COLLEGE STUDENTS'
ATTITUDES TOWARD RAPE VICTIMS[†]

Jeaw-Mei Chen*   Phylis Lan Lin**

According to the FBI, 87,340 rapes were reported in the United States in 1985. Since rapes are under-reported, the actual number is estimated to be at least five times higher (FBI, 1986). In recent years, the rates have risen so high that authorities have estimated that a rape occurs in the U.S. once every six minutes. One in every ten women might be raped in her lifetime in America. Because the age and degree of physical attractiveness of rape victims are wide-ranging, rape is a problem shared by all females (Williams, 1984; Kilpatrick, et al. 1985; Kilpatrick, Veronen, and Best, 1984; Johnson, 1980; Koss, Gidycxz, and Wisniewsic, 1987).

There is some evidence that a person's attitudes toward women's rights and roles in society are related to one's views about rape. Field (1978) found that people who view women in traditional roles are likely to blame rape victims. Attitudes toward rape victims have been shown to influence a jury. Brozan (1985) found that both male and female jurors treated the rape victim who seemed chaste or conventional in her style more seriously. Recent studies have pointed out that exposure to pornography affects attitudes toward rape victims (Malamuth and Check, 1981; Malamuth and Donnerstein, 1982; Check and Malamuth, 1983). Wyer, et al. (1985), in their experimental research, also revealed that portrayals of women as sex objects increased male subjects' beliefs that the victim was responsible for the incident.

Many studies on the topic of rape have dealt with the rapist. Anger, aggressive-

---

ness, low self-esteem, lack of self-control, the tendency to be stimulated by abnormal sexual acts and nudity, and the belief in "rape myths" are some typical characteristics of rapists (Chen, 1986; Abel, et al., 1977; Atwood and Howell, 1976; Clark and Lewis, 1977; Williams and Holmes, 1981; and Scully and Marolla, 1985). Clark and Lewis (1977) discovered that rapists, more than the public at large, believed rape myths such as, "Women like to be raped," and "Women get pleasure from being raped". Gager and Schus (1976) found the phrases that rapists most often said to victims included, "It is what you've wanted, isn't it?" and after the rape, "You really liked it, didn't you?" This distorted cognition leads to recidivism (Scully and Marolla, 1982). Burt's study (1980) found that general public hold many similar misconceptions about rape as rapists did. He found that almost three quarters of the people surveyed believed that women had an unconscious rape wish. As a result, people tended to hold the victim responsible for the rape.

Aside from studying characteristics of rapists, attribution studies were found to be important indicators in the whole process of stigmatizing victims. Jones and Aronson's (1973) study of attitudes toward rape victims determined that married women and virgins were considered to be more at fault than divorcees based on the public's belief that a "respectable" person will not be raped unless the person misbehaves. This misconduct ultimately leads to rape, and therefore victims should be blamed.

A great deal of attributional processes are influenced by societal and cultural definitions (Seligmann, 1984; Russell, 1982; and L'Armand, Pepitone, and Shanmugam, 1981). Sandy (1981) examined the social-cultural context of rape in 156 societies and suggested that rape is part of a cultural configuration which includes interpersonal violence, male dominance, and sexual separation. Thus, one can predict that the higher the degree of sex-role stereotype, the higher will be the degree of victimization.

Situational factors also affect the attribution of the causes of rapes. Calhoun et al. (1976) found that the more rape occurred in a given area, the less the victims were blamed. Because the public expects victims to struggle with their attackers, if no signs of struggle exist, the victims are highly criticized (Krulewitz and Wash, 1979). Field (1978) found that "public officers" and the "public" agreed with the "rapists" that victims should take responsibility. The study further revealed that "female counselors," being females, were the only ones who showed some acceptance of the victims. In conclusion, attribution studies demonstrate a very large tendency for victims to be

blamed by the public. The "blaming of the victim" provides a justification for the oppression of society's victims. If people themselves are responsible for the fact that they are sick, poor, disabled, or raped, there is little need for the rest of us to sympathize with them (Ryan, 1971; Howard, 1984; Chen and Tu, 1984; Ratliff, Chen and Lin, 1988). The consequences of blaming victims are quite clear. They inevitably lead victims to self-blame and fear of filing reports. Victims were often trapped in both "behavioral" and "characteristic" blame. Self-blame and other blame further stigmatized victims and greatly hindered their coping and adjusting mechanisms (Chen and Lin, 1987; Janoff-Bullman, 1979; Miller and Porter, 1983).

But why people blame the victims? Lerner's (1970 & 1980) "just world" hypothesis might provide an explanation. Lerner (1965) ran several laboratory experiments in which victims were picked at random to be given electric shock. It was found that subjects tended to denigrate them, as if the victims were morally responsible for their misfortunes. Lerner interprets that we all believe in a just world. Good things happen to good people, while bad things happen only to bad people. If something bad happens to someone, he or she must be a bad person. People believe in a just world mainly because they want to believe that the world is controllable and predictable rather than uncontrollable and unpredictable. Thus, "bad things won't happen to a good person like me," and therefore, the victim himself/herself is responsible. Janoff-Bullman and Frieze (1983) used the term "illusion of invulnerability" to describe the notion that prior to victimization most individuals think that "it can't happen to me." Langer (1975) found that even in the case of pure chance, people tended to believe that they were able to control the situation. Based on this illusion, the public tended to accuse victims for not trying to control the situation. To protect this sense of control, society blames people (victims) for the bad things that happen to them. Therefore, the world is just. This societal tendency to believe in a just world has led victims to feel that they were bad girls because they were raped (Burt, 1980; Field, 1978; Brownmiller, 1975; Hurt, 1977; and Thornton, 1984).

The present study was designed to investigate how college students' beliefs in a just world and sex-role stereotyping are related to their attribution of responsibility in rape cases and their attitudes toward rape victims. This study was derived from an original study, by the present researchers, in Taiwan in 1985 (Chen and Lin, 1987). In that study, both public and college samples were drawn. For both studies, comparing gender differences in attitudes toward rape victims and beliefs in a just world seems to be a

logical cross-sectional design. Therefore, the focus of the present research was also placed upon the comparative study on gender differences. A third research report was prepared separately. The focus, then, was on a cross-cultural comparative study. The key purposes of the present study were to understand:

1. college students' view of a "just world" and their acceptance of sex-role stereotyping.

2. college students' attitudes toward rape victims and the views on the important factors which trigger rape incidents.

3. how an individual's attitudes toward rape victims are related to his/her belief in a just world, acceptance of sex-role stereotypes, and views on factors attributing to rape incidents, and

4. whether gender might be related to these attitudes.

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

Two hundred and sixty-six students from four universities and colleges in Indiana (both public and private) answered the survey questionnaire in 1987. The sample included 101 (38.3%) male and 163 (61.3%) female respondents (2 missing data). The majority (55.5%) were ages 10 to 19, and 33.2% of the respondents were in the 20 to 29 category.

Instruments and Analysis

The design of the research instruments is described by the following: The Just World Scale (JWS). The JWS was originally designed by Rubin and Peplau (1975) and was tested by Rubin at Boston University and Oklahoma University. The internal consistencies (KR-20) were 0.80 and 0.81, and several pilot studies proved to have high scale reliability. Ma and Smith (1985) modified and translated the JWS to the Chinese language and then tested it on 1091 students at two universities in Taiwan. The original JWS has 20 items (Items 1-20), 9 being "unjust" and 11 being "just," whereas the present study used a 23-item scale with 10 "unjust" and 13 "just" items. The results revealed high validity, and the between-item reliability was high also. For the purpose of a future cross-cultural analysis, the Chinese translation of the JWS for the present study was tested on 233 students in Taiwan in 1985. The JWS for the present survey

was back translated independently from the Chinese scale for accuracy. Although some of the wordings are slightly different from those in the original JWS (Rubin's & Peplau's), the double back translations (from English to Chinese to English to Chinese to English) prove to be adherent to the original scale.

A seven-point Likert scale was used varying from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" with scores ranging from 1 to 7 (Note: the original Rubin and Peplau's JWS used a six-point scale). For the positive items ("just"), the higher the score, the more the subject disagreed with the statement, whereas for the negative items ("unjust"), the higher the score, the higher was the degree of agreement. These items were recorded. Therefore, the higher the score, the lower was the individual's degree of belief in a "just world."

In order to understand the dimension of the JWS, a Principle Factor Analysis was done on the scores of each item. By using varimax method, two factors (with Eigenvalue > 1) were derived from the analysis. Factor 1, "Unjust Factor," (factor loading > 0.36) contained four items clustered around the idea of an unjust world. Factor 2, "Just factor," (factor loading > 0.43) was composed of three items which seemed to be associated with the idea of a just world (Table 1). The correlation between these two factors and other measurements allows researchers to further understand the relationship between the belief in a just world and attitudes toward rape victims.

Sex Role Stereotype Scale (SRSS)

The SRSS, designed by Burt (1980), is aimed at measuring an individual's acceptance of sex-role stereotypes. The scale includes nine items, and its Cronbach Alpha Coefficient was 0.80 (Burt, 1980). The scale reliability was tested by Check and Malamuth (1983) and was found to be highly correlated (r= −.73) with Speme and Helmreich's (1972) sex-role stereotype scale. The scale, including seven positive and two negative items, was measured by the Likert method with a higher score indicating a lower sex-role stereotype.

Factor analysis was conducted from the results of the present study. Eight items were found to have a factor loading larger than 0.42, and those items were all related to "traditional female behaviors." Therefore, the dimension was termed "traditional female" factor (Table 2).

Table 1. Gender and the Means for the JWS, Unjust Factor, and Just Factor

Just World Scale	Male		Female		Pooled variance estimate	
	mean	SD	mean	SD	t	p
1. I feel that many people in the world have a false reputation.	4.76	1.32	5.01	1.20	−1.58	ns
2. In general, this is a fair world.	4.13	1.35	4.30	1.28	−0.99	ns
3. Luck always brings fortune.	3.00	1.14	3.20	0.94	−1.56	ns
4. Those who drive carefully and those who drive without care have the same probability of being hurt in a car accident.	3.14	1.72	3.58	0.68	−2.02	*
5. Many criminals are judged innocent in court.	4.59	1.34	4.74	0.12	−0.97	ns
6. If you study hard, you will receive good grades.	3.20	1.41	3.29	0.39	−0.48	ns
7. If you take care of your health, you are very unlikely to have a heart attack.	3.55	1.41	3.65	0.13	−0.66	ns
8. Those candidates who insist on holding onto their principles in an election are usually the losers.	3.71	1.26	3.67	0.03	0.25	ns
9. Innocent people are seldom put into jail.	4.00	1.40	4.24	0.19	−1.43	ns
10. In a race, many athletes are not caught when they violate a regulation.	3.96	1.29	4.09	0.04	−0.95	ns
11. A person will get what he (or she) deserves.	3.68	1.34	3.98	0.43	−1.73	ns
12. Parents always find good excuses to punish their children.	4.77	1.05	4.75	0.06	0.12	ns
13. Those who do good deeds are usually not known and do not receive just rewards.	3.84	1.26	3.81	0.25	0.19	ns
14. Although bad persons might have held the power in the history of mankind, good persons will eventually regain control.	3.73	1.21	3.67	0.08	0.40	ns
15. In all occupations, those who work hard always get promoted.	4.79	1.10	4.85	1.02	−0.51	ns
16. Parents often neglect their children's wishes.	3.83	1.26	3.72	1.14	0.76	ns
17. In our court system, it is difficult to find a fair judge.	3.09	1.21	3.45	1.08	−2.46	**
18. One should blame himself (or herself) for his (or her) misfortunes.	4.10	1.35	4.29	0.27	−1.12	ns
19. Criminals always pay for their actions.	5.01	1.24	4.99	1.32	0.16	ns
20. Innocent people are always the victims	3.14	1.04	3.56	1.07	−3.15	***
21. The rich should be heavily taxed.	4.13	1.59	4.05	1.24	0.48	ns
22. Most people do not have the motivation to cheat.	4.81	1.19	4.75	1.17	0.38	ns
23. In a disordered world, criminals should be severely punished.	4.75	1.17	3.36	1.19	−1.23	ns
Total JWS	3.91	1.27	4.04	0.37	−2.67	**
Unjust Factor	4.14		4.37		−2.25	*
Just Factor	4.15		4.21		−0.56	ns

*P<.05; **p<.01; and ***p<.001

Unjust factor includes items 1, 2, 5, and 17.
Just factor includes items 11, 14, and 19.

Table 2. Sex-Role Stereotype Scale and the "Traditional Female Role"
Factor Mean Scores

"Traditional Female Role" Factor	Male		Female		t	p
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
2. A girl must be a virgin when she gets married.	5.26		4.99		1.45	ns
3. It is wrong for a woman to remain single.	5.68		5.98		−2.11	ns
4. In public places, a wife should not refute her husband.	4.59		5.26		−3.36	**
6. It is much worse for a woman to get drunk than for a man to do so.	5.27		5.50		−1.28	ns
7. There is nothing wrong with a single girl going to a bar.	5.22		5.19		0.17	ns
8. When a girl wants to obtain something, it is much better for her to use her attraction than to use ability.	5.38		6.15		−5.18	**
9. When a man's girl friend gets insulted, he should fight back.	3.63		4.15		−2.78	***
Total (Traditional Female Role Factor)	5.07		5.38		−3.05	**
SRSS	4.87		5.15		−2.86	**

*p<.05; **p<.01; and ***p<.001

Attitudes Toward Rape Victims Scale (ATRVS)

The items in the scale used in the present study were first generated by senior psychology majors at the National Cheng-Chi University. Several items from Burt's (1980) Rape Myth Acceptance Scale and Field's (1978) Attitudes Toward Rape Incidents Scale were added. A 50-item scale was then tested on 100 students. After the item analysis, 29 items with low discriminatory power were deleted. A 21-item scale was then used in the present study, including the item, "I am willing to accept a rape victim as my girl friend," which was applied to make subjects only. Reverse scoring was applied to the six negatively worded items. A higher total score indicated a higher de-

gree of acceptance of rape victims (Chen & Lin, 1987).

Factor analysis revealed three key factors (with factor loading > 0.41) on the scale. The first factor, "characteristics of the rape victim," includes five items which are related to whether or not subjects judged the nature of the rape incident based on the victims' characteristics. The second factor, "victimization," includes four items which are related to victimization or stigmatising the victim. The third factor, "blaming the victim," includes four items which are focused on the negative evaluation of the victim's behavior. These three factors (dimensions) allow researchers to correlate subjects' acceptance of rape victims and their beliefs in a just world (Table 3).

Attribution Scale (AS)

The attribution scale used in the present research was divided into two sections. Section one listed four possible causal factors (characteristics of rapists, characteristics of victims, circumstances, and luck) which led to rape incidents. A 7-point Likert Scale was used for subjects to indicate their viewpoints. Section two identified a list of ten characteristics of victims which might lead to rape incidents. Items (overexposure of one's body, failing to fight back or struggle, not knowing how to behave properly, etc.) which entailed victims' misbehaviors, personalities or characteristics, and cause-effects consequences, etc. were evaluated by the subjects. The "other" item was provided for subjects to further elaborate on attribution factors.

Subjects were asked to consider the characteristics and behaviors of the rape victim and to identify major factors which caused rape. Since it is a multiple choice check list, factor analysis was not applied. Nevertheless, the frequency counts allow researchers to draw some interesting conclusions for further elaboration on subjects' attitudes toward rape victims.

Social-demographic Information

Eight items were included in the basic information section: sex, age, education, religion, occupation, marital status, whether a victim is an acquaintance of the subject, and whether the subject thought of the victim at the time of answering the questionnaire. For the purpose of this preliminary report, the interaction effects between sex and other demographic variables were not analyzed.

Table 3. Mean Scores for Attitudes Towards Rape Victims by Gender

ATRVS	Male	Female	t	p
"Victimization" Factor				
1. Rape victims should be responsible for what happened.	6.01	6.47	−3.09	**
2. Rape victims also should be punished.	6.22	6.71	−3.56	***
4. We should feel sympathy for the rape victim.	5.63	5.85	−1.34	ns
7. A woman is not virtuous when she gets raped.	6.12	6.49	−3.84	***
Subscale Total	6.12	6.49	−3.84	***
"Characteristics of the Victim" Factor				
3. Only those who like to expose themselves by wearing revealing clothing will get raped.	6.12	6.51	−2.99	**
10. The reason that a rape happens is that the victim does not protest as she should.	5.90	6.26	−2.32	*
14. If a prostitute gets raped, it is not necessary to report it to the police.	5.76	6.21	−4.01	***
19. A good girl will never get raped.	6.52	6.75	−2.49	**
20. Rape victims enjoy the sex when they are raped.	6.26	6.69	−3.75	***
Subscale Total	5.90	6.21	−2.81	**
"Blaming the Victim" Factor				
9. I can accept the idea of making friends with a rape victim.	5.65	6.07	−4.02	***
12. Rape victims do not know how to behave themselves properly.	5.59	6.22	−4.00	***
13. Many women would like to be raped, so they are always under attack.	6.04	6.57	−4.01	***
18. The reason that one may be raped is that she or he is not rational or cool enough to handle things.	5.67	6.14	−3.03	**
Subscale Total	5.75	6.25	−4.66	***
Attitudes Toward Rape Victims Scale	5.65	6.02	−4.55	***

*p<.05; **p<.01; and ***p<.001

RESULTS

Beliefs in a "Just World"

The total mean score from the JWS and the two dimensions explains an individual's belief in a just world——the higher the score, the lower the degree of acceptance of the "just world" idea. Results from the present study showed a mean of 3.98, which reflected the subjects' slight rejection of the "just world"; this was in congruence with Wagstaff's study of the JWS with British subjects (1983).

A closer look at the itemized JWS revealed that only three items showed significant gender differences. Two of these items (item 17 and item 20) were related to the "just" idea and one (item 4) was "unjust." However, the total mean scores for the JWS showed a significant gender difference (mean = 3.91 for males and 4.04 for females; $t = -.26$, $p = .008$), revealing that males, more than females, believed in a "just world." Educational background, marital status and whether the subjects knew any rape victims did not show any significant differences in the JWS and the two subscales.

A significant gender difference was found on the "unjust" factor mean scores ($t = -2.25$, $p = .02$) (Table 1). The study also found that subjects tended to reject items related to the "criminal justice" theme (items 5, 9, 17, 19, 20, and 23). It is interesting to point out that both sexes tended to disagree regarding the work related statement, "In all occupations, those who work hard always get promoted."

Sex Role Stereotype

Significant differences between the sexes were demonstrated on the SRSS. For instance, males, more than females, accepted the statement, "It is wrong for a woman to remain single" ($t = -2.71$, $p = 0.007$). However, there was no significant gender difference with regard to the statement, "It is wrong for a woman not to have a family (to be childless)." This finding reflects some very intriguing attitudes toward marriage and the family. Although there was no gender difference toward a childless woman, the mean scores for this item (5.683 for males and 5.98 for females) were higher than the means for the statements regarding a woman remaining single (5.465 for males and

5.853 for females). This meant, for both sexes, that to be childless was more accepta-
ble than to remain single.

A look at the total scores from the SRSS showed that mean scores for both sexes
were over 4 (mean = 4.879 for males and 5.515 for females), reflecting that males ac-
cepted sex-role stereotyping more than did females (t = −2.67, p = 0.005). Nevertheless,
both sexes did disagree with statements reflecting sex-role stereotypes. Since only one
dimension ("traditional females") was derived from the factor analysis, it is adequate
to conclude that males , more than females, consider that "females should abide with
traditional female roles." This conclusion was drawn based upon the consistency of the
lower scores for males in both the "traditional female" dimension score and the SRSS
total score (Table 2).

There were significant differences between the sexes in items #3, #4, #8, and #9
(Table 2). In each of those questions, males tended to accept the traditional female
role more than females did. Even though the items were not significant, it is interesting
to note that females, more than males, tended to accept the traditional female role on
questions #2 and #7. In question #2, "A girl must be a virgin when she gets married,"
the mean for males was 5.267 and for females was 4.993, and in question #7, "There is
nothing wrong with a single girl going to a bar," the males' mean was 5.220 while the
females' mean was 5.190.

Attitudes Toward Rape Victims

By tabulating the total score from the ATRVS, it was found that both males and
females tended to accept rape victims, although females exhibited a higher degree of
acceptance (The mean for males was 5.65 and for females was 6.02; t = −4.55, p <
0.001). In addition, separate scores from three dimensions —— "characteristics of the
rape victim," "victimization," and "victims's behavior"——revealed that females had
higher means than did males (t = −3.84, p < 0.001; t = −2.81, p < 0.01; and t =
−4.66, p < 0.001) which further confirmed the findings that females had a higher
degree of acceptance of rape victims. In addition, females also had higher scores on
every single item in the three dimensions. This leads to the conclusion that males were
more reluctant to accept rape victims (Table 3).

Attribution Factors

The results showed, on a 7-point scale, that the mean scores for characteristics of rapists, victims, circumstances, and luck factors were 2.06, 4.02, 2.69, and 4.12, respectively. Of these, the rapists and circumstances were considered to be more important factors than the other two. Among the four factors, only attribution to victim characteristics showed a significant gender difference (t = −3.17, p <0.01).

Males, more than females, attributed the characteristics of the victim as an important cause of rape. The more one believes that rape is the victim's fault, the more one tends to blame the victim, and therefore, the victim is stigmatized. The characteristics of the rapist had the lowest mean (1.940 for males and 2.181 for females) which revealed it as the most important cause of rape.

Correlations Among the Four Scales

A second order analysis was carried out for further understanding of the relationship between and among the four scales used in the present study. A number of significant correlations were found. They are briefly described as follows:

1. The correlation between the JWS and other scales
   No significant correlation between the JWS and the SRSS existed. However, a Positive correlation between the JWS and the Victim's Behavior factor was found (r = .10, p < .05); the more one believed in a just world, the more one blamed the victim's behavior and circumstances. The JWS and the Attribution Factor (circumstances under which rape occured) were also positively correlated (r = 0.13, p <.05). In addition, it was found that the unjust factor was positively correlated with the Characteristic of the Victim Factor (r = 0.15, p < 0.001).

2. The correlation between the SRSS and other scales
   The SRSS was significantly correlated with the ATRVS, the three dimensions of the AS, and the Characteristics of the Victim Attribution at the p < 0.001 level (r = .57, .38, .44, .40, and .27, respectively). In short, the more one accepted the SRSS, the more one tended to blame victims.

3. ATRVS and AS
   Data showed that the higher the subjects scored on the ATRVS, the lower they scored on one of the Attribution factors. Namely, the more one rejected rape victims, the less one attributed the incident to the characteristics of the rapists (r = −.29, p < 0.001). The Blaming the Victim factor and the Characteristics of the

Victim factor were also found to be positively correlated with every scale except the Characteristic of Rapist Attribution. In other words, the more one blamed the victim, the more one accepted the sex-role stereotype and the less one attributed the responsibility to the rapist (Table 4).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The purposes of the present study were to assess possible gender differences in attitudes (acceptance of) toward rape victims and to determine these attitudes' correlations with one's beliefs in a just world. Significant gender differences were found. However, although females had a higher degree of acceptance of victims than did males, mean scores from the Attitudes Toward Rape Victim Scale indicated that both sexes, in general, tended to accept rape victims. In addition, although males accepted sex-role stereotypes more than did females, the findings suggested that both sexes tended to reject sex-role stereotypes. This finding was inconsistent with the Taiwan study (Chen and Lin, 1987). Although both studies showed significant gender differences, the U.S. subjects far more rejected the attitudes toward sex-role stereotypes. This was predictable since the Chinese society tends to be more male-dominant.

Behaviors tended to be influenced by attitudes. Although the subjects attributed rape incidents least to the characteristics of victims and most to the rapists, the present study found that the more one accepted the sex-role stereotypes, the more one tended to blame victims and the less one attributed the responsibility to the rapist. This finding supports a previous study by Howard (1980).

It is interesting to point out that on the SRSS male subjects felt very strongly that "when a man's girlfriend gets insulted, he should fight back" (t = −2.78, p < 0.001). This might reflect the traditional idea that rape is not only an act of violence toward the woman, but also a sign of violence toward her partner.

The results showed that the more one believed in a just world, the more one blamed the victim's behavior and circumstances. Gender appeared to be an important variable in affecting attitudes toward rape victims, identifying attribution factors, affecting the degree of belief in a "just world," and accepting sex-role stereotypes. Males, significantly more than females, believed in the "just world" idea and accepted

Table 4. Pearson correlation matrix for scales and subscales[a]

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1.	1.00												
2.	.58***	1.00											
3.	.58***	.10**	1.00										
4.		.16**		1.00									
5.				.97***	1.00								
6.				.57***	.51***	1.00							
7.				.38***	.40***	.67***	1.00						
8.			.15***	.44***	.45***	.85***	.54***	1.00					
9.	.10*	.12*		.40***	.40***	.78***	.50***	.70***	1.00				
10.				.27***	.29***	.19***	.28***	.29***	.33***	1.00			
11.						-.29**	-.11*	-.18**	-.15**		1.00		
12.	.13*	.12*							.10*	.39***	.16**	1.00	
13.								.14**	.12**		.16**	.11**	1.00

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001.

a. 1 = Just World Scale, 2 = "Just" Factor, 3 = "Unjust" Factor, 4 = Sex Role Stereotype Scale, 5 = "Traditional Female Role" Factor, 6 = Attitudes Toward Rape Victims Scale, 7 = "Victimization" Factor, 8 = "Characteristics of the Victim" Factor, 9 = "Blaming the Victim" Factor, 10 = Attribution: Characteristics of the Victim, 11 = Attribution: Characteristics of the Rapist, 12 = Attribution: The Circumstances When the Rape Occurred, and 13 = Attribution: The Luck Factor.

the sex-role stereotypes. One unfortunate consequence of the tendency to see the world as a just place is that it provides a justification for blaming victims.

Although gender differences are given substantial support by the obtained data, the findings from the present study are not in accord with previous studies (Ma and Smith, 1985 and Rubin and Peplau, 1973) regarding gender differences in beliefs in a just world. Nevertheless, the present study supports many studies on attitudes toward rape victims; more specifically, attributions of blame to rape victims may be influenced in part by one's acceptance of sex-role stereotypes and rape myths (Wyer, et al., 1985; Sattlem, et al., 1984; Acock and Ireland, 1983; L'Armand, et al., 1981; and Burt 1980). Many items on the ATRVS in the present study were related to rape myths. The findings also pointed to the fact that rape myths abound among college students. These myths formed a part of an interrelated attitude structure, as shown in the present study, that includes acceptance of traditional sex-role stereotyping and beliefs in a just world.

It is important to point out that the study also found that subjects tended to reject items related to the "criminal justice" theme. The results might imply that an alarming increase in the number of rapes occurred every year, yet many assailants were not convicted.

A close look at the Pearson Correlation Matrix (Table 4) reveals that almost all scales and subscales are significantly correlated. The findings support the assertion that attitudes (beliefs in a just world, attitudes toward rape victims and sex-role stereotyping) and behaviors (blaming the victim and victimization) are indeed intertwined. A further analysis on the causal relations between attitudes and behaviors should be considered.

The subjects in the present study, as compared to the subjects in Taiwan, tended to reject sex-role stereotypes, just world beliefs and rape myths. At the same time, it needs to be pointed out that the present sample consisted of college students in the Midwest; therefore, the generalization of the conclusion should be limited to this particular group. It is suggested that further research should focus on sex-role socialization practices and their influence on changing attitudes toward rape victims. If a college sample were used again, a comparison of their attitudes toward date rape, marital rape and other kinds of forcible rapes might be points of interest.

REFERENCES

Abel, G.G., D.H. Barlow, E. Blanchard, and D. Guild
  1977   "The components of Rapists' Sexual Arousal," *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 34: 895-903.

Acock, Alan C. and Nancy K. Ireland
  1983   "Attribution of Blame in Rape Cases: The Impact of Norm Violence, Gender, and Sex-Role Attitudes," *Sex-Role*, 9: 179-193.

Atwood, R.W., and R.J. Howell
  1971   "Pupilometric and Personality Test Score Differences of Female Aggressing Peduphiliacs and Normals," *Psychonumic Science*, 22: 115-116.

Brownmiller, S.
  1975   *Against Our Will : Men, Women, and Rape.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Brozan, N.
  1985   "Jurors in Rape Trials Studied," *New York Times*, (June 17): 20.

Burt, Martha R.
  1980   "Cultural Myths and Supports for Rape," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38: 217-230.

Calhoun, L., J. Selby, and L. Warring
  1976   "Social Perception of the Victim's Causal Role in Rape: An exploratory Examination of Four Factors," *Human Relations*, 26: 517-526.

Cann, A. et al.
  1981   "Rape: A Contemporary Overview and Analysis," *Journal of Social Issues*, 37: 1-4.

Chen, Jeaw-Mei and F.H. Tu
  1984   "Attitudes toward the Handicapped," *Chinese Sociological Journal*, 18: 91-112.

Chen, Jeaw-Mei and Phylis Lan Lin

    1987   "Gender Differences in Attitudes toward Rape Victims and Beliefs in a Just World - The case in Taiwan," paper presented at the 1st International China Symposium, Indianapolis.

Chen, Ro-Chang

    1986   "In the Shadow of the Dark: Why Did They Rape Me?" *Living Psychology*, 97: 85-89

Clark, L. and D. Lewis

    1977   *Rape: The Price of Coercive Sexuality*. Toronto: The Women's Press.

Federal Bureau of Investigation

    1986   *Crime in the United States: Uniform Crime Report*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Field, H.S.

    1978   "Attitudes toward Rape: A Comparative Analysis of Police, Rapist, Crisis Counselors, and Citizens," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36: 156-179.

Cager, N. and Schurr

    1976   *Sexual Assault: Confronting Rape in America*. New York: Grosset and Dunlop.

Howard, Judith A.

    1984   "Social Influences on Attribution: Blaming Some Victims More Than Others," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47:494-505.

Janoff-Bulmann, R.

    1979   "Characterological versus Behavioral Self-Blame: Inquiries into Depression and Rape," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37: 1798-1809.

Johnson, Allan G.

    1980   "On the Prevalence of Rape in the United States," *Signs*, 6: 136-145.

Jones, C. and E. Aronson

    1973   "Attribution of Fault to a Rape Victim as a Function of Responsibility of the Victim," *Journal of Personality*, 26: 415-419.

212

Kilpatrick, D.K., L.J. Veronen, and C.L. Best

    1984   "Factors Predicting Psychological Distress among Rape Victims," in C.R. Figley (ed.), *Trauma and its Wake: The Study of Treatment of Postraumatic Stress Disorder.* New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Kilpatrick, D.G.et all.

    1985   "Mental Health Correlates of Criminal Victimization: A Random Community Survey," *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology,* 53:886-873.

Koss, Mary P.

    1985   "The Hidden Rape Victim: Personality, Attitudinal, and Situational Characteristics," *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 9: 193-212.

Koss, M.P., C.A. Gidycz, and N. Wisniewski

    1987   "The Scope of Rape: Incidence and Prevalence of Sexual Aggression and Victimization in a National Sample of Higher Education Students," *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology,* 55: 162-170.

Krulewitz, J. and J. Nash

    1979   "Effects of Rape Victim Resistance, Assault Outcome, and Sex of Observer on Attribution about Rape," *Journal of Personality,* 47: 557-574.

Langer, E.J.

    1975   "The Illusion of Control," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 32: 311-328.

L'Armand, K., A. Pepiton, and T.E. Shanmugam

    1981   "Attitudes toward Rape: A Comparison of the Role of Chastity in India and the United States," *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology,* 12: 284-303.

Lerner, M.J.

    1965   "The Effect of Responsibility and Choice on a Partner's Attractiveness Following Failure," *Journal of Personality,* 33: 178-187.

    1970   "The Desire for Justice and Reaction to Victims," in J. McCauley and L. Berkowitz (eds.), *Atruism and Helping Behavior.* New York: Academic Press.

    1980   The Belief in a Just World: A Fundamental Delusion. New York: Plenum Books.

Ma, L.C. and K.B. Smith
1985   "Individual and Social Correlation of the Just World Belief: A Study of Taiwanese College Students," *Psychological Reports*, 57: 35-38.

Malamuth, N.M. and J.V.P. Check
1981   "The Effects of Mass Media Exposure on Acceptance of Violence against Women: A Fixed Experimant," *Journal of Research in Personality*, 15: 436-446.

Malamuth, N.M. and E. Donnerstein
1982   "The Effects of Aggressive-Pornographic Mass Media Stimuli," pp. 103-136 in L. Berkowitz (ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. New York: Academic Press.

Malamuth, N., S. Hager, and S. Feshback
1980   "Testing Hypotheses Regarding Rape: Exposure to Sexual Violence, Sex, Difference, and 'Normality' of Rapists," *Journal of Research in Personality*,14: 121-137.

Ratliff, K.G., Jeaw-Mei Chen, and Phylis Lan Lin
1988a   "Factors Predicting College Students' Acceptance of Disabled Persons," paper presented at the Southeastern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, New Orleans.

1988b   "A Cross-Cultural Analysis of Attitudes toward Disabled Persons," paper presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Atlanta.

Russell, D.E.H.
1982   *Rape in Marriage*. New York: Macmillan.

Ryan, W.
1971   *Blaming the Victim*. New York: Vintage.

Sanday, P.R.
1981   "The Socio–Cultural Context of Rape: A Cross-Cultural Study," *Journal of Social Issues*, 37: 5-27.

Sattem, L., J. Savells, and E. Murray
1984   "Sex-Role Stereotypes and Commitment of Rape," *Sex-Role*, 11: 849-860.

214

Scully, D. and J. Marolla
    1982   "Convicted Rapists' Vocabulary of Motive: Excuses and Justifications," *Social Problems*, 31: 530-544.
    1985   "Riding the Bull at Gilley's': Convicted Rapists Describe the Rewards of Rape," *Social Problems*, 32: 251-263.

Seligmann, J.
    1984   "The Date Who Rapes," *Newsweek*, (April 9): 91-92.

Spence, J.T. and R. Helmreich
    1972   "The Attitudes toward Women Scale: An Objective Instrument to Measure Attitudes toward the Rights and Roles of Women in Contemporary Society," *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 2: 66.

Thornton, B.
    1984   "Defensive Attribution of Responsibility: Evidence for an Arousal-Based Motivational Bias," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46: 721-734.

Warr, M.
    1985   "Fear of Rape among Urban Women," *Social Problems*, 32: 238-250.

Williams, L.S.
    1984   "The Classic Rape: When Do Victims Report?" *Social Problems*, 31: 459-467.

Williams, J.E. and K.A. Holmes
    1982   "The Second Assault: Rape and Public Attitudes," *Sociology and Social Research*," 67: 101-102.

Wyer, R.S., G.V. Bodenhausen, and T.F. Gorman
    1985   "Cognitive Mediators of Reactions to Rape," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48: 324-338.

大學生對強姦受害者的態度研究

陳 皎 眉*　　藍 采 風**

（中 文 摘 要）

　　強姦受害者可能受到社會、生理和心理等各方面的傷害。「公正世界」的觀念提供了一般人爲什麽對強姦受害者抱著負向態度的最好解釋。Lerner（1965）認爲我們都相信這是一個公正的世界，好事降臨在好的人身上，壞事只會發生在壞的人身上。如果不幸的事情發生在某人身上，那麽這個人一定是不好的。人們相信公正世界主要是因爲希望相信這世界是規律的，可以預測和控制的，而不是隨機的和不可控制的。那麽，壞的事情就不會發生在我這麽好的人身上，而強姦受害者也一定是罪有應得的了。

　　本研究旨在瞭解個人相信「公正世界」的程度及其性別角色刻板印象對於一個與性別有關聯的受害者——卽強姦受害者態度的影響。

　　針對 260 名印第安那大學生的問卷調查，結果顯示一個人愈相信公正世界的觀念，便愈會責備受害者，且愈不接受她們。另外，本研究發現男性受試者較女性受試者傾向相信公正世界的觀念。但是男性和女性都沒有很強烈的性別角色刻板印象。最後，本研究並針對 Lerner 公正世界的假設加以討論。

---

* 國立政治大學心理研究所教授
** 美國 University of Indianapolis 行爲科學系教授

COLLEGE STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD RAPE VICTIMS

(ABSTRACT)

The impact of rape on the victims is social, physical, and psychological. The just world hypothesis provides an explanation of why victims are often blamed for their misfortunes. Lerner (1965) proposed that we all believe in a just world —— good things happen to good people, while bad things only happen to bad people. If someone suffers a misfortune, the person must be bad. People believe in a just world mainly because they want to believe that the world is predictable and controllable rather than uncontrollable and random. Thus, "bad things won't happen to a good person like me," and therefore the victim himself or herself is responsible.

The present study was designed to investigate how one's belief in a just world and attitudes toward sex-role stereotyping affect his/her attitude toward gender-linked victim—the rape victim.

Data were collected from 260 Indiana college and university students via a survey questionnaire. The results show that the more one believed in a just world, the more one blamed and therefore the less one accepted the victim. Male subjects tended to believe in a just world more than did female subjects. However, the study also reflected both males and females rejecting sex role stereotypes. The present study concludes with a discusson of Lerner's just world hypothesis.

Key words: Attitude, Rape, Victim, Just World, Attribution.