Examining Bystander Blame in Rape and Sexual Assault

(Under the direction of Dr. Carrie Smith)

The present study investigated the effect of various factors on blame distribution in sexual violence cases. Participants (N = 378) were randomly assigned to either a *rape* (N = 187) or *sexual assault* (N = 190) condition and directed to read a scenario that varied only by the terminology indicated by the condition. Participants were provided two pre-filled slots labeled as the perpetrator and victim. Additionally, they were given two blank “free-response” options in which participants could assign blame and indicate a responsible party if they found it necessary. Data was gathered from the male (N = 163) and female (N = 200) respondents and analyzed as discrete samples to continue exploring if the pervasiveness of victim-blaming varies across genders. The questionnaire never explicitly mentioned a bystander, enabling us to explore the prevalence of non-prompted bystander blame in sexual violence scenarios. Blame attribution assigned by those who placed blame on a bystander was compared to those who did not. Results indicated that the distribution of victim blame did not vary across the *rape* and *sexual assault* conditions. Furthermore, the amount of assigned victim blame was consistent for both men and women. Very few participants indicated a bystander was to blame for the scenario (N = 30). Moreover, these participants assigned less blame to the perpetrator of the crime. Given their relevance in sexual violence prevention programs, the responsibility bystanders hold for sexual violence should be further investigated.

Keywords: Bystander, blame, sexual assault, rape, victim

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
METHODS.....	6
RESULTS.....	8
DISCUSSION.....	11
REFERENCES.....	18
APPENDIX.....	24

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Demographic Breakdown of the Study Sample 17

Examining Bystander Blame in Rape and Sexual Assault

The terms *rape* and *sexual assault* are often used interchangeably, although their legal definitions are different. Rape, as defined by the Department of Justice, is “[t]he penetration, no matter how slight, of the vagina or anus with any body part or object, or oral penetration by a sex organ of another person, without the consent of the victim” (U.S. Department of Justice, 2012). The term sexual assault is far broader and encompasses the act of rape. Legally, sexual assault is defined as all nonconsensual sexual encounters, and is not limited to acts of penetration (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2011).

How an act of sexual violence is labeled depends largely on an observer’s rape script, or schema dictating what is expected to occur during rape. Rape scripts typically have the following requirements: the perpetrator and victim are strangers, the perpetrator uses physical force on the victim, and the victim attempts to fight back (Anderson, 2007; Estrich, 1987; Shotland & Goodstein, 1983). Studies indicate that women who are victims of sexual violence are more likely to deem their experience as “rape” if the perpetrator was a stranger (Bondurant, 2001; Khan et al., 1994). Research by Sasson and Paul (2014) found that sexual violence scenarios are more likely to be labeled as “rape” if they follow the stereotypical rape script. Further, the scenario is more likely to be labeled “sexual” assault if it conflicts with the traditional rape script

Although the typical rape script is widely accepted, most rapes that occur do not follow the script (Allison et al., 1993). A 2016 study, examining the characteristics of reported rapes in the United Kingdom, revealed that the majority of the rapes were committed by an acquaintance and did not include physical violence (Waterhouse et. al, 2016). Due to these inconsistencies between actual rapes and the typical rape script, the act of rape is often belittled and viewed as less

severe than it is (i.e. less violent; Newcombe et al., 2008). Bieneck and Krahe (2011) highlighted this, finding that the perpetrators of robbery received more blame than the perpetrators of rape although the victims of rape receive higher levels of blame than the victims of robbery.

Blame attributed to the victim and perpetrator of sexual violence are inextricably linked. As one party receives more blame, the other party receives less. The prevalence of victim blame in cases of sexual violence is a topic of interest in numerous studies however the results have not always been consistent. Some studies have found that men attribute significantly more blame to the victim (Bell et al., 1994; Hockett et al., 2016), while others have found that women place more blame on the victim (Stormo et al, 1997). However, other studies find no significant difference in blame attribution towards the victim (Newcombe et al., 2008). Each of the previous studies utilized different study designs with varying degrees of factors that could influence the participants to respond a certain way. It is plausible that the differences in study design are responsible for the inconsistencies in the responses.

Sexual Violence and Bystanders

While sexual violence occurs between a victim and perpetrator, Cohen (1993) suggests there is often a third party involved, known as the bystander. Levy and Ben-David (2015, p. 97) define a bystander as “an individual who is present during the victimizing act but does not take part in the situation or the event”. According to this definition, bystanders must be physically present at the scene of the crime, however, other studies have not stipulated this as a requirement. For example, Lickel, Schmader, and Hamilton (2003) conducted a study that showed that participants assigned blame to the perpetrator’s parents in a school shooting scenario. In this case, the shooter’s parents were not physically present during the time but considered bystanders

since they did not notice or intervene before the crime occurred. On the other hand, bystanders who are physically present are blamed for not intervening during the actual crime (Levy & Ben-David, 2015).

In the past, education courses and self-defense training were used as the primary way to reduce women's risk of being sexually assaulted (Katz & Moore, 2013). In recent years, however, bystander prevention programs have become the standard approach to the prevention of sexual violence (The American College Health Association, 2011). Bystander prevention programs are used to "encourage responsive bystander behaviors to 'spread' responsibility for safety to members of the broader community" (Katz & Moore, 2013, p. 184). As of 2013, the Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act (SaVE Act) requires most colleges and universities to educate all students, faculty, and staff on bystander prevention (Maloney, 2011). Though, the method of bystander education is not always uniform across these institutions.

Some prevention programs target men or women exclusively. For instance, Men Can Stop Rape (www.mcsr.org) emphasizes the importance of educating men to actively intervene in sexual violence. These men-oriented programs attempt to shift the prospective role of men from a perpetrator to someone who can stop sexual violence from occurring (Foubert & Newberry, 2006). Women-oriented initiatives, such as the Women's Program (www.oneinfourusa.org), aim to empower women to intervene in and avoid getting themselves into high-risk situations. Many bystander prevention programs educate men and women together. For example, the It's On Us campaign (www.itsonus.org) educates all students on sexual assault awareness and encourages them to be proactive bystanders.

The effectiveness of bystander programs varies. Many colleges and universities provide a one-time bystander prevention course to incoming students during orientation, however, DeGue (2014) doubts the effectiveness of this. This doubt stems from the fact that the only two bystander prevention programs, *Safe Dates* and *Shifting Boundaries*, proven to significantly reduce the rate of sexual violence consist of 10 education sessions (Foshee et al., 1996; Taylor et al., 2011; DeGue, 2014). DeGue (2014) suggests programs that utilize multiple training sessions are likely to be successful while single sessions are not due to their repetitive nature. Single session prevention programs fail to provide lasting changes to behavior patterns due to the lack of reinforcement (DeGue, 2014).

These bystander prevention programs educate participants about the responsibility that bystanders hold in preventing sexual violence. Yet, if the sexual violence were to still occur, should the bystander be blamed? The term “innocent bystander” is often used to describe the bystander. However, in previous studies, questions are presented in a way that suggests the bystander holds responsibility. Levy and Ben-David (2008, p.6) pose the commonly asked question, “[w]hy did the innocent bystander not try to help save the victim?”. Questions like these imply that bystanders carry the blame in sexual violence cases.

It is worth noting that no previous studies have investigated if participants will place blame on a bystander without being explicitly told a bystander was involved. Previous studies investigating the prevalence of bystander blame do explicitly mention that a bystander is involved, thus suggesting to participants that they should blame the bystander (Levy & Ben-David, 2013). It is critical to understand the responsibility bystanders hold and the blame they receive to better prevent sexual violence.

Present Study

Considering the inconsistencies in victim-blame research, as well as the scarcity of bystander blame research, the present study collected information on the blame distribution in sexual violence. We presented four research questions for this study.

The first research question (Research Question #1) asked the following: Does the average victim-blame vary across the conditions of “sexual assault” and “rape”? Asking this question enables us to determine if the use of different terminology is significant enough to alter how participants ascribe responsibility to the victim.

The second research question (Research Question #2) posed the following: What is the relationship between participants’ gender and the average blame assigned to the victim in a sexual assault scenario? Using this question, the study sought to clarify the discrepancies that past research has presented about the rate at which men and women assign blame to the victim in assault cases. To obtain non-biased results, all priming factors (e.g., rape scripts) were not included in the scenario.

The third research question (Research Question #3) asked the following: To what extent are “bystanders” organically mentioned and assigned blame in the case of sexual violence? In conducting this study, we were interested in if participants would attribute blame to a bystander without being explicitly told a bystander was involved. This research would allow us to determine if Cohen (1993) was correct in stating crimes, including sexual violence, consist of three guilty parties.

Lastly, the fourth research question (Research Question #4) asked the following: For those that assign blame to “bystanders”, does the amount of blame they assigned to the victim

differ from those who only assigned blame to the victim and perpetrator? By comparing the amount of victim-blame assigned by those who blame a bystander and those who do not, we will be able to see if blaming a bystander removes some of the blame attributed to the victim.

Methods

Participants

The original sample included 412 participants. Fifteen participants were excluded for failing at least one of two attention checks and 19 were excluded for completing the survey in less than 90 seconds. The final sample size consisted of 378 participants ranging in age from 18-78 ($M_{age}=31.98$, $SD = 11.90$). More than half of the respondents were white (63.39%). There was a relatively even distribution of gender amongst the respondents, with 53.47% being female. Table 1 provides a full demographic breakdown of the participant's gender and race.

Design and Procedure

The purpose of this study was to gain insight into how people perceive sexual violence by gathering information about who or what people place the blame on. A brief statement provided the participants with a general idea of the study, indicating the primary purpose was for participants to provide answers on how they perceive a crime. Participants were recruited to take part in an online questionnaire via Prolific (www.prolific.co). Upon successful completion of the questionnaire, respondents were compensated for their participation (\$0.84). This research was approved by The University of Mississippi's Institutional Review Board (IRB). The survey included a question to confirm that participants were aware of the study's purpose and that they were at least 18 years of age. Additionally, the risk and benefits of the study were explained to potential

respondents before the initiation of the questionnaire. The questionnaire included a demographics portion in which participants gave their age, race, and gender.

The survey consisted of two conditions, to which the participants were randomly assigned. The first condition was labeled the “rape” condition and the second condition was labeled the “sexual assault” condition. Participants in both conditions were given the following scenario: “After meeting at a party, John _____ Kim because...”. Depending on their randomly assigned condition, the blank in the statement was replaced with either “raped” or “sexually assaulted”.

Respondents were instructed to read their given scenario and assign blame, in the form of a percentage, to whoever holds responsibility for the incident. There were four available categories that participants could assign blame to (John, Kim, Other 1, and Other 2). The categories labeled as “Other” were considered free-response categories, in which participants could assign blame and indicate the person or factor deserving this blame. The only stipulation given was that the total amount of blame the participant distributed had to sum to 100%. A full copy of the question can be found in the appendix (Appendix A).

Data Analysis Plan

Chi-square analyses were conducted to determine the effectiveness of random assignment, ensuring that gender and racial makeup were identical between the “rape” and “sexual assault” conditions.

To investigate Research Question #1, we first gathered descriptive statistics (e.g., mean and standard deviation) for the victim-blame under each condition. An independent samples t-test was conducted using victim-blame data from the “rape” and “sexual assault” conditions as the two samples. A secondary analysis was explored by separating the respondents who assigned

zero blame to the victim from those who did assign the victim a percentage of the blame. Participants who assigned no blame to the victim were referred to as “non-zero participants”. The number of non-zero participants under each condition was recorded. Descriptive statistics were calculated for the non-zero responses for both the “rape” and “sexual assault” conditions. An independent samples t-test was conducted for the victim-blame data, using the non-zero participants in the “rape” and “sexual assault” conditions.

To explore Research Question #2, we first collected descriptive statistics on victim-blame levels for both men and women. An independent samples t-test was conducted, using men and women as the two samples. As a secondary analysis, we suppressed the data from participants who did not report any blame to the victim. Descriptive statistics were gathered for the non-zero responses from men and women. An independent samples t-test was employed, using non-zero men and women as the two samples.

For Research Question #3, the number of respondents to select at least one of the “Other” categories was reported as a percentage. The qualitative data, gathered from the free-response section attached to the “Other” categories, was sorted and reported in terms of percentages. The number of times a “bystander” was mentioned as well as the specific type of “bystander” was reported.

To examine Research Question #4, the data was sorted to separate participants who selected an “Other” and those who did not. Participant data that selected an “Other” was sorted again so that only the labels mentioning a bystander were used for analysis. Descriptive statistics were run on each group and an independent samples t-test, using the two defined samples. A secondary analysis was conducted in which all participant data that did not assign blame to the vic-

tim was suppressed. Descriptive statistics and an independent samples t-test were run using the non-zero victim-blame data and the same two previous groups for the samples.

Results

Random assignment generated similar demographics across both conditions. Females comprised 57% of the “rape” condition and 49% of the “sexual assault” condition. Chi-square analysis indicated there was no significant difference in gender distribution across conditions ($\chi^2(5) = 7.35, p = 0.19$). The majority of the respondents in both conditions were white (“rape” = 66%; “sexual assault” = 61%). An additional chi-square test denoted no significant difference in racial demographics across conditions ($\chi^2(6) = 3.21, p = 0.78$)

Descriptive statistics ran for Research Question #1 revealed that the mean victim-blame in the “sexual assault” condition was slightly higher than the mean of the “rape” condition (Sexual Assault: $M = 5.02\%$, $SD = 12.95\%$; Rape: $M = 3.99\%$, $SD = 13.27\%$). An independent samples t-test revealed the difference in victim blame between the two conditions was not statistically significant, $t(375) = -0.76, p = 0.45$.

The secondary analysis ran Research Question #1 indicated that 20.86% ($n = 39$) of participants in the “rape” condition and 27.37% ($n = 52$) of participant in the “sexual assault” condition attributed at least 1.00% of the blame to the victim. Despite the non-zero participants in the “rape” condition assigning more blame, on average, to the victim ($M = 19.15\%$, $SD = 24.03\%$) than the non-zero participants in the “sexual assault” condition ($M = 18.35\%$, $SD = 19.29\%$), there was no statistically significant difference between the two, $t(89) = -0.18, p = 0.21$.

The data analyzed for Research Question #2 indicated that, on average, male participants assigned more blame to the victim than the female participants (Male: $M = 5.48\%$, $SD = 13.34\%$;

Female: $M = 3.79\%$, $SD = 13.00\%$). Yet, the independent samples t-test revealed that the difference between the two was not statistically significant, $t(361) = 1.22$, $p = 0.22$.

Secondary analysis for Research Question #2 revealed that 55 (33.74%) male participants and 35 (17.50%) female participants distributed at least 1.00% of the blame to the victim. On average, female non-zero participants assigned a higher portion of the blame to the victim than the male non-zero participants (Female: $M = 21.63\%$, $SD = 24.34\%$; Male: $M = 16.25\%$, $SD = 18.86\%$). However, the independent samples t-test ran showed the difference was not statistically significant, $t(88) = 1.18$, $p = 0.24$.

Analysis for Research Question #3 revealed that 52 (13.75%) participants attributed blame to at least one of the “Other” categories. Of those 52 participants, 3 did not provide a free-response label and 3 assigned blame, accompanied by a label, to both “Other” categories. Thus, 55 total free-response labels were collected. Thirty (54.54%) of the free-response labels indicated the guilty party was a bystander that was physically present. A review of the terminology used to describe the bystander showed that 63.33% ($n = 19$) explicitly indicated a “bystander”, 20% ($n = 6$) specified John’s friend’s, and 16.67% ($n = 5$) stated Kim’s friends as the bystander. Four (7.27%) of the labels explicitly mentioned “John’s parents” (i.e., bystanders who are not physically present) as the guilty party. Therefore, the total number of “bystander” labels given was 34 (61.81%).

The remainder of the labels were unrelated to bystanders. Nine (16.36%) of the labels specified that alcohol and drugs were an attributable factor in the scenario. An additional 16.36% ($n = 9$) of the labels indicated societal factors were at fault (e.g., healthcare system and educa-

tion). The remaining 5.46% of the labels placed blame on mental health ($n = 2$) and “abuse” ($n = 1$).

Analysis for Research Question #4 showed that participants who blamed a bystander assigned slightly more blame, on average, to the victim than participants who did not (Bystander Blamed: $M = 5.57\%$, $SD = 9.24\%$; No “Other” Blamed: $M = 4.12\%$, $SD = 13.37\%$). The independent samples t-test that was run revealed that the difference between the two groups was not statistically significant, $t(353) = -0.56$, $p = 0.58$.

The secondary analysis for Research Question #4 indicated that 12 (40%) participants who blamed a bystander and 66 (20.25%) who did not blame any “Other” option, assigned at least 1.00% of the total blame to the victim. The average victim-blame was lower from the participants who also blamed a bystander (Bystander Blamed: $M = 14.36\%$, $SD = 13.19\%$; No “Other” Blamed: $M = 20.34\%$, $SD = 23.58\%$). The difference between the two was not statistically significant, $t(76) = 1.06$, $p = 0.29$.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding of blame distribution in sexual violence. We explored factors that may influence victim-blaming (e.g., terminology and gender differences) and the prevalence of bystander blame. We proposed four research questions to investigate in the study.

Research Question #1 explored the potential influence that using different terminology has on the prevalence of victim-blame. The primary analysis revealed that participants in the “sexual assault” condition blamed the victim at slightly higher rates than those in the “rape” condition. Yet, in the secondary analysis, using the suppressed data, participants in the “rape” condi-

tion reported a higher average victim-blame. Regardless, the difference across conditions for both analyses was insignificant.

The difference in blame distribution between the primary and secondary analysis is likely due to a larger number of participants in the “rape” condition assigning zero blame to the victim. Yet, those participants in the “rape” condition that did assign the victim blame, did so at a higher level than those in the “sexual assault” condition. Nonetheless, victim-blame did not differ between terms to a degree large enough to be significant.

These results may indicate that participants do not find the terms “rape” and “sexual assault” to be different. That is, neither term is considered to be more severe than the other. According to Bieneck and Krahe (2011), the more severe a crime is considered, the less blame the victim is given. Furthermore, since victim-blame is relatively low in both conditions one may conclude that both are taken as a serious crime by participants. However, this study did not directly assess how severe participants thought the crime to be. This limits our ability to fully conclude why the results did not vary across conditions.

The present results from Research Question #2 are consistent with Newcombe et al.’s (2008) study, finding that men and women do not blame the victim at different rates. The lack of influential factors (e.g., rape scripts) used in this studies scenario likely explains this. Past studies that have found gender differences in victim-blame, used vignettes with descriptions that potentially prime a given gender to blame the victim more harshly (Bell et al., 1994; Hockett et al., 2016; Stormo et al, 1997). These priming factors may prompt participants to utilize the defense attribution theory (Levy & Ben-David, 2015).The defense attribution theory suggests that blaming the victim depends on how similar the victim and observer are (Levy & Ben-David, 2015).

Since more victims of sexual violence are women, you would suspect that female participants would be less likely to blame the victim. Similarly, you would expect male participants to be more likely to excuse the perpetrator, thus assigning more blame to the victim. However, in our study this was not the case. It is possible that we obtained these results since the neither victim nor perpetrator were thoroughly described in the scenario. Thus, the participants were not given enough information to align themselves strongly with either the victim or perpetrator.

Our findings for Research Question #3 highlight that people or factors, other than the victim and perpetrator, are not often blamed for sexual violence. Only 13.75% of all participants blamed anyone other than the victim and/or perpetrator. However, of the additional people or factors that were assigned blame, a “bystander” was the most common response. Most of the “bystander” labels indicated bystanders who were physically at the party were at fault. Still, “John’s parents” were mentioned multiple times. It is unclear if participants were aware that mentioning the parents was considered blaming a bystander. Nevertheless, this supports Lickel et al’s (2003) study that suggests bystanders do not have to be physically present. Rather, they can be considered a bystander if they could have intervened in behavior leading up to the crime.

The small number of participants to mention a bystander reflects the idea that most people do not consider a bystander to be a guilty party in sexual assault. This contradicts Cohen’s (1993) claim that crimes consist of three guilty parties: the victim, the perpetrator, and the bystander. We cannot conclude if participants considered a bystander to play a role in the sexual violence, but we can confirm that bystanders were not heavily blamed for the crime.

The second most common factors blamed for the sexual violence were alcohol and drugs. Thus, implying some participants readily think of rape myths. Rape myths are “prejudicial,

stereotyped, or false beliefs about rape, rape victims, and rapists” (Burt,1980). Rape myths often serve to justify the actions of the perpetrator while placing blame on the victim. Overtime, rape myths have become subtle, often indicating the victim was assaulted due to being in an intoxicated state, wearing suggestive clothing, or participating in actions that imply to the perpetrator that she wanted to engage in sexual intercourse (O’Connor et al., 2018). Past studies indicate that men accept rape myths at higher rates than their female counterparts, thus indicating that men tend to excuse the perpetrator more often (Newcombe, et al., 2008; Johnson et al., 1997). However, our evidence does not support the notion that men distribute blame differently than women. Additionally, we did not explore whether blaming factors of rape myths influenced the amount of victim-blame participants assigned, thus limiting our understanding of the subject.

Results from exploring Research Question #4 indicate that participants are no more or less likely to blame the victim when they also blame a bystander. Since the total blame had to equal 100%, this means participants who blamed a bystander removed blame from the perpetrator. This is significant because the growing support for bystander prevention programs is likely to influence more people to blame bystanders. This increase in bystander-blame is likely to occur since prevention programs preach the “responsibility” bystanders have to intervene (Katz & Moore, 2013, p. 184).

Thus, these programs may lead to the perpetrator being blamed even less for the crime. This could affect incarceration rates for perpetrators of sexual violence, leaving more perpetrators unpunished for their crime. Victims of sexual violence are already less likely to report it than other crimes (Epstein & Lagenbahn, 1994). If sexual violence perpetrators become even less responsible for their actions, victims are more likely to not report the crime. This is due to the fact

that trials often cause severe psychological stress to the victim (Grubb & Turner, 2012). When the perpetrator is not found guilty, the victim loses their credibility and undergoes even more psychological stress (Gunn & Linden, 1997; Campbell & Johnson, 1997).

Future Directions for Research

More research needs to be done to better understand the topic without the limitations this study provided. First, to better understand if the severity of the implied crime alters the amount of blame the victim receives, future studies should include a question that asks participants to indicate how severe they interpret their scenario to be. This would provide more clear results on whether or not “rape” and “sexual assault” are thought to be of the same severity replicating and extending the findings of Sasson and Paul (2014).

Second, this study did not determine if participants thought a bystander was present during the crime. Rather, it is only establishing if participants actually blamed a bystander for the crime. An additional question should be added to the survey, asking participants to list people who were present when the sexual violence occurred. Asking this question after the blame distribution question would still allow data to be collected without any priming influence. Knowing this information would allow us to determine if people actually blame bystanders for the crime, or just simply do not naturally think of them as being present.

Lastly, the study could be enhanced by exploring rape myths. Since high rape myth acceptance indicates higher victim blame, it would be relevant to explore. Knowing participants level or rape myth acceptance would allow us to better understand their blame distribution.

A great deal of research is still needed to fully understand bystander blame. More non-priming studies need to be done to determine the actual prevalence of bystander blame. Once

there is a great deal of research on the subject, we will be able to better understand and approach sexual violence prevention programs. It is critical to know this information so that bystander prevention programs can be altered to ensure they are not encouraging people to remove blame from perpetrators, resulting in victims suffering from more long-term emotional distress.

Table 1

*Demographics of Study
Sample*

Factor	Total Sample	Rape Condi- tion	Sexual Assault Condi- tion
Gender			
Male	161 (43.04%)	72	89
Female	200 (53.47%)	107	93
Transgender Male	1 (0.26%)	0	1
Transgender Female	0 (0%)	0	0
Gender-variant/ Non-conforming	7 (1.87%)	2	5
Prefer Not to Answer	3 (0.80%)	2	1
No Response Given	2 (0.53%)	2	0
Race			
White	239 (63.39%)	123	116
Black/African American	28 (7.42%)	14	14
Hispanic/Latino	23 (6.10%)	12	11
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	2 (0.53%)	0	2
Asian	54 (14.32%)	26	28
Multiracial	29 (7.69%)	12	17
Prefer Not to Answer	2 (0.53%)	1	1

References

- Allison, J. A., Wrightsman, L. S. (1993). Rape: The Misunderstood Crime. India: SAGE Publications.
- Anderson, I. (2007). What is a typical rape? Effects of victim and participant gender in female and male rape perception. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 46(1), 225–245. <https://doi-org.umiss.idm.oclc.org/10.1348/014466606X101780>
- Banyard, V. L., & Moynihan, M. M. (2011). Variation in bystander behavior related to sexual and intimate partner violence prevention: Correlates in a sample of college students. *Psychology of Violence*, 1(4), 287–301. <https://doi-org.umiss.idm.oclc.org/10.1037/a0023544>
- Bell, S. T., Kuriloff, P. J., & Lottes, I. (1994). Understanding attributions of blame in stranger rape and date rape situations: An examination of gender, race, identification, and students' social perceptions of rape victims. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 24(19), 1719–1734. <https://doi-org.umiss.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1994.tb01571.x>
- Bieneck, S., & Krahé, B. (2011). Blaming the victim and exonerating the perpetrator in cases of rape and robbery: Is there a double standard? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(9), 1785–1797. <https://doi-org.umiss.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/0886260510372945>
- Bondurant, B. (2001). University women's acknowledgment of rape. *Violence Against Women*, 7(3), 294–314. <https://doi-org.umiss.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/10778010122182451>
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (2011). Rape and sexual assault. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=tp&tid=317>

- Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38(2), 217–230. <https://doi-org.umiss.idm.oclc.org/10.1037/0022-3514.38.2.217>
- Campbell, R., & Johnson, C. R. (1997). Police officers' perceptions of rape: Is there consistency between state law and individual beliefs? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12(2), 255–274. <https://doi-org.umiss.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/088626097012002007>
- Cohen, S. (1993). Human Rights and Crimes of The State: The Culture of Denial. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 26(2), 97–115. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000486589302600201>
- Coker, A. L., Fisher, B. S., Bush, H. M., Swan, S. C., Williams, C. M., Clear, E. R., & DeGue, S. (2015). Evaluation of the Green Dot bystander intervention to reduce interpersonal violence among college students across three campuses. *Violence Against Women*, 21(12), 1507–1527. <https://doi-org.umiss.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/1077801214545284>
- DeGue, S. (2014). Preventing sexual violence on college campuses: Lessons from research and practice. Part one: Evidence-based strategies for the primary prevention of sexual violence perpetration. Washington, DC: White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault. Retrieved from https://www.nccpsafety.org/assets/files/library/Preventing_Sexual_Violence_on_College_Campuses.pdf

- Epstein, J., & Lagenbahn, S. (1994). *The Criminal Justice System and community response to rape. Issues and practices in criminal justice series, National Institute of Justice*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice. <https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/Digitization/148064NCJRS.pdf>
- Estrich, S. (1987). *Real rape*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Fenton, R. A., & Mott, H. L. (2017). The bystander approach to violence prevention: Considerations for implementation in Europe. *Psychology of Violence, 7*(3), 450–458. <https://doi-org.umiss.idm.oclc.org/10.1037/vio0000104>
- Foubert, J. D., & Newberry, J. T. (2006). Effects of Two Versions of an Empathy-Based Rape Prevention Program on Fraternity Men's Survivor Empathy, Attitudes, and Behavioral Intent to Commit Rape or Sexual Assault. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*(2), 133–148. <https://doi-org.umiss.idm.oclc.org/10.1353/csd.2006.0016>
- Foubert, J. D. (2018, October 30). *The Women's Program*. Culture of Respect. <https://cultureofrespect.org/program/the-womens-program/>.
- Frese, B., Moya, M., & Megías, J. L. (2004). Social Perception of Rape: How Rape Myth Acceptance Modulates the Influence of Situational Factors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*(2), 143–161. <https://doi-org.umiss.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/0886260503260245>
- Grubb, A., & Turner, E. (2012). Attribution of blame in rape cases: A review of the impact of rape myth acceptance, gender role conformity and substance use on victim blaming. *Ag-*

- gression and Violent Behavior*, 17(5), 443–452. <https://doi-org.umiss.idm.oclc.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.06.002>
- Gunn, R., & Linden, R. (1997). The impact of law reform on the processing of sexual assault cases. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 34(2), 155–174. <https://doi-org.umiss.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/j.1755-618X.1997.tb00205.x>
- Hockett, J. M., Smith, S. J., Klausing, C. D., & Saucier, D. A. (2016). Rape myth consistency and gender differences in perceiving rape victims: A meta-analysis. *Violence Against Women*, 22(2), 139–167. <https://doi-org.umiss.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/1077801215607359>
- It's On Us: Our Story*. It's On Us. (2014). <https://www.itsonus.org/about-us/our-story/>.
- Johnson, B. E., Kuck, D. L., & Schander, P. R. (1997). Rape myth acceptance and sociodemographic characteristics: A multidimensional analysis. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 36(11–12), 693–707. <https://doi-org.umiss.idm.oclc.org/10.1023/A:1025671021697>
- Kahn, A. S., Mathie, V. A., & Torgler, C. (1994). Rape scripts and rape acknowledgment. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 18(1), 53–66. <https://doi-org.umiss.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1994.tb00296.x>
- Katz, J., & Moore, J. (2016). Bystander education training for campus sexual assault prevention: An initial meta-analysis. In R. D. Maiuro (Ed.), *Perspectives on college sexual assault: Perpetrator, victim, and bystander*. (pp. 183–196). Springer Publishing Company.
- Levy, I., & Ben-David, S. (2015). Mechanism of bystander-blaming: Defensive attribution,

- counterfactual thinking, and gender. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 59(1), 96–113. <https://doi-org.umiss.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/0306624X13503297>
- Maloney, C. (2013). Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act. H. R 812, 113th Cong.
- McMahon, S. (2007). Understanding community-specific rape myths: Exploring student-athlete culture. *Affilia: Journal of Women & Social Work*, 22(4), 357–370. <https://doi-org.umiss.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/0886109907306331>
- McMahon, S., & Dick, A. (2011). “Being in a room with like-minded men”: An exploratory study of men’s participation in a bystander intervention program to prevent intimate partner violence. *The Journal of Men’s Studies*, 19(1), 3–18. <https://doi-org.umiss.idm.oclc.org/10.3149/jms.1901.3>
- Newcombe, P. A., van den Eynde, J., Hafner, D., & Jolly, L. (2008). Attributions of responsibility for rape: Differences across familiarity of situation, gender, and acceptance of rape myths. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 38(7), 1736–1754. <https://doi-org.umiss.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2008.00367.x>
- O’Connor, J., Cusano, J., McMahon, S., & Draper, J. (2018). Students’ articulation of subtle rape myths surrounding campus sexual assault. *Journal of College Student Development*, 59(4), 439–455. <https://doi-org.umiss.idm.oclc.org/10.1353/csd.2018.0041>
- Sasson, S., & Paul, L. A. (2014). Labeling acts of sexual violence: What roles do assault characteristics, attitudes, and life experiences play? *Behavior and Social Issues*, 23. <https://doi-org.umiss.idm.oclc.org/10.5210/bsi.v23i0.5215>

Shotland, R. L., & Goodstein, L. (1983). Just because she doesn't want to doesn't mean it's rape:

An experimentally based causal model of the perception of rape in a dating situation. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 46(3), 220–232. <https://doi-org.umiss.idm.oclc.org/>

[10.2307/3033793](https://doi-org.umiss.idm.oclc.org/10.2307/3033793)

[10.2307/3033793](https://doi-org.umiss.idm.oclc.org/10.2307/3033793)

The women's Program (45 minutes + Q&A;). (2014).

<https://www.oneinfourusa.org/thewomensprogram.html>.

Waterhouse, G. F., Reynolds, A., & Egan, V. (2016). Myths and legends: The reality of rape of-

fences reported to a UK police force. *The European Journal of Psychology Applied to*

Legal Context, 8(a1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpal.2015.04.001>

Appendix A

Survey Question

How responsible do you think each of these people is for the incident at the party?

Assign a percentage of responsibility to each so that the total assignment equals 100. Possible scores for John and Kim range from 0% to 100%. If there are other people or factors responsible for the incident, you should name/describe them in the boxes provided below and attribute some percentage of the responsibility to them as well, also ranging from 0% to 100%.

The total must equal 100%.

John : _____

Kim : _____

Other: : _____

Other: : _____

Total : _____