Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, Vol. 10, No. 2, 1998

Psychometrics of the Rape Conformity Assessment and Other Measures: Implications for Rape Prevention

Paul A. Schewe[1,3] and William O'Donohue[2]

This study investigated the psychometric properties and aspects of the construct validity of the Rape Conformity Assessment (RCA). In addition, the test–retest reliability and internal consistency of Malamuth's Attraction to Sexual Aggression scale and Burt's Rape Myth Acceptance, Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence (AIV), and Adversarial Sexual Beliefs scales were investigated. One hundred twenty-six undergraduate males in three samples served as subjects. Findings suggest that the RCA may be useful as a disguised measure that addresses the social desirability problem in rape prevention and treatment outcome research. With the exception of the AIV, the psychometric properties of the administered scales were adequate. The conformity manipulation revealed strong effects, which suggests that the potential to rape should be viewed not only as a trait but also as having situational components.

KEY WORDS: aggression; assessment; crimes of violence; rape; prevention.

INTRODUCTION

The stated or implied goal of every rape prevention program is to decrease the likelihood that program participants will commit rape. However, because of the difficulty (if not impossibility) of accurately tracking the actual occurrence of rape in a nonoffending population, prevention researchers have attempted to assess the construct of *rape potential,* that is, the relative

[1]Jane Addams College of Social Work (MC 309), University of Illinois at Chicago, 1040 West Harrison Street, Chicago, Illinois 60607-7137.
[2]University of Nevada, Reno.
[3]To whom correspondence should be addressed.

1079-0632/98/0400-0097$15.00/0

likelihood that one may commit rape some time in the future. However, because the construct of rape potential is not directly observable, it must be inferred from other, more observable constructs. When evaluating the effectiveness of rape prevention programs, researchers often address the issue of rape potential by assessing proxy variables such as knowledge acquisition and changes in rape attitudes. Unfortunately, the manner in which the construct of rape potential is currently measured is problematic, as there is an overreliance on self-report measures and the validity and reliability of several commonly used measures are questionable or unknown. The purpose of this paper is to describe a measure that may help to broaden the list of observable variables used to define rape potential and to supply missing psychometric information for some commonly used rape-related measures.

In addition to aiding in outcome evaluations, an accurate assessment of males' potential for committing rape is relevant to critical forensic and treatment decisions regarding matters such as probation and parole for convicted offenders as well as treatment termination. Furthermore, if high-potential males who have yet to offend can be accurately identified, they can then be targeted in primary prevention programs (Schewe & O'Donohue, 1993b). The prevention of actual occurrences of rape in high-risk individuals is obviously preferable to secondary or tertiary interventions. However, to achieve this goal an accurate assessment of rape potential is necessary.

Currently, assessments used to demonstrate rape potential have largely ignored situational variables. Rape potential may not be trait-like (i.e., it may vary across situations within the same individual). Increasing our ability to assess rape potential in men may help to answer questions concerning what situational variables are likely to cause males' rape potential to change across situations. This can be critical for determining the true range of high-risk situations in relapse prevention efforts (Hildebran & Pithers, 1992).

Researchers evaluating the efficacy of treatments for convicted sexual offenders have commonly used police reports of rearrest or reconviction to track the progress of both treated and untreated offenders (Marshall, Jones, Ward, Johnston, & Barbaree, 1991). However, tracking incidence rates would not be an effective way to measure the outcome of primary prevention interventions. First, this type of research takes years to complete and is extremely costly. Second, there is the problem of measuring incidence. Given a normal or even a high-risk population, only a small percentage of men would be expected by chance to ever commit rape. Estimates using the Sexual Experiences Survey (SES) suggest that about 9% of the male population commit acts that meet the legal definition of rape or attempted rape (Koss & Harvey, 1987). Police reports of incidents would be unacceptable since only approximately 10% of all rapes are reported to the police, and only 50% of these result in arrest (Missouri Division of

Health, 1985). Of those that are arrested, 66% are prosecuted and 85% of these result in conviction (M. Cavins, Cook County State's Attorney's Office, personal communication, June 21, 1996). Thus the probability of finding that a subject has committed rape by monitoring rape convictions is roughly 1 in 1000. Because of the difficulties in measuring the incidence of rape, it becomes necessary to use proximate outcome measures to evaluate the efficacy of primary prevention programs targeting males (Schewe & O'Donohue, 1993a).

Typically, rape potential has been measured by assessing attitudes and behaviors thought to be relevant to committing an act of sexual coercion. For example, it is common to assess acceptance of rape myths, acceptance of interpersonal violence, and the extent to which individuals believe that sexual relationships are adversarial in nature (Burt, 1980). Another approach has been directly to ask males to rate their likelihood of committing rape (Malamuth, 1989) or to ask them whether they have committed acts of sexual coercion in the past (Koss & Oros, 1982). Rape potential is then inferred from one of these pathways; i.e., rape-supportive attitudes indicate rape potential, self-reported future likelihood of raping indicates rape potential, or self-reported past history of raping indicates rape potential.

These measures have several problems: (1) although some of their psychometric properties are known to be acceptable, others have not been investigated; (2) these measures are not disguised and therefore are particularly vulnerable to response biases due to social desirability and other demand characteristics, particularly when they are used in rape prevention programming; and (3) the measures are not criterion relevant, i.e., completing an anonymous questionnaire is far-removed from rape-related behavior.

In addition to paper-and-pencil measures, there have been several efforts to develop innovative behavioral measures related to male rape proclivity. Pryor (1987) developed a sexual harassment assessment that involved having male subjects teach a female confederate how to play golf. The female rated how sexual and how frequent the men's physical contact with her was. The frequency of sexual touching was positively correlated with scores on a measure of the likelihood of sexual harassment. While this type of assessment holds considerable promise for use in evaluating the effectiveness of rape prevention programs, it presents a major ethical problem in that it places confederates at risk for unwanted sexual contact.

Gilbert, Heesacker, and Gannon (1991) used a behavioral measure as part of the evaluation of a rape prevention program. For this assessment, the experimenters telephoned the participants, described a women's safety project, and asked the subjects to volunteer time. Responses were coded according to how much information subjects were willing to listen to, the

number of favorable comments made, and how much time they volunteered for the project. This assessment offers the benefits of being a disguised measure, which may help to reduce the threat of socially desirable responding, of being able to demonstrate some immediate benefits to society (increasing volunteerism), and of being relatively inexpensive. Unfortunately, the construct being measured in this assessment is unclear, as is its relation to rape proclivity.

Donnerstein (1980) tested the effects of viewing aggressive erotic material by allowing subjects ostensibly to deliver mild electric shocks to a female confederate. In a similar example, Malamuth (1983) used an assessment in which male subjects were allowed to apply aversive noise to a female confederate who had previously angered them. Males' behavior in this situation was significantly correlated with their attitudes condoning aggression against women and penile tumescence to rape portrayals (Malamuth, 1983). This type of assessment offers the benefits of being a disguised measure because it does not deal directly with rape. One disadvantage of this assessment is that it is time-consuming and would require an elaborate setup in order to incorporate it into the evaluation of a rape prevention program. A final and more serious problem is that this procedure's construct validity may be problematic: the relationship between a nonsexual, nonnaturalistic event (applying electric shock or aversive noise) and rape potential is unclear.

George and Marlatt (1986) assessed college students' interest in viewing neutral, erotic, violent, or violent–erotic material in an experiment exploring the effects of alcohol and anger on interest in violence, erotica, and deviance. While this assessment appears to be a good behavioral measure, its use in evaluating rape prevention programming is problematic because the relationship between preferences for violent–erotic material and rape potential has not been assessed. Furthermore, changing preferences for erotic material is not necessarily an intended outcome of current rape prevention programming for males. This assessment, however, could be useful in developing programming aimed at changing males' preferences for violent–erotic material. Such an intervention might be a useful tool in efforts to prevent men from raping.

Hall, Hirschman, and Oliver (1994) developed a paradigm in which subjects were given the opportunity to show neutral, erotic, explicit–erotic, deviant erotic, or autopsy slides to a female confederate in an attempt to distract her from a memory task. The results showed that men were more likely to use erotic slides to distract a female confederate when they were informed specifically that she disliked pornography. The authors concluded that subjects used the demand characteristics of the experiment as an excuse to impose an ostensibly unwanted sexual experience on a woman.

However, it is uncertain whether subjects showed the erotic material out of malice or out of an attempt to be most distracting to the confederate.

In a further experiment, Hall and Hirschman (1994) simplified the procedure by allowing subjects to show a short film vignette to a female confederate under the guise of a "themes in the media" experiment. Results indicated that choice of vignette shown (a neutral conversation, a rape scene, or a physical assault on a nude women) was related to male subjects' scores on the Coercive Sexuality Scale. This assessment has several strengths in that it is an analogue of sexual aggression and is disguised. In addition, a change in this behavior (from showing sexually violent films to showing neutral films) would be a desirable outcome of nearly any current rape prevention program. One problem with this assessment is that it would be difficult to present to participants in a rape prevention program outside of a university or experimental situation. In any natural setting, the juxtaposition of a rape prevention program with selecting violent erotica for a female confederate to view would likely either ruin the disguise or facilitate socially desirable responding.

Part of the purpose of this experiment was to provide some initial validity and reliability data on an assessment designed to assess males' rape potential. The assessment was designed to be useful in evaluating the outcome of rape prevention programs by being less susceptible to the response bias of socially desirable responding, by being capable of being disguised, and by being relatively inexpensive to administer. Importantly, a further goal was to develop a more criterion-relevant measure. It appeared that conformity to a rape-supportive peer group would be, at least arguably, more criterion-relevant than completing questionnaires, as this would be a naturalistic behavior that one would want to change. The second purpose of the study was to provide missing psychometric information on existing rape-related measures. The final purpose of the study was to test the hypothesis that rape potential is not an invariant trait but, rather, a function of situational, as well as person-centered, variables.

METHOD

Measures

Attraction to Sexual Aggression Scale (ASA). Malamuth (1989) developed this 10-item scale (modified version) to improve upon the psychometric properties of *likelihood* measures and to expand the construct of the lure of sexual aggression. The scale shows a high internal consistency ($\alpha = .91$; $n = 117$) and an adequate test–retest reliability ($r = .76$). Principal-compo-

nents analysis yielded a single factor that accounted for over 50% of the variance. In addition, the scale was significantly correlated with rape supportive attitudes (r = .46), perceptions (r = .30), and behavioral inclinations (r's = .22–.56). As evidence for its discriminant validity, the ASA did not correlate highly with attraction to other deviant behaviors (Malamuth, 1989).

Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence (AIV). This six-item scale measures attitudes condoning the use of force in relationships (Burt, 1980). Malamuth (1986) found this scale to have a stronger relationship with sexual aggression, as measured by the SES, than Burt's other scales. Reliability studies for this scale report alpha coefficients of about .60 (Burt, 1980; Malamuth, 1986). No test–retest correlations have been reported.

Rape Myth Acceptance (RMA). This 19-item scale measures the degree to which a person believes false information concerning rape [i.e., "Women who get raped while hitchhiking get what they deserve" (Burt, 1980)]. Burt reported an alpha coefficient of .88 for this scale. This scale has been found to discriminate between convicted rapists and nonrapists. No test–retest correlations have been reported.

Adversarial Sexual Beliefs (ASB). This nine-item scale measures the degree to which a person believes that sexual relationships are exploitative or adversarial in nature (Burt, 1980). The alpha coefficient for this scale is .80. No test–retest correlations have been reported.

Marlowe–Crowne Social Desirability Scale-Short Form (MC). The MC consists of 13 true/false items and has been shown to be an adequate substitute for the original Marlowe–Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Reynolds, 1982). The original scale was developed to measure the "need of subjects to obtain approval by responding in a culturally appropriate and acceptable manner" (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960, p. 353).

Rape Conformity Assessment (RCA). For this disguised assessment, subjects were told that they would be participating in a facilitated small-group discussion and were placed in a room with two experimental confederates. Subjects were asked to indicate publicly their response to a series of multiple-choice questions. The two confederates responded to each question publicly, in turn, followed by the subject. The confederates' responses were always identical. For the first two questions, which did not deal with rape, the confederates responded with high base rate responses. The purpose of this was to establish some history of agreement with the subject. For the 17 following items that comprised the dependent measure, the responses of the two confederates always indicated that sexual victimization *was* in some way justifiable in order to create a conformity norm antithetical to social desirability. Subjects were scored according to how many times they did not conform to the group norm for those 17 items. A list of the questions used in the RCA is presented in the Appendix.

The conformity measure used in this experiment has been revised using the suggestions given by Schewe and O'Donohue (1993b) in the article which introduced the methodology. Specifically, the total number of items in the scale has been increased from 10 to 19. The purpose of this was to increase the possible variability in scores across subjects and potentially to increase the reliability of the assessment. In addition, the number of confederates has been reduced from three to two. This was done in an effort to reduce the conformity pressure. In the original experiment, it was believed that the conformity pressure may have overpowered potential group differences. The purpose of the conformity pressure was to reverse any trends in social desirability that the experimental situation might evoke. The conformity questionnaire was intended to measure the strength of a subject's commitment to not rape. It is scored simply by noting how many times a subject responds that rape is never justified while interacting with a peer group that unanimously professes the opposite.

Observations from the original measure correlated significantly with scores on the likelihood of raping scale ($r = .38$) and with the rape empathy scale ($r = .46$), but did not correlate significantly with more traditional rape attitude scales such as the AIV ($r = .19$) and ASB ($r = .21$) (Schewe & O'Donohue, 1993b). On average, subjects considered to be at high risk for raping responded opposite the negative group norm significantly less often than low-risk subjects did [means = 3.05 and 4.00, respectively; $t(36) = 2.42, p < .05$] (Schewe & O'Donohue, 1993b). No test–retest correlations have been reported.

Subjects

Male subjects enrolled in introductory psychology courses at a large Midwestern university volunteered to participate in exchange for course credit. Subjects in Sample 1 ($n = 21$) and Sample 2 ($n = 19$) were recruited from the same population specifically for the purpose of this study. Sample 3 data ($n = 86$) were originally collected as a part of study evaluating the outcome of a rape prevention program. The modal age of all subjects was 19 (range = 18–33, $SD = 2.79$), and the race of subjects closely matched that of the university (84% Caucasian and 16% other).

Procedures

Sample 1 (the Test–Retest Condition). Of the 21 males who volunteered to participate in this portion of the study, 2 were dropped from the analyses because they failed to attend both administrations. Subjects in this sample

completed the ASA, RMA, AIV, ASB, and MC scales and the RCA twice, with a 2-week interval between administrations. The same confederates were used during both administrations.

Sample 2 (the No-Pressure condition). An additional 19 subjects were recruited to complete an altered version of the RCA. Subjects in this condition responded to the RCA questions individually using a paper-and-pencil format without any conformity pressure. This procedure was implemented to allow for the assessment of the effects of conformity pressure in the standard assessment.

Sample 3 (the Treatment Outcome Condition). Data from 86 *high-risk* subjects (determined by scores in the upper quartile of the ASA scale) who participated in a rape prevention treatment outcome study were used in Sample 3. In this experiment, subjects completed the ASA scale, the RMA, AIV, and ASB scales, and the MC and then participated in a rape prevention program. Two weeks posttreatment, subjects again completed the dependent measures and also participated in the RCA.

RESULTS

Table I presents the α coefficients and test–retest reliabilities for each of the measures used in Samples 1 and 3. Simple Pearson correlations

Table I. Alpha Coefficients and Test–Retest Reliabilities Over 2 Weeks

	Alpha coefficient		Test–retest reliability	
	Sample 3 (n = 86)	Sample 1 (n = 21)	Sample 3 (n = 86)	Sample 1 (n = 19)
RCA	.84	.83	—	.78**
ASA	.76	.88	.66**	.69**
AIV	.48	.59	.56**	.56**
ASB	.73	.79	.66**	.71**
RMA	.84	.82	.79**	.88**
MC	.77	.67	.26*	.77**

Note. RCA, Rape Conformity Assessment; ASA, Attraction to Sexual Aggression; AIV, Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence; ASB, Adversarial Sexual Beliefs; RMA, Rape Myth Acceptance; MC, Marlowe–Crowne Social Desirability Scale—Short Form. *p < .01; **p < .001. Lack of variance prohibited statistical analysis of group differences in Sample 2.

between the first and the second administrations of the RCA in Sample 1 revealed that the measure had an adequate test–retest reliability (r = .78; n = 19). The RCA also demonstrated an adequate internal consistency (α's = .84 and .83 and n's = 86 and 19, respectively).

As shown in Table II, intercorrelations between the RCA and the other dependent variables from Sample 3 revealed that the RCA correlated significantly with the AIV, ASB, and RMA (r's = .39, .43, and .51, respectively; $p < .001$; n = 86). The RCA was not significantly correlated with the MC or ASA scale (r's = .18 and .15, respectively; n = 86).

Fisher's z transformation was used to compare correlations between the RCA and the other rape-related measures for the full sample as compared to the high and low conformers, i.e., the upper and lower third of the distribution of RCA scores. As shown in Table III, no significant differences in correlations existed between the full sample and the low conformers. However, significant differences were found between the full sample and the high conformers, with correlations in the upper third of the distribution dropping significantly.

The internal consistency of the other scales administered was also assessed using coefficient α. As shown in Table I, each scale was found to possess an adequate internal consistency (α's > .66), except for the AIV scale (α's = .48 and .59). In addition, the test–retest reliablities for each of the dependent measures in Samples 1 and 3 were assessed. These assessments also revealed generally adequate reliablities, with the AIV again demonstrating the least reliability (r = .56).

Further inspection of Table I reveals that the test–retest reliability of the Marlowe–Crowne Social Desirability scale was inconsistent between the

Table II. Intercorrelations Among Variables

	RCA	ASA	AIV	ASB	RMA
ASA	.15				
AIV	.39**	.27*			
ASB	.43**	.22	.38**		
RMA	.51**	.20	.58**	.53**	
MC	.18	.11	.05	.06	.06

Note RCA, Rape Conformity Assessment; ASA, Attraction to Sexual Aggression: AIV, Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence; ASB, Adversarial Sexual Beliefs; RMA, Rape Myth Acceptance; MC, Marlowe–Crowne Social Desirability Scale—Short Form. N = 86. *$p < .01$; **$p < .001$.

Table III. Fisher *z* Transformations Comparing Correlations Between the RCA and Other Variables for the Upper and Lower Third of the Distribution of RCA Scores

	Full sample RCA (n = 86)	Lower third RCA (n =29)	Fisher's *z* transformation
ASA	.15	.20	0.23
AIV	.39	.40	0.05
ASB	.43	.28	0.76
RMA	.51	.57	0.36
MC	.18	-.08	1.17
	Full sample RCA (n = 86)	Upper third RCA (n =29)	Fisher's *z* transformation
ASA	.15	-.14	1.30*
AIV	.39	.06	1.57*
ASB	.43	.02	1.96**
RMA	.51	-.12	3.04***
MC	.18	.05	0.59

Note. RCA, Rape Conformity Assessment; ASA, Attraction to Sexual Aggression: AIV, Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence; ASB, Adversarial Sexual Beliefs; RMA, Rape Myth Acceptance; MC, Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale—Short Form. *p < .10; **p < .05; ***p < .01.

two samples (r's = .77 and .26 for Samples 1 and 3, respectively). It should be noted that two-thirds of the subjects in Sample 3 participated in a rape prevention program between the first and the second administrations of the assessment measures. It is likely that the intervention served to decrease the test–retest reliablities reported for Sample 3. By comparing the reliablities reported for Samples 1 and 3 in Table I, it is clear that the intervention had little effect on the test–retest reliability of the measures, with the possible exception of the Marlowe–Crowne scale.

Lack of variance prohibited statistical analysis of group differences between Sample 1 and Sample 2 on the RCA. Inspection of the means and standard deviations revealed that subjects in Sample 1 endorsed an average of 10.2 (SD = 3.9) of the 17 rape-supportive items, while no subject in Sample 2 (the no-pressure condition) endorsed any rape-supportive item (M = 0).

DISCUSSION

The Rape Conformity Assessment demonstrated an adequate internal consistency and 2-week test–retest reliability. The poor reliability of the AIV in this and previous studies (Burt, 1980; Malamuth, 1986) makes its use as an outcome measure for rape prevention programs questionable. The data indicate that all scales except the AIV have an adequate internal consistency and 2-week test–retest reliability.

Initial evidence for the paradigm's validity comes from the study that introduced the methodology (Schewe & O'Donohue, 1993b). In that study, subjects were classified as high or low risk based on their self-reported likelihood of committing rape. Subjects considered to be at low risk for raping responded opposite the negative group norm significantly more often than high-risk subjects did [$t(36) = 2.42$, $p < .5$].

Data from the current study also suggest that the RCA has an acceptable construct validity. The RCA was significantly but moderately correlated with three of the four rape-related measures. These moderate correlations suggest that the RCA is measuring a related, but not identical, construct. Because the RCA does not directly measure the constructs measured by the other scales (e.g., attitudes toward interpersonal violence), the correlations should be in the moderate range. The nonsignificant correlation with the ASA scale indicates that the RCA is measuring a construct separate from the construct measured by the ASA scale. As Malamuth states, the ASA is intended to measure the "lure of sexual aggression," while the RCA is intended to measure the strength of antirape attitudes. Finally, the insignificant correlation with a measure of social desirability provides some evidence of the RCA's discriminant validity.

Taken together, the reliability and validity data regarding the RCA suggest that it has promise as a measure of rape-related behavior. One advantage of the RCA is that it is a disguised measure that can be logically linked to rape prevention programming. The RCA is presented as a group discussion that is a part of the rape prevention program, not as an evaluation or as a separate experiment. In extensive debriefing interviews that were conducted with each individual who completed the RCA, no subject reported detecting this disguise.

Moreover, this measure provides a more criterion-relevant sample of behavior. Conformity (or nonconformity) to peers' problematic statements about rape are arguably more relevant than questionnaire completion or applying aversive noise, particularly when the measurement is disguised. Admittedly, however, the RCA is still not a direct sample of sexually coercive behavior. It is clear, however, that ethical as well as practical

considerations place large limitations on the directness with which one can sample this behavior.

A limitation of the RCA is that it is relatively expensive to administer. Subjects must be assessed individually and each assessment requires the use of two confederates and one experimenter. This cost would be reduced if a version were produced in which the confederates' responses were transmitted via computer. This would allow multiple subjects to be run at one time and would not require the use of live confederates. However, this possibility must be evaluated empirically.

More studies need to be conducted on the RCA to assess its psychometric properties further. Of particular interest is whether the scale can discriminate between constructs which affect conformity behavior (i.e., assertiveness, need for uniqueness) and rape potential. It may be the case that males who are low in rape potential and who are unassertive may be false positives. However, even if the scale fails to make this distinction validly, this shortcoming may be attenuated by the scale's strength in reducing false negatives. If a person truly holds rape-supportive beliefs, it would be unlikely that he would not report them in this assessment. In other words, the RCA tells us little about those who conform; it could be that they hold rape-supportive attitudes or it could be that they have a tendency to conform. However, for those who do not conform, we can conclude that they hold attitudes against rape and that those attitudes are strong enough to overcome conformity pressure. The data presented in Table III support this hypothesis. Despite the restricted range, correlations between the RCA and other rape-related measures remain consistent for the lower third of the distribution of RCA scores. For the upper third of the distribution, the high conformers, the correlations between the RCA and other measures drops significantly.

The extent to which the conformity pressure affected scores is an interesting finding for several reasons. As noted, 0 of the 19 subjects in the no-pressure condition endorsed any rape-supportive items on the RCA. This finding suggests that rape potential is not a static trait but may change from situation to situation. This suggests that testing needs to be seen in a larger social context. This finding is of particular concern because most treatment outcome studies sample a limited range of social situations (i.e., laboratory, classroom, etc.). It might be useful in the future for treatment outcome studies also to include this conformity paradigm to assess situational variance in rape-related responses. Also, the data show that scores can change in an undesirable direction: males who would not endorse any items when left to themselves endorse several rape-supportive items when in the presence of "deviant" peers. This provides experimental evidence supporting the concern that rape-supportive peer groups can negatively in-

fluence more benign individuals. Clinically, the finding that the magnitude of responding in undesirable ways can be strongly influenced by conformity pressure argues for the inclusion of peer pressure resistance strategies to be included in primary, as well as tertiary, prevention efforts (Hildebran & Pithers, 1992). Finally, this finding provides a host of questions for further research, e.g., What type of individual best resists conformity pressure? and Can individuals be taught skills to resist this? The answers may directly affect rape prevention efforts.

APPENDIX: ITEMS USED IN THE RAPE CONFORMITY ASSESSMENT

(1) It's O.K. to have sex with a woman who asks you to tie her up beforehand.
   (a) Yes (b) No
(2) It's O.K. to have premarital sex when you're in love.
   (a) Yes, what's important is that you're in love.
   (b) No, its best to wait till after you're married.
(3) Two women were raped. One was wearing a tank top and miniskirt and invited herself up to the man's room after drinking too much at a fraternity party. The other was raped when she was walking from her dorm to the library. Was the first woman more responsible for her own rape?
   (a) Yes (b) No
(4) (a) Once a couple has had sexual intercourse, then that issue is resolved and it is no longer possible for that man to rape that woman.
   (b) Even if a couple has had sexual intercourse before, if the man forces the woman to have sexual intercourse with him against her will, this should be considered rape.
(5) In World War II Russians raped German women. Given how the Russians suffered under the Germans, was this justified?
   (a) Yes (b) No
(6) (a) When a woman dresses in a sexually attractive way, she must be willing to accept the consequences of her behavior, whatever they are, since she is signaling her interest in having sexual relations.
   (b) A woman has the right to dress in a sexually attractive way whether she is really interested in having sexual relations or not.

(7) (a) In a court of law, I feel that the rapist must be held accountable for his behavior during the rape.
(b) In a court of law, I feel that the rape victim must be held accountable for her behavior during the rape.

(8) Being roughed up is sexually stimulating to many women.
(a) Yes, some women like to be pushed around a little.
(b) No, women probably don't enjoy that.

(9) (a) In general, I feel that rape is an act that is provoked by the rape victim.
(b) In general, I feel that rape is an act that is not provoked by the rape victim.

(10) No matter how much a woman resists or says "no," if she has an orgasm, she can't call it rape.
(a) Yes, I agree. (b) No, I disagree.

(11) Some women will pretend that they don't want to have sex just because they don't want to seem loose, but they're really hoping a man will force them to have sex.
(a) Yes, I've known or heard about women like that.
(b) No, I think that when a woman says no she means it.

(12) If I forced a woman to have sexual intercourse with me, she would probably begin to enjoy it.
(a) Yes (b) No

(13) (a) Under certain circumstances, I can understand why a man would use force to obtain sexual relations with a woman.
(b) I cannot understand why a man would use force to obtain sexual relations with a woman under any circumstances.

(14) (a) If a man rapes a sexually active woman, he would probably be justified in his action by the fact that she chooses to have sexual relations with other men.
(b) If a man rapes a sexually active woman, his actions would not be justified by the fact that she chooses to have sexual relations with other men.

(15) (a) I believe that some women secretly want to be raped.
(b) I don't believe that any women secretly want to be raped.

(16) (a) I believe that it is impossible for a rape victim to enjoy being raped.
(b) I believe that it is possible for a rape victim to enjoy the experience of being raped, whether she admits it or not.

(17) (a) Some great relationships start out with the man forcing sex on a woman.
(b) Forcing a woman to have sex with you is a sure way to end a good relationship.

(18) (a) I feel that the situation in which a man compels a woman to submit to sexual intercourse against her will is an unjustifiable act under any circumstances.
(b) I feel that the situation in which a man compels a woman to submit to sexual intercourse against her will is a justifiable act under certain circumstances.

(19) It's O.K. to rape women.
(a) Yes, sometimes
(b) No.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Portions of this paper were presented at the Center for Disease Control's First Annual Violence Prevention Conference, October 1995, in DesMoines, IA. The writing of the manuscript was supported in part by the National Institute of Mental Health Prevention Research Branch and Office on AIDS Research Training Grant T32MH19933 to the University of Illinois at Chicago.

REFERENCES

Burt, M. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38,* 217-230.

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24,* 349-354.

Deitz, S., Blackwell, K., Daley, P., & Bentley, B. (1982). Measurement of empathy toward rape victims and rapists. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43,* 372-383.

Donnerstein, E. (1980). Aggressive erotica and violence against women. *Journal of Personalty and Social Psychology, 39,* 269-277.

George, W. H., & Marlatt, G. A. (1986). The effects of alcohol and anger on interest in violence, erotica, and deviance. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 95,* 150-158.

Gilbert, B., Heesacker, M., & Gannon, L. (1991). Changing the sexual aggression-supportive attitudes of men: A psychoeducational intervention. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38,* 197-203.

Hall, G. C. N., & Hirschman, R. (1994). The relationship between men's sexual aggression inside and outside the laboratory. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 62,* 375-380.

Hall, G. C. N., Hirschman, R., & Oliver, L. L. (1994). Ignoring a woman's dislike of sexual material: Sexually impositional behavior in the laboratory. *Journal of Sex Research, 31,* 3-10.

Hildebran, D., & Pithers, W. D. (1992). Relapse prevention: Application and outcome. In W. O'Donohue & J. Geer (Eds.), *The sexual abuse of children: Clinical issues* (pp. 365-393). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Koss, M. (1988). Hidden rape: Sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of students in higher education. In A. Burgess (Ed.), *Rape and sexual assault II* (pp. 3-25). New York: Garland.

Koss, M., & Harvey, M. (1987). *The rape victim: Clinical and community approaches to treatment.* Lexington, MA: Stephen Greene.

Koss, M., & Oros, C. (1982). Sexual experiences survey: A research instrument investigating sexual aggression and victimization. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 50,* 455-457.

Malamuth, N. M. (1983). Factors associated with rape as predictors of laboratory aggression against women. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45,* 432-442.

Malamuth, N. (1986). Predictors of naturalistic sexual aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50,* 953-962.

Malamuth, N. M. (1989). The attraction to sexual aggression scale: Part one. *Journal of Sex Research, 26,* 26-49.

Marshall, W., Jones, R., Ward, T., Johnston, P., & Barbaree, H. (1991). Treatment outcome with sex offenders. *Clinical Psychology Review, 11,* 465-485.

Missouri Division of Health (1985). *Myths and Facts about Sexual Assault.* Jefferson City, MO: Department of Social Services.

Pryor, J. B. (1987). Sexual harassment proclivities in men. *Sex Roles, 17,* 269-290.

Reynolds, W. M. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 38,* 119-124.

Schewe, P. A., & O'Donohue, W. T. (1993a). Rape prevention: Methodological problems and new directions. *Clinical Psychology Review, 13,* 667-682.

Schewe, P. A., & O'Donohue, W. T. (1993b). Sexual abuse prevention with high-risk males: The roles of victim empathy and rape myths. *Violence and Victims, 8,* 336-348.

Schewe, P. A., & O'Donohue, W. T. (1996). Primary prevention with high risk males: Testing two model-based rape prevention programs. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 25,* 455-471.