

Improving Understanding of Rape Proclivity

by

Laleh Dadgardoust

A dissertation submitted to the
School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Forensic Psychology

Faculty of Social Science in Humanities

University of Ontario Institute of Technology (Ontario Tech University)

Oshawa, Ontario, Canada

April 2022

©[Laleh Dadgardoust](#)

THESIS EXAMINATION INFORMATION

Submitted by: **Laleh Dadgardoust**

Doctor of Philosophy in Forensic Psychology

Thesis title: Improving Understanding of Rape Proclivity

An oral defense of this thesis took place on March 21, 2022 in front of the following examining committee:

Examining Committee:

Chair of Examining Committee	Dr. Joseph Eastwood
Research Supervisor	Dr. Leigh Harkins
Examining Committee Member	Dr. Karla Emeno
Examining Committee Member	Dr. Matthew Shane
University Examiner	Dr. Carla Cesaroni
External Examiner	Dr. Emma Alleyne

The above committee determined that the thesis is acceptable in form and content and that a satisfactory knowledge of the field covered by the thesis was demonstrated by the candidate during an oral examination. A signed copy of the Certificate of Approval is available from the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies.

ABSTRACT

The current dissertation included three studies that together aimed to improve understanding of rape proclivity as a potential construct related to sexual violence. In the first study, participants' understanding of the items on the Rape Proclivity Measure were assessed to gain insight into participants' perspectives about rape scenarios and to examine the content validity of the measure. Most participants (68.7% to 95.8%) did not view the wording of scenarios as ambiguous, and understood scenarios as incidents of sexual violence, indicating that the Rape Proclivity Measure is comprehensible and has good content validity. However, participants were more likely to label rape scenarios involving: (a) a stranger perpetrator, and (b) use of physical force, as incidents of rape, indicating that their definition of rape matches the rape scripts prevalent in North America. The second study examined the relationship between rape proclivity and various correlates of rape, namely deviant sexual interests, offence supportive cognition (both rape and antisocial), and history of past sexually aggressive behaviour. The aim was to identify the most relevant variables, and to evaluate whether rape proclivity forms a distinct construct or whether it overlaps substantially with one of these other constructs. There was a strong correlation between rape proclivity and correlates of rape. However, in a factor analyses, the various measures of rape proclivity did not form a distinct construct indicating that different measures of rape proclivity may not be assessing the same construct. Finally, the third study aimed to address the gap in the literature regarding the role of rape proclivity, assessed by rape proclivity measures, as a predictor of sexually aggressive behaviour. Results indicated that rape proclivity measured by Sexual Experience Survey-Tactics First Revised (SES-TFR) predicted future sexual

violence, but the Rape Proclivity Measure did not. This means that rape proclivity may be a factor related to the perpetration of sexual offending, but care must be taken in the measures that are used. Once proclivity can be identified in a reliable and valid manner, it can be targeted in programs designed to prevent sexual violence.

Keywords: Sexual Violence; Rape Proclivity; Prevention of Sexual Violence

AUTHOR'S DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this thesis consists of original work of which I have authored. This is a true copy of the thesis, including any required final revisions, as accepted by my examiners.

I authorize the University of Ontario Institute of Technology (Ontario Tech University) to lend this thesis to other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research. I further authorize University of Ontario Institute of Technology (Ontario Tech University) to reproduce this thesis by photocopying or by other means, in total or in part, at the request of other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research. I understand that my thesis will be made electronically available to the public.

The research work in this thesis that was performed in compliance with the regulations of Research Ethics Board/Animal Care Committee under **REB Certificate number 14734, 14741, and 15263.**

Laleh Dadgardoust

YOUR NAME

Laleh Dadgardoust

STATEMENT OF CONTRIBUTIONS

Sole authorship

I hereby certify that I am the sole author of this thesis and that no part of this thesis has been published or submitted for publication. I have used standard referencing practices to acknowledge ideas, research techniques, or other materials that belong to others. Furthermore, I hereby certify that I am the sole source of the creative works and/or inventive knowledge described in this thesis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Leigh Harkins, for her continuous guidance and support throughout my graduate program and in writing this dissertation. She has dedicated immense amount of time and effort to reviewing my work and providing insightful feedback. Her expertise, passion, and dedication to ending sexual violence has inspired me to pursue my goals whole heartedly. Her mentorship has helped me grow as a researcher, and I am truly honored for the opportunity to have worked under her supervision.

I wish to extend my deepest gratitude to my committee members, Dr. Karla Emeno and, Dr. Mathew Shane for their time and dedication to this dissertation. Their feedback and insight strengthened and improved my research. I truly appreciate their input and support over the past few years. I would also like to thank Dr. Emma Allenye and Dr. Carla Cesaroni for serving on my PhD defence committee and for their time to review this dissertation. I wish to acknowledge Dr. Shaheen Sharif from McGill University, the lead researcher of the SSHRC-funded project *IMPACTS: Collaborations to Address Campus Sexual Violence on Campus* for financial support for my dissertation. I am honoured to have received support from a large-scale project aiming to end campus sexual violence across Canada.

I would like to thank my parents, Sheida and Mohammad, who uprooted their established careers and social network and immigrated to Canada so I could pursue my dreams. They have provided me with immense love and encouragement throughout this process. Their unwavering belief in me gave me the courage to persevere through this challenging and rewarding process. Without their support, I would not be where I am

today. I would also like to thank my fur baby, Nisha, who, in return for treats, allowed me to shift my focus from her to this project for hours on end. The calming energy she exuded while patiently sitting next to me as I worked for long hours is unmatched.

Lastly, I wish to acknowledge my loved ones who passed away while I was working on this degree. I never got the chance to travel back and say my final goodbyes, but their unconditional love gave me the strength and courage to get through moments of uncertainty throughout this journey. To my sweet, gentle grandmother who longed for one last visit until her final days, your compassion towards human beings inspired me to choose this path. To my grandfather, who kept telling everyone how proud of his grandchildren he is, your strength and sense of social justice gave me the motivation to continue on this path. And finally, to my childhood friend Somi, who kept motivating me to write this dissertation even on her last days of battling cancer, your perseverance inspired me to work hard. My heart is filled with love and gratitude and you will always live on in my memory.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Thesis Examination Information	ii
Abstract	iii
Authors Declaration	iv
Statement of Contribution	v
Acknowledgements	vi
Table of Contents	viii
List of Tables	xiv
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Risk Factors for Sexual Violence	2
Rape Proclivity.....	5
Prevalence of Rape Proclivity.....	6
Rape Proclivity and Constructs Related to Sexual Violence	8
Rape Proclivity and Deviant Sexual Interests.....	9
Arousal to Rape.....	9
Rape Proclivity and Distorted Cognitions	10
Rape Proclivity and Reported Perpetration of Sexual Violence	12
Construct Validity of Rape Proclivity Measure.....	13
The Current Dissertation.....	16
Chapter 2: Perception of Scenarios on The Rape Proclivity Measure	17
Match-and-Motivation Model.....	18
Gender Stereotypes	19
Rape-Supportive Attitudes (Rape Myths).....	20
Content Validity.....	22
Scale Revisions	24
Purpose.....	24

Methods.....	25
Participants.....	25
Procedure	26
Measures	27
Demographic Questionnaire	27
Rape Proclivity Measure.....	27
Perception of Rape Proclivity Scale	29
Research Approach	29
Data-analytic Strategy.....	29
Qualitative Content Analysis	30
Items/Themes	31
Results.....	31
Scenario 1.....	32
Scenario 2.....	35
Scenario 3.....	38
Scenario 4.....	41
Scenario 5.....	45
Discussion	47
Match and Motivation Model	48
Endorsement of Rape Supportive Beliefs	50
Content Validity.....	50
Limitations and Future Directions	51
Conclusions.....	52
Chapter 3: Rape Proclivity and Related Constructs	54
Deviant Sexual Arousal	54
Rape Proclivity and Arousal to Rape.....	57
Distorted Cognitions	57
Rape Supportive Cognitions	59
Rape Proclivity and Rape Supportive Cognitions.....	62

Antisocial Cognitions.....	63
Rape Proclivity and Antisocial Cognitions.....	65
Past perpetration of sexual violence.....	65
Study Purpose	66
Methods.....	67
Participants.....	67
Procedure	69
Measures	71
Demographic Questionnaire	71
Rape Proclivity Measures	71
Rape Proclivity Scale.....	72
Likelihood to Rape Question.	72
Sexual Experiences Survey-Tactics First Revised (SES-TFR).	72
Measures for Sexual Interest.....	73
The Sexual Interest Cardsort Questionnaire.	73
Measures for Rape Supportive Cognitions	74
The RAPE Scale.	74
Rape Myth Acceptance Scale.	75
Costin’s R Scale.....	76
Acceptance of Modern Myths about Sexual Aggression Scale.	76
Measures for Antisocial Cognitions.....	76
Measure of Criminal Attitude and Associates.	76
Measures for Past Perpetration of Sexual Violence.....	77
Behaviour SES-TFR.	77
Coercive Sexuality Scale.	77
Quality Control Questions	77
Results.....	78
Rape Proclivity.....	80
Rape Proclivity and Related Constructs	81
Does rape proclivity form distinct or overlapping factors?	84

Discussion	88
Limitations and Future Directions	90
Conclusion	91
Chapter 4: Longitudinal study examining the relationship between rape proclivity and sexually aggressive behaviour	93
Issues with Identifying Perpetrators of Sexual Violence Among Non-Convicted Individuals.....	93
Failing to Include Community Men.....	93
Not Making Distinction Between Coercion and Aggression.....	95
Correlates of Rape and Past Perpetration of Sexual Violence	97
Rape Proclivity and Past Perpetration of Sexual Violence	98
Rape Proclivity and Future Perpetration of Sexual Violence	99
Study Purpose	101
Methods.....	101
Participants.....	101
Student Sample	101
Community Sample	101
Procedure	103
Wave 1	103
Student Participants	103
Wave 2	104
Student Participants	104
Community Men	105
Measures	106
Sexual Experience Survey-Tactics First Revised (SES-TFR)	106
Quality Control Questions	107
Results.....	107
Wave 1	109
Comparing Community Men to Students	109

Prevalence of Sexual Coercion and Aggression	110
Perpetration of Sexual Violence and Constructs Related to Sexual Offending..	111
Wave 2	113
Perpetration of Sexual Violence	113
Rape Proclivity and Perpetration of Sexual Violence.....	113
Rape Proclivity and Likelihood to Engage in Sexual Violence.....	115
Discussion	117
Limitations	120
Future Directions	121
Conclusion	121
Chapter 5: General Discussion	123
Participant’s Interpretations of Rape Scenarios	123
Relationship Between Rape Proclivity and Risk Factors for Sexual Violence	125
Predictive Validity of Rape Proclivity	127
Community Sample	128
Limitations	130
Future Research and Implications.....	131
Conclusion	133
References	135
Appendices.....	164
Appendix A: Study 1 Consent Form.....	165
Appendix B: Demographic Questionnaire	171
Appendix C: Rape Proclivity Measure	173
Appendix D: Perception of Rape Proclivity	180
Appendix E: Study 1 Debrief Form	184

Appendix F: Study 2 Consent Form-Time 1.....	186
Appendix G: Likelihood to Rape Questionnaire.....	194
Appendix H: Sexual Experiences Survey-TFR (SES-TFR).....	195
Appendix I: The Sexual Interest Cardsort Questionnaire	200
Appendix J: The Rape Scale	207
Appendix K: Rape Myth Acceptance Scale.....	210
Appendix L: Costin's R scale.....	214
Appendix M: Acceptance of Modern Myths about Sexual Aggression Scale.....	216
Appendix N: Measure of Criminal Attitude and Associates	222
Appendix O: Coercive Sexuality Scale.....	226
Appendix P: Quality Control Questions	228
Appendix Q: Study 2 Debrief Form.....	229
Appendix R: Consent Form Wave 1 (Community men)	231
Appendix S: Wave 1 Debrief Form (Community Men).....	238
Appendix T: Wave 2 Consent Form (Student Sample)	240
Appendix U: Wave 2Debrief Form (Student Sample).....	246
Appendix V: Wave 2 Consent form (Community Men)	248
Appendix W: Wave 2 Debrief form (Community Men).....	255

List of Tables

Table 1: Participants' Understanding of Rape Scenario	32
Table 2: Breakdown of Responses to the Question "Do you think either party should have done something differently?"	34
Table 3: Participants' Understanding of Rape Scenario 2	35
Table 4: Breakdown of Responses to the Question "Do You Think Either Party Should Have Done Something Differently?"	36
Table 5: Views on Female's "Lack of Resistance in Scenario 2"	37
Table 6: Breakdown of Responses to the Question "Did You Find Anything Unclear About The Scenario?"	38
Table 7: Participants' Understanding of Rape Scenario 3	38
Table 8: Breakdown of Responses to the Question "Do you think either party should have done something differently?"	40
Table 9: Breakdown of Responses to the Question "Did you find anything unclear about the scenario?"	41
Table 10: Participants' Understanding of Rape Scenario 4	41
Table 11: Breakdown of Responses to the Question "Do you think either party should have done something differently?"	43
Table 12: Breakdown of Responses to the Question "What do you think female's resistance means?"	44
Table 13: Participants' Understanding of Rape Scenario 5	45
Table 14: Breakdown of Responses to the Question "Do you think either party should have done something differently?"	46
Table 15: Percentage of Participants who Perceived Scenarios as an Incident of Sexual Violence	47
Table 16: Demographic Characteristics of Student Participants	68
Table 17: Internal Consistency and Descriptive Statistics for Proclivity to Rape, Sexual Interest, Supportive Cognitions, Antisocial cognitions, and Past Perpetration of Sexual Violence	78

Table 18: Pearson Correlations Between Rape Proclivity, Arousal to Coercive Behaviour, Rape Supportive Cognition, Antisocial Cognition, and Past Perpetration of Sexual Violence	82
Table 19: Eigenvalues and Proportion of Variance Explained for Retained Factors	85
Table 20: EFA Rotated Factor Loadings	87
Table 21: Demographic Characteristics of the Male Students and Community Samples.	102
Table 22: Internal Consistency and Descriptive Statistics for Deviant Arousal, Rape-Supportive Cognition, Antisocial cognition, and Proclivity to Rape for the Sample of Community Men.	108
Table 23: Self-Reported Frequency of Sexually Aggressive Behavior by Tactic Used for the Samples of Students and Community Men.....	111
Table 24: Measures Related to Sexual Offending by Perpetration of Sexual Violence .	112
Table 25: Rape Proclivity and History of Sexual Violence Perpetration	114
Table 26: Regression Analysis Summary for Rape Proclivity Predicting sexual violent behaviour.....	116
Table 27: Regression Analysis Summary for the Rape Proclivity Measure Predicting sexual violent	117

Chapter 1: Introduction

The high rate of sexual violence experienced by women is one of the most pressing worldwide social issues. It is estimated that 15-20% of North American women report experiencing at least one incident of rape during their lifetime (Black et al., 2010; Elliott et al., 2004; Kilpatrick et al., 2007; Koss, 1993; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2006). The statistics become even more alarming when considering that between 44% and 53% of women report experiencing other forms of sexual violence in their lifetime, including sexual coercion, unwanted sexual touching, and unsolicited sexual experiences (Black et al., 2010; Breiding et al., 2014; Kilpatrick et al., 1987). Sadly, the actual prevalence rate is probably even higher because of the many unreported incidents of sexual violence, and this rate is further augmented by many unwanted sexual acts including incapacitated rape, which may not be viewed as serious enough to report (Fisher et al., 2003; Sabina & Ho, 2014).

Sexual violence against adult victims includes the perpetration of any unwanted sexual act, using a wide variety of tactics to engage in sexual behaviour including sexual coercion (e.g., manipulation, lies, verbal coercion) and sexual aggression (e.g., physical force, incapacitation; Sexual Experience Survey; Koss 2007). The term rape refers to vaginal, anal, oral penetration through some degree of force, or threats of force (Abby et al., 2012; DeGue & Dilillo, 2004). The term sexual violence is more encompassing and includes a wide range of unwanted sexual behaviour including sexually coercive and sexual aggressive acts (Campbell & Townsend, 2011). Therefore, in this dissertation, the term sexual violence refers to the perpetration of any unwanted sexual behaviour including rape obtained through coercive or aggressive tactics.

Sexual violence is well established as leading to a variety of negative and long-lasting consequences for the victims. For example, compared to those who have not experienced sexual victimization, victims of sexual violence are more likely to experience negative psychological and physical consequences, including symptoms of depression and anxiety (Acierno et al., 2002; Choudhary et al. , 2012), post-traumatic stress disorder (Dworkin et al., 2017; Testa et al., 2007), suicidal ideations (Ullman & Brecklin, 2002), sexually transmitted infections and unwanted pregnancies (Mcfarlane et al., 2005), physical injuries, sexually transmitted infections, and other health problems (Campbell et al., 2003).

Considering the high rates of sexual violence, and the magnitude of harmful effects on victims, establishing factors that can better inform prevention and intervention strategies for sexual violence is crucial. Historically, sexual violence prevention programs have focused on helping women learn rape avoidance strategies such as awareness of their surroundings and self-defence techniques (Barone et al., 2007); however, such programs were deemed ineffective and harmful to victims (Roze, 2002). Therefore, implementing sexual violence prevention and intervention strategies that focus on perpetrators, rather than victims, is imperative. More specifically, establishing factors that are associated with perpetration of sexual violence becomes crucial in informing strategies that can help eliminate sexual violence.

Risk Factors for Sexual Violence

Contemporary research examining the etiology of sexual offending posits that sexual offending is multifactorial in nature and that there are multiple pathways leading to the onset and continuation of behaviour that is sexually violent in nature (Hall &

Hirshman, 1992; Malamuth, 2003; Ward & Siegert, 2002). These theories have identified a wide range of factors that influence sexual violence, including developmental factors (i.e., attachment problems), psychological factors (i.e., offence supportive cognitions, deviant sexual interests), and contextual factors (i.e., substance abuse).

Postulating on empirical theories and recidivism data, many scholars have attempted to identify factors that could inform risk assessment, intervention, and treatment management of sexual offenders. Dynamic risk factors have been identified as changeable characteristics of the perpetrator or the environment that can increase the risk of re-offending behaviour (Andrews, & Bonta, 2003). These factors generally fall into the domains of deviant sexual interests (i.e., preoccupation with sex), offence supportive cognition (i.e., hostile attitudes), socio-affective functioning (i.e., negative affect), and self-management problems (i.e., impulsivity; Beech, & Ward, 2004; Hanson, & Harris, 2000; Thornton, 2002). Meta-analysis of studies examining factors associated with re-offending indicates that deviant sexual interests, antisocial orientation, and distorted sexual cognitions are dynamic risk factors most highly correlated with sexual recidivism (Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2004; Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2005). These factors should, therefore, be targeted in treatment to reduce the risk of re-offending.

While research in the area of identifying factors related to sexual offending has been valuable, it has not been without shortcomings. The majority of research in this area has been conducted using samples of individuals convicted of sexual offences. However, individuals convicted of sexual offences only constitute a minority of sexual perpetrators and may not be representative of rapists in general. First, the vast majority of individuals who commit sexual crimes are never apprehended due to underreporting of sexual

violence. According to the U.S. Department of Justice Report, only 34% of sexual assault perpetration is reported to the police (Truman & Langton, 2015). Notably, other studies indicate even lower rates of reporting sexual victimization, with most studies finding rates less than 20% (Ceelen et al., 2019; Krebs et al., 2007; Wolitzky-Taylor et al., 2011). Given that more than two-thirds of incidents of sexual victimization are not reported, let alone convicted, incarcerated sexual offenders might not be representative of all sexually violent men.

Furthermore, individuals convicted of sexual offending bear characteristics that are not necessarily unique to all perpetrators. Characteristics of incident, the perpetrator, and the victim all contribute to the outcome of whether a rape incident will lead to formal disclosure (Sabrina, & Ho, 2014) and consequently, the apprehension of perpetrators. For example, incidents of sexual assaults are more likely to be reported when the perpetrator is a stranger to the victim. However, more than 80% of sexual assault incidents involve someone known to the victim (BJS, 2014; Fisher et al., 2003). Also, extreme forms of sexual aggression, such as forcible sexual contact, are more likely to be reported to the officials even though using verbal coercion and threats are far more common (Abbey & Jacques-Tiura, 2010). Therefore, perpetrators of sexual violence who are convicted of sexual offences might have characteristics that are different from the majority of perpetrators who have not been apprehended and incarcerated. Thus, even though there is great value in considering dynamic risk factors for sexual offending intervention, less is known about their applicability in addressing nonincarcerated sexually aggressive men. Further, examining factors that might contribute to the

perpetration of sexual offending using samples of men who are not incarcerated can also inform strategies aimed at prevention of sexual violence.

Rape Proclivity

In order to address the majority of sexual offenders who are not apprehended, scholars have developed ways to measure the propensity for individuals to engage in sexually violent behaviour (e.g., Blake & Gannon, 2010; Bohner et al., 1998). Rape proclivity, a construct that could potentially have an important role in the perpetration of sexual violence, is defined as a self-reported propensity to commit sexually violent behaviour regardless of whether individuals have committed a sexual crime (Malamuth, 1981). It is usually measured by asking individuals to self-report whether they would be likely to engage in different types of sexually aggressive behaviours towards adults or children. These self-report proclivity measures assess the tendency to commit rape by both lone (e.g., Bohner et al., 1998) and multiple perpetrators (Alleyne et al., 2014).

Theoretical perspectives can help provide insight into the importance of studying rape proclivity. The theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1991) is a theoretical model that may explain why it is important to study rape proclivity and in particular, how it may be related to perpetration of sexual violence. Theory of planned behaviour posits that an individual's intent to use behaviour is the best predictor of subsequent engagement in that behaviour. According to theory of planned behaviour, attitudes (e.g., distorted cognitions), perceived norms (e.g., gender norms), and perceived control over behaviour (e.g., believing in one's ability), determine behaviour intentions. Interestingly, research examining this phenomenon, has found a strong correlation between behavioural intentions and behaviour (Sheeran, 2002). From this point of view, it might be fair to

assume that men's intention of engaging in sexual violence might indicate their future perpetration of sexual violence. Therefore, it would be valuable to determine if those who self-report a likelihood to rape, are, in fact, more likely to perpetrate acts of sexual violence.

Prevalence of Rape Proclivity

In order to determine the proportion of men who have a propensity to rape but might not necessarily have committed acts of sexual violence, Malamuth and colleagues ran a series of studies using samples of university students from North America (e.g., Malamuth, 1981). They presented participants with different depictions of sexual violence scenarios, including written passages and audiotapes depicting rape, and videotaped interviews, and asked them to indicate the likelihood of engagement in similar behaviours if they could be assured that they would not face any consequences. Participants were asked to specify their responses on a five-point Likert scale ranging from "not at all likely" to "very likely".

For example, as part of a study examining hypotheses regarding rape, Malamuth, Haber, and Feshbach (1980) presented a written scenario to 53 male students and 38 female students which depicted either a violent or nonviolent sexual interaction. Participants were then presented with a 500-word passage depicting a male student raping a female student. Subsequently, participants were asked a series of questions regarding their level of arousal, perception of the victim and the perpetrator, and students' likelihood to engage in the same behaviour. Participants were asked to indicate on a 5-point Likert scale how likely they would be to engage in the same behaviour if they could be assured of not facing consequences. Results indicated that of the 53 male participants,

51% reported at least some likelihood to rape if they could be assured of not facing consequences.

In a similar study, Malamuth and Check (1980) presented audio recordings of either a violent or nonviolent sexual scenario to 75 male university students. All participants later listened to a scenario depicting rape. Participants were asked whether they would act the same if they were in the same situation as the male perpetrator. Of the 75 participants who responded to the rape proclivity question, 69% showed at least some likelihood to engage in rape. Overall, the integrated data from Malamuth's studies suggested that 35% of individuals showed at least some propensity to rape, and 20% choose the middle of the scale (3) or above, indicating a higher likelihood to rape (Malamuth, 1981).

Malamuth's studies are valuable, as they comprise the earliest research examining rape proclivity. However, in most of his studies, participants are introduced to either violent or non-violent erotic stimuli before being exposed to the rape scenario to report on their likelihood to commit rape. Although this methodology has value in terms of measuring the level of physiological arousal during rape depiction, some might argue that the physiological arousal would act as a confounding factor.

More recently, researchers have employed other self-report measures to study rape proclivity. The rates of reported likelihood to rape remain high. For example, as part of a larger study investigating the relationship between rape proclivity and other related constructs (i.e., rape supportive attitudes) among a German sample of 125 male students, 33% of participants reported at least some likelihood to rape if they could avoid being caught (Bohner, 1989). In a more recent study examining lone and multiple rape

proclivity in a university sample, a high proportion of participants (44.8%) reported at least some level of interest in engaging in sexually aggressive acts (Palermo et al., 2019). In another study, Gidycz et al. (2011) found that even though a relatively lower number of individuals reported a likelihood of using force to have sexual intercourse, 35.1% still indicated a propensity to perpetrate other forms of sexual violence, such as using pressure and arguments to engage in sexual behaviour. These results indicate that rape proclivity is not an isolated response. In fact, rape proclivity might provide information regarding the existence of underlying risk factors associated with sexual violence even when there is no overt aggressive behaviour.

Rape Proclivity and Constructs Related to Sexual Violence

One way to determine if rape proclivity is a meaningful factor in terms of intervention and prevention, is to identify whether men who indicate a greater likelihood of raping are similar to individuals convicted of sexual offending on other constructs related to sexual offending. A limited number of research studies have focused on examining the relationship between rape proclivity and common risk factors for sexual offending such as deviant sexual interests (e.g., arousal to rape) and attitudes facilitating sexual aggression (e.g., distorted cognitions). Malamuth (1981) integrated findings from a series of studies examining rape proclivity among men. Data revealed that in comparison to men who indicated no likelihood of engaging in sexual violence, men who reported a higher likelihood of rape (i.e., higher propensity) were more similar to individuals convicted of sexual violence both in sexual arousal to rape depiction and distorted cognitions related to sexual offending. Furthermore, it is important to better understand how rape proclivity correlates with other related factors and whether these

factors represent separate but related constructs or could be parts of a larger umbrella construct. The relationship between rape proclivity and each of those constructs will be reviewed in the next section.

Rape Proclivity and Deviant Sexual Interests

Deviant sexual interests refer to sexual arousal to a variety of deviant or offence-related behaviours, including coercive sex, exhibitionism, frotteurism, and sexual contact with minors (Akerman & Beech, 2012; Ward & Beech 2008). Evidence from meta-analytic reviews suggest deviant sexual interests are strong predictors of future sexual offending (Hanson & Morton- Bourgon, 2005).

Arousal to Rape

Earlier studies indicate that individuals convicted of sexual offences exhibit higher levels of self-reported and physiological arousal to erotic stimuli depicting rape and sexual violence than men with no history of committing sexual violence (Abel et al., 1977; Lalumiere et al., 2003; Rice et al., 1994). In fact, individuals convicted of rape showed an equally high level of arousal in response to both rape and consenting sexual scenarios. Similarly, among men who have not been convicted of sexual offences, arousal to rape is more common among men who reported a history of coercive sexual behaviour than those who did not (Lalumiere et al., 2003; Lohr et al., 1997).

Understanding the relationship between arousal to rape and self-reported likelihood to perpetrate sexual violence can be useful for determining whether rape proclivity is associated with risk factors for sexual offending. However, there is a paucity of research in this area, and existing studies have found contradictory results. In a study aiming to understand the relationship between arousal to rape and proclivity to rape,

Malamuth and Check (1983) asked 145 male university students to complete questionnaires assessing personality variables, past sexual behaviour, power as sexual motivation, and rape proclivity. Subsequently, participants listened to audio stimuli depicting either consenting or coercive sex. Participants' level of physiological arousal was measured using penile tumescence and self-report. Results indicated that individuals with higher rape proclivity were more aroused to coercive scenarios than the consenting ones, whereas those with a lower proclaimed tendency to rape were more physiologically aroused to consensual sexual scenarios. In contrast, Chiroro et al. (2004) more recently found that anticipated sexual arousal to rape was only weakly correlated with a self-reported likelihood to engage in sexually violent behaviour.

The correlation between arousal to rape and rape proclivity found in some studies might mean that rape proclivity is a meaningful measure, predictive of important arousal and cognitive attitudinal responses. However, given inconsistent findings in other studies, more research is needed to shed light on the relationship between arousal to rape, the proclivity to perpetrate sexual violence, and the engagement in sexual violence; such research could not only offer improved understanding of these relationships, but also inform potential prevention strategies.

Rape Proclivity and Distorted Cognitions

Cognitive distortions are viewed as beliefs and attitudes that minimize, excuse, or justify sexual offending (Abel et al., 1989; Ward, 2000). They are believed to be important dynamic risk factors (i.e., potentially changeable risk factors with a demonstrated relationship to offending) for sexual offending, with their presence

increasing the likelihood that an individual may engage in sexually violent behaviour (Beech et al., 2012; DeGue et al., 2010; Thornton, 2002; Ward & Beech, 2006).

Among men who have not been convicted of sexual offending, beliefs and attitudes supportive of hostility towards women and interpersonal violence are found to be associated with a reported history of perpetrating sexual violence (Malamuth, 1986). Furthermore, endorsing rape supportive beliefs is believed to be more common among men who reported committing repeated acts of sexual violence than those who committed one isolated act of sexual violence (Hall et al., 2006). Similarly, antisocial cognitions, such as beliefs supportive of interpersonal violence, hostile masculinity, and entitlement, are related to self-reported perpetration of sexual violence among men who have not been convicted of sexual offending (Hill & Fischer, 2001; Malamuth, 1998; Trueman et al., 1996).

There is research indicating that individuals who endorse rape supportive beliefs also report a higher likelihood of engaging in sexually violent behaviour (Bohner et al., 2006; Bohner et al., 2005; Durán et al., 2016; Malamuth, 1981; Tieger, 1981), thereby suggesting that justification of sexual and interpersonal violence could be related to a self-reported likelihood of engaging in sexual violence. However, research is not unanimous on the causal nature of these two constructs. Previous research has theorized that cognitive distortions, namely rape myth acceptance, act as an antecedent to rape proclivity and can therefore predict an individual's self-reported likelihood to rape (Bohner et al., 1998; Bohner et al., 2005; Bohner et al., 2006). However, emerging research indicates a reciprocal causal relationship between the constructs (O'Connor, 2019), where both rape proclivity and rape myth acceptance predict each other.

Understanding the relationship between cognitive distortions and rape proclivity can shed light on whether rape proclivity is a meaningful construct related to other factors strongly associated with sexual offending.

Rape Proclivity and Reported Perpetration of Sexual Violence

While a number of studies have explored the relationship between rape proclivity and other related constructs, fewer studies have examined the relationship between a self-reported likelihood to rape and the perpetration of sexual violence. For example, as part of a larger study examining factors associated with sexual coercion, Degue and Dillilo (2004) investigated the relationship between sexual coercion and rape proclivity among 304 male university students. Participants completed measures of rape proclivity, rape supportive cognitions, interpersonal reactivity, the Psychopathic Personality Inventory and the Sexual Experience Questionnaire. Results indicated that men who reported using sexually coercive tactics to engage in sexual behaviour reported a significantly greater likelihood to rape.

Although a few research studies have explored the relationship between rape proclivity and the history of perpetrating sexual violence, there is a dearth of information available on the role of rape proclivity in predicting sexual aggression. In the only known study that aimed to examine the utility of rape proclivity in predicting sexual aggression, Gidycz et al. (2011) asked 432 male university students to report on the likelihood that they find themselves engaging in a variety of coercive and violent tactics, including using arguments, authority, or physical force to engage in sexual behaviour in the next three months. At the three-month follow-up, students were asked to complete the Sexual Experience Survey, which assessed sexual aggression perpetration. Results indicated that

rape proclivity predicted perpetration of violence. While the results of this study can shed light on the role rape proclivity plays in sexual offending, it is difficult to make firm conclusions on the predictive validity of rape proclivity, as this is one of the only studies examining this relationship. Further, the Rape Proclivity Measure (Bohner, 1998) was not used to measure participants' tendency to commit rape. Rather, the Sexual Experience Survey (SES) was used. It would be of value to find out if Bohner's (1998) rape proclivity measure can accurately predict sexual violence.

Although it is not safe to assume that individuals who indicate a possibility of engaging in rape in hypothetical situations are potential rapists, it is possible that some men who report a likelihood to rape are more likely to engage in sexually aggressive behaviour when they get the opportunity to do so (Bohner et al., 1998). Given the state of the current literature and the implications of this research, examining the role of rape proclivity in predicting sexual violence is warranted. If rape proclivity is found to predict future sexual offending, it might be a useful tool to identify individuals who are at higher risk of committing sexually violent behaviour in the future. As such, sexual violence prevention programs may need to address men at higher risk of sexual assault, such as those with higher rape proclivity, in order to reduce the perpetration of sexual violence on campuses nationwide.

Construct Validity of Rape Proclivity Measure

As previously noted, rape proclivity is often assessed using self-report measures. Earlier rape proclivity measures asked participants to report how likely they would be to commit rape if they were certain that they would not face any consequences. For example, Likelihood to Rape (LR; Malamuth, 1981), one of the first scales measuring

individuals' propensity to rape, is a single item measure that asks individuals how likely they would be to commit rape if they knew they would not be apprehended or punished. There are a few problems with using one-item scales to measure rape proclivity. First, taboo stimuli such as rape are likely to lead to fewer false positives. More Specifically, individuals are less likely to report arousal to rape if they are not aroused to non-consensual sexual scenarios. However, participants might respond in a socially desirable manner if asked directly about whether they commit rape.

In fact, the direct rape proclivity measure used in Malamuth studies (1989a, 1989b) revealed a small significant relationship with social desirability. Furthermore, there seems to be a lack of understanding regarding what constitutes rape (Anderson, & Doherty, 2008). Individuals are more likely to associate stranger assailants or use of extreme force with rape (Ellison, & Munro, 2010). Therefore, the single question originally included in Malamuth's study (1981) might not capture many instances of acquaintance rape, or other forms of sexual violence such as sexual coercion.

One widely used measure of rape proclivity (the Rape Proclivity Measure) was developed by Bohner et al. (1998). It is based on five scenarios depicting a sexual assault, described without using the word rape. Before reading each scenario, individuals are asked to carefully read each one and imagine that they are in the same situation as the male character. After each of the scenarios, the participants were asked the following three questions: "How sexually aroused would you have felt in the above situation? (scale from 1 = not at all aroused to 5 = highly aroused)," "Would you have behaved like this in this situation? (scale from 1 = certainly no to 5 = certainly yes)," and "How much would you have enjoyed getting your way in this situation? (scale from 1 = not at all to 5 = very

much)." This scenario-based measure of Rape Proclivity has been shown to be unrelated to social desirability (Bohner et al., 1988; Bohner et al., 2006). More specifically, the correlation between the Rape Proclivity Measure and a measure of social desirability (SD; Amelang & Borkenau, 1981) were found to be nonsignificant ($r(111) = .05, P > .61$).

In order to target individuals who have a tendency towards committing acts of sexual violence, accurate measurement of a proclivity for sexual violence is necessary. If such scales are going to be used to make determinations about which individuals are more like to sexually offend in the future, then there needs to be confidence that they are indeed indicative of perpetrating sexual violence. Furthermore, with such a high number of individuals self-reporting a potential interest in sexual violence, it is important to ensure that participants have a general understanding of what each scenario depicts and determine whether the measure is actually measuring what it is aimed to measure.

Although the Rape Proclivity Measure has been validated and supported in research (e.g., Bohner et al., 2006; Eyssel et al., 2006), there is potential ambiguity in some of the items regarding the age of the victim, and the wording of the scenarios (e.g., use of the term 'petting'). It would be valuable to examine individuals' understanding of scenarios on the Rape Proclivity Measure to assess whether they have an accurate understanding of what each scenario is intended to entail and whether they find the scenarios to be unambiguous. Examining people's interpretation of items on the Rape Proclivity Measure could potentially improve this scale to be more discerning of true interest in sexual aggression.

The Current Dissertation

Given the dearth of information on rape proclivity and the potential value of the topic in terms of preventing sexual violence, improving understanding of rape proclivity is important. Specifically, more information is needed in terms of how accurately rape proclivity is being measured, its potential association with other factors related to sexual violence, and its ability to predict sexual offending. The purpose of this research is to further improve the understanding of rape proclivity. This will be accomplished by: (1) assessing participants' understanding of the items on the Rape Proclivity Measure and modifying and updating these measures as necessary (Chapter 2), (2) examining the relationship between rape proclivity and potentially related constructs, deviant sexual interests, offence supportive cognition (both rape and antisocial), history of past sexually aggressive behaviour, to determine which are most closely related to proclivity and whether it is indeed a distinct construct (Chapter 3), and finally, (3) to address the gap in the literature regarding the role of rape proclivity as a predictor of sexually aggressive behaviour (Chapter 4).

This research could have implications for specific prevention strategies. Although changing policies about informing and educating the public about prosocial sexual behaviour is very important, identifying individuals who have not committed a sexual crime but are at higher risk of doing so could be an important approach to preventing sexual violence. If this research can demonstrate that rape proclivity can, in fact, predict future acts of sexual violence, it could be a useful construct for identifying at-risk individuals.

Chapter 2: Perception of Scenarios on The Rape Proclivity Measure

Rates of self-reported likelihood to rape (i.e., rape proclivity), using a variety of different measures, have been alarmingly high. Studies examining the rate of rape proclivity among college students have found that up to 40% of men (Malamuth, 1981; Palermo et al., 2019) have reported at least some tendencies to engage in non-consensual sexual activities. Considering the alarming proportion of men who profess at least some willingness to engage in rape, investigating how individuals perceive scenarios provided in the Rape Proclivity Measure becomes important. In order to find out if rape proclivity is a meaningful construct related to the perpetration of sexual violence, it is important to enquire about whether these high numbers actually represent those who have a propensity to commit rape.

One factor contributing to such high rates of self-reported likelihood to rape is that many individuals might not identify the non-consensual sexual activities presented in scenarios as a form of sexual violence. More specifically, if individuals fail to perceive the scenarios as coercive or problematic, or if there is ambiguity, they may be more likely to report a likelihood to engage in the same behaviour. Non-consensual sexual behaviour can include any form of sexual activity initiated by manipulation, abuse of power, coercion, and use of threats and physical force (Koss et al., 2007). However, when presented with rape scenarios, many individuals do not label incidents that meet the operational definition of non-consensual sex as rape or sexual violence (Fisher et al., 2003; Humphreys et al., 2007; Koss, 2011). Further, even most victims of rape do not label their experience as rape. For example, in the Sexual Victimization of College Women survey, Fisher et al. (2000) found that only 46.5% ($n = 40$) of women who had experiences that met the operational definition of rape actually perceived their experience

as rape. Similarly, in one study examining understanding of consent and sexual experiences among young women, of the 186 participants who experienced non-consensual sexual contact, 67.2% ($n = 125$) did not label their experience as sexual assault (Kilimnik & Humphreys, 2018).

Match-and-Motivation Model

In an attempt to explain the above research findings, Peterson and Muehlenhard (2011) introduced the match-and-motivation model framework. According to this model, the match between individuals' experience and their script for possible labels can partially explain how people perceive their experiences. More specifically, the closer an incident of non-consensual sex is to their script of what constitutes stereotypic rape, the more likely individuals are to label the incident as rape. For example, in the North American culture, the stereotypic rape scenario entails a male stranger violently and forcefully attacking a female who has not indicated a sexual interest. Therefore, individuals are more likely to only label such incidents as rape and dismiss other non-consensual scenarios that are inconsistent with these stereotypical scenarios. However, defining rape only in terms of physical force can imply that without signs of physical force or injury non-consensual sex is not as problematic. In fact, numerous studies suggest that people are more likely to label and report the incident as rape if it was perpetrated by a stranger (Kahn, et al., 2003) and if there was a weapon involved (Fisher et al., 2003; McMullin & White, 2006; Wolitzki-Taylor et al., 2013). On the contrary, victims whose experience of sexual violence did not fit the sexual scripts (i.e., voluntarily consuming alcohol or drugs prior to being sexually assaulted or being acquainted with the perpetrator) were less likely to report the incident (Littleton & Axom, 2003).

Gender Stereotypes

Furthermore, individuals' interpretation of non-consensual sexual scenarios can be greatly influenced by traditional gender stereotypes. The prevalent North American gender roles, rooted in the social dominance of men over women (Aulette & Connel, 1991), reinforce gender sex roles regarding men being the initiators and women being the gatekeeper of sexual activities. For example, men are supposed to always be ready for sex and put in an effort to get sex (e.g., by buying alcohol), and women are not to express eagerness to have sex and to repay men's efforts by agreeing to have sex with them. More specifically, the socially assigned sex roles that require men to initiate sex, and women to restrict their sexual responses to those invitations, make men more likely to assume consent until proven otherwise (Jozkowski, 2011).

These gender role stereotypes may be manifested in men and women perceiving and responding differently to sexual scenarios, with men more likely responding in a manner in line with the expectation that ambiguity in women's responses indicates consent and that coercion is an expected component of sexual interactions between men and women. In a research study examining perceptions of sexual consent, Humphry et al. (2007) presented three vignettes that included sexual intercourse to 414 undergraduate students. In all of those scenarios, verbal consent for sexual intercourse was ambiguous, and the female was portrayed as reluctant to engage in sexual activity. Results indicated that men were significantly more likely than women to perceive ambiguous scenarios as consensual and acceptable. Similarly, as part of a bigger study examining sexual consent among college students, Jozkowski and Peterson (2013) asked 185 college students to respond to an open-ended survey that asked participants to report how they indicate and

interpret consent. Results revealed that 12 to 14% of men included aggression and deception in their description of how consent is obtained in sexual relationships. In a more recent study aiming to examine college student's communication of consent and perception of gender stereotypes, Jozkowski et al. (2017) conducted interviews with 17 female and 13 male students. Results revealed that men disclosed a variety of tactics, including continued physical attempts to convince women to engage in sexual activities even after women verbally refused their request. In such instances, men rationalized women's refusal as a lack of assertiveness and their own coercive behaviour as initiating sex. Therefore, these victim-blaming and rape supportive attitudes can be used to justify undermining women's refusal to have sex and facilitating coercion to engage in sexual relationships with women.

Rape-Supportive Attitudes (Rape Myths)

Similar to socially constructed sexual scripts, commonly held rape myths narrow the definition of rape to only a limited number of possible scenarios such as those that include obviously violent, stranger perpetrated offenses and can lead to a misunderstanding of what constitutes consensual sex. This narrowed definition of rape can create the misperception that only certain non-consensual behaviour constitutes rape. As a result, other coercive sexual behaviours (e.g., those that involve acquaintance perpetrators) are viewed as less problematic. Rape supportive attitudes (commonly referred to as rape myths) are false beliefs about rape, perpetrators, and victims of rape that minimize and justify sexual violence (Burt, 1980; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994). Some examples of rape myths are that women are 'asking for it' by behaving or dressing a certain way, or if a woman does not fight back, it is not considered rape. Rape myths

are prevalent, and although a relatively high proportion of women hold these beliefs, men are significantly more likely to endorse rape-supportive beliefs (Chapleau et al., 2008; Suarez & Gadalla, 2010). In a national telephone survey regarding sexual abuse, McGee et al. (2011) assessed 20 rape myths among 3120 respondents in Ireland. Results indicated that 42.4% of men and 38.0% of women believed that the accusation of rape is often false. Further, 30.5% of men and 28.1% of women believed women who wear revealing clothing invite rape.

Rape myths not only minimize or justify sexual violence, but also narrow the definition of what constitutes rape. For example, if a man endorses a myth that women secretly want to have sex but feel it is expected that they say no, he may be more likely to consider the use of coercive tactics to engage in sexual behaviour as acceptable. Research studies indicate that individuals who hold rape myth attitudes were more likely to perceive non-consensual sexual experiences and scenarios as consensual (Peterson, & Muehlenhard, 2004). Similarly, in a systematic review of studies examining rape myth acceptance and juror decision-making, Dinos et al. (2015) found that when provided with rape scenarios, mock jurors who endorsed rape supportive beliefs were more likely to find the defendants as not guilty of committing rape.

Together, socially constructed rape scripts, gender-assigned sex roles, and common rape myths can narrow the definition of rape and affect an individual's conceptualization of sexual violence. Given how prevalent and deep-rooted these beliefs are, they are likely to affect how individuals interpret scenarios on rape proclivity measures. This is especially true since most scenarios on the Rape Proclivity Measure do not fit the prototypical rape script that involves a stranger ambushing a woman and raping

her by force. Considering the high number of individuals who proclaim at least some interest in rape, it is important to determine whether these individuals understand that each scenario entails rape or if they have perceived these vignettes as consensual.

Further, in order to target individuals with a tendency towards committing acts of sexual violence (i.e. rape proclivity), accurate measurement of a proclivity for sexual violence is necessary. For rape proclivity measures to be valid, there needs to be confidence that each item measures propensity to perpetrate sexual violence. Lack of clarity on the meaning of aspects of the scenarios can impact the psychometric properties of the measure. Therefore, examining participants' understanding of each scenario on a commonly used rape proclivity measure, such as the Rape Proclivity Measure, can help researchers check for each item's relevancy and clarity and ensure that rape proclivity measures are indeed assessing the intended construct.

Content Validity

Validity is the degree to which a scale is measuring what it is intended to measure and ensures that total scores can be interpreted in terms of the psychological construct being measured. In this regard, content validity refers to the degree to which the items on a specific measure are relevant to, and denote, the construct they intend to measure (Haynes et al., 1995). Content validity is considered one of the most important characteristics of a measure, as it allows researchers to examine whether a measure truly assesses the intended construct without ambiguity. In other words, for a measure to have content validity, the items should represent the content measured, and they should be distinguishable from other related constructs. Lack of content validity can negatively impact all other measurement properties.

Ambiguous and unrelated items may affect internal consistency and content validity (Terwee et al., 2018). A measure can have high internal consistency and test-retest reliability and examine the incorrect construct because of irrelevant or missing items. Similarly, including items that do not have the same connotations as intended, or leave room for various interpretations, can impact participants' understanding of the intended meaning of questions and hence compromise the validity of scale (Tucker et al., 2006).

Content validity of existing measures can be assessed by asking individuals about the relevance, comprehensiveness, and comprehensibility of the items, response options, and instructions (deWever et al., 2011). However, when examining content validity, the methods used vary widely and many studies only address comprehensibility without paying attention to relevance and comprehensiveness.

For the Rape Proclivity Measure to be valid, the measure should adequately reflect the definition of rape proclivity. Items should be appropriate and sufficiently broad to cover all components of the construct. If individuals fail to perceive a scenario as non-consensual, the measure may not sufficiently assess whether individuals have the self-reported tendency to commit rape. In other words, for the Rape Proclivity Measure to have content validity, respondents should have a clear understanding that they are being asked whether they would engage in non-consensual sex.

Therefore, careful consideration of each item is important. This includes examining whether questions are ambiguous or unclear, or if there is wide variation in how individuals interpret question. This will allow researchers to examine whether participant's interpretation of the questions is what the construct is aiming to measure.

Scale Revisions

Scale testing and subsequent revision can be an important step in improving the validity of a measure. The main motivation for scale revision is to improve the measure's psychometric properties that are found to be inadequate (Reise et al., 2000). However, there can be a number of reasons why a scale may need to be revised, such as ambiguity in the items, substantial overlap with other constructs, and inadequate construct representation (West & Finch, 1997). Guided by theory and research, scale revision is a process that includes evaluating old items, developing and refining new items, and assessing the new measure (Goldberg & Digman, 1994).

Overall, it is important to examine individuals' understanding of scenarios included in the Rape Proclivity Measure. Investigating individuals' interpretation of scenarios may help improve understanding of the high rates of self-reported tendencies to rape found in previous studies (e.g., Palermo et al., 2019), enhance the development of more useful prevention and intervention efforts, and improve content validity of the Rape Proclivity Measure. Although previous research has examined the prevalence of rape proclivity among different samples, there is a lack of research exploring individuals' understanding of rape proclivity measures. In order for prevention programs to be effective, more information is needed on how individuals perceive rape scenarios included in these measures. Also, in order to ensure rape proclivity is measuring its intended construct, it is important to ensure that items are worded clearly and that individuals have a unanimous understanding of what each scenario entails.

Purpose

The overall purpose of this study was to examine individuals' understanding of a commonly used rape proclivity measure by Bohner (1998). More specifically, the analysis will allow researchers to: (1) qualitatively explore a deeper understanding of participant's understanding of each rape scenario and (2) check for content validity of the Rape Proclivity Measure by investigating whether participants have a clear understanding of scenarios.

Methods

Participants

Participants were 107 male undergraduate students enrolled in various psychology courses at Ontario Tech University. Information regarding the specific course that students were enrolled in was not collected to ensure anonymity. However, most students who participated in the study were enrolled in first- or second-year psychology courses (e.g., Introductory Psychology, Abnormal Psychology). Participants could have been enrolled in a variety of undergraduate programs since students belonging to any faculty can take psychology courses as electives. Participants with missing and incomplete data ($n = 7$) were excluded from the study. This resulted in a sample of 100 men ranging from 18 to 35 years old ($M = 21.18$; $SD = 3.25$).

In regards to ethnicity, 25 (25.0%) were Caucasian, 23 (23.0%) were South Asian, 20 (20.0%) were Middle Eastern, 12 (12.0%) were East Asian, 9 (9.0%) were Southeast Asian, 7 (7.0%) were African American, 2 (2.0%) were mixed race, 1 (1.0%) was Hispanic or Latino, and 1 (1.0%) reported their ethnicity as "Other."

Participants mostly identified as heterosexual ($n = 96$, 97.0%), two (2.0%) men identified as homosexual, and 1 (1.0%) man reported being asexual. On average,

participants had 2.86 ($SD = 6.17$) lifetime female sexual partners. The number of female sexual partners reported ranged from 0 to 50, with 33 (33.3%) participants reporting having had no sexual partners. Since the study aimed to examine participants' understanding of each scenario as opposed to their sexual behaviour, participants who reported never having female sexual partners were not excluded from the study. Furthermore, the number of male sexual partners reported ranged from 0 to 4, with most participants ($n = 89, 94.7\%$) reported having no male sexual partner in their lifetime.

Procedure

This study was reviewed and approved by the Ontario Tech University Research Ethics Board. The data collection occurred between September 2017 and December 2018. Student participants were recruited using the Ontario Tech University Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities Research Participant Pool. All participants completed the survey on Qualtrics using a laptop provided by Ontario Tech University.

Due to the sensitive nature of the study, participants were emailed the consent form (see Appendix A) in advance. Upon entering the laboratory, participants were given a hard copy of the consent form. A research assistant explained the details of the consent form and gave participants a chance to ask questions. Upon agreement to participate in the study, participants were provided with an anonymous link to access the survey on Qualtrics. At the start of the survey, participants provided three memorable words (i.e., initials, mother's maiden name, last 3 digits of their phone number) to facilitate withdrawal from the study at a later date. Participants were presented with a demographics questionnaire (Appendix B) first and then completed the Perception of Rape Proclivity Scale (Appendix D).

Participants were then debriefed (see Appendix E), provided with support if needed, and given the opportunity to ask questions. For participating in this study, participants received 1 credit towards the Psychology course in which they were enrolled. The study was approximately 60 minutes long.

Measures

Demographic Questionnaire

A brief demographic questionnaire (Appendix B) was used to collect information regarding their age, sexual orientation, and ethnicity.

Rape Proclivity Measure

The Rape Proclivity Measure (Bohner, 1998, Appendix C) is designed to measure individuals' proclivity to rape. This measure consists of five acquaintance rape scenarios. Participants are asked to read each scenario carefully and imagine that they are in the same situation. Participants are asked how sexually aroused they would be in the situation on a 5-point Likert scale (1= not at all aroused to 5= very aroused), whether they would have behaved the same (1= certainly no to 5= certainly yes), and how much they would have enjoyed getting their way on a 5-point Likert scale (1= not at all to 5= very much). The following is an example of one of the scenarios:

“You have gone out a few times with a woman you met recently. One weekend you go to a film together and then back to your place. You have a few beers, listen to music and do a bit of petting. At a certain point your friend realises she has had too much to drink to be able to drive home. You say she can stay over with you, no problem. You are keen to grab this opportunity and sleep with her. She objects, saying you are rushing her and anyway she is too drunk. You don't let that put you off, you lie down on her and just do it.”

The responses on the five scenarios are summed with higher scores indicating greater tendency to commit rape. Overall, the Rape Proclivity Measure demonstrated excellent internal consistency in previous studies ($\alpha = .88$; Bohner, 2006).

Scenario 1. Scenario 1 entailed rape in a dating relationship. It asked participants to imagine inviting a woman they had been dating to their place. The two parties drink and engage in “petting.” The female in the scenario is too drunk to drive home and asks if she can stay over for the night. The male in the scenario is keen to take advantage of the situation and sleeps with her even though she objects, saying she is too drunk.

Scenario 2. Scenario 2 entails an acquaintance rape. It asks participants to imagine meeting an attractive woman in a club a while back. The man in the scenario is interested in taking things further with her. He invites her to his friends’ holiday home for a weekend and they have a great time together. On the last night, he attempts to sleep with her, but she repeatedly says no even after he tries to persuade her. She finally stops resisting and he proceeds to have sex with her.

Scenario 3. Scenario 3 entails a sexual harassment scenario. Participants were asked to imagine being a personnel manager who invites his female employee to dinner and takes her home afterwards. The male in the scenario sits next to the female on the sofa and starts kissing her. However, she tries to move away and resists his advances. He tells her that her career is going to be advanced if she is in good terms with her boss. She seems to accept his advances and stops resisting when he has sex with her.

Scenario 4. Scenario 4 involves a man meeting an attractive woman at a party. They start to dance and flirt. The woman invites the man to her house. She starts kissing

and fondling him. The man wants more, but the woman pushes him and asks him to stop. The man uses force to press her down and penetrates her.

Scenario 5. Scenario 5 entails a scenario that is more closely aligned with the prevalent rape scripts. It entails a man who helps a young woman when her car breaks down. To say thank you, she invites him to her house for dinner. The man has a pleasant time and gets the impression that she likes him. After dinner, the hostess expresses that she is tired and wants him to leave. The man refuses to leave, grabs her arms, and drags her to the bedroom. He throws her on the bed forcefully penetrates her.

Perception of Rape Proclivity Scale

The Perception of Rape Proclivity Scale (Appendix D) was developed for the purpose of this study to measure individuals' perception and understanding of the scenarios in the Rape Proclivity Measure. The Perception of Rape Proclivity Scale includes 32 open-ended questions regarding scenarios on the Rape Proclivity Measure. The survey includes questions on individual's understanding of each scenario, whether they think the interaction was consensual, and whether anyone in the scenario should have done things differently. Further, participants are asked to report any ambiguity they encountered while reading the questions. This allowed us to determine whether participants' interpretation of the question is consistent with what the construct aims to measure. If necessary, this information will be used to generate revisions to the current Rape Proclivity Measure in the event that there is wide variation in the interpretation of the scenarios.

Research Approach

Data-analytic Strategy

While a few quantitative research studies exploring the prevalence of the Rape Proclivity Measure and its relationship with other similar constructs, qualitative research in this area is lacking. Qualitative research refers to approaches to data analysis when the data is in the form of words, expression of opinion, and interpretations (Levit et al., 2018). It may further involve analyzing data by identifying patterns in responses and then developing an understanding of what the data entails based on those patterns (Wertz, 2021). Qualitative research allows researchers to investigate the results of quantitative research in greater depth and gain insight into participants' understanding of items (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Thus, to further explore participants' understanding of rape proclivity measures, a qualitative methodology was employed in the current study.

There are different approaches to qualitative research. Broadly speaking, all these different approaches seek to make sense of how participants understand and experience the researched phenomenon. The difference between different qualitative methods lies in how data is collected and interpreted. For the purpose of this study, content analysis was utilized. The subsequent section gives a brief description of content analysis and provides a rationale for selecting this particular research design.

Qualitative Content Analysis

A type of qualitative research method, content analysis refers to a systematic approach to describing, quantifying, and reducing data (Weber, 1990). The aim of content analysis is to gain a rich and broad appreciation for the phenomenon being studied (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008). It is a descriptive method in which the researcher can transcribe participants' answers to codes, and make inferences and conclusions about the responses,

and describe patterns found in the data. More specifically, content analysis allows for participants' responses to be refined into fewer content-related categories (Weber, 1990). The purpose of the current content analysis was to further understand participants' understanding and interpretations of scenarios on the Rape Proclivity Measure. Participants were asked open-ended questions regarding how they perceive each scenario and their responses were categorized and described in themes. This allows for making inferences regarding participants' perceptions of scenarios included in the Rape Proclivity Measure.

Items/Themes

To allow for richer themes closely suited to participant's responses, categories were developed post hoc rather than a priori. More specifically, I reviewed participants' responses to capture the fundamental concepts and to classify them into distinct categories. Two main groups of questions were devised for this purpose. The first group included questions that examined individuals' understanding of the rape scenarios (e.g., What's your understanding of what is happening in this scenario?; Do you think both parties consented to have sex?). The second group included questions that examined the clarity of the scenarios (e.g., How old do you think the female is?; Is there anything that is unclear in this scenario?). These categories were not necessarily mutually exclusive, meaning that participants' responses may have been included in more than one category if they included various responses. Only the primary researcher conducted the qualitative analysis for this study, hence there were no reliability analyses.

Results

The aim of the study was to gain a better understanding of how participants interpreted rape scenarios and to ensure that the scenarios are clearly worded. This section will outline the results for each specific scenario on the Rape Proclivity Measure, followed by a more general presentation of the results.

Scenario 1

When asked about their understanding of what is happening in the scenario, responses ($N=100$) fell into four distinct categories. The majority of participants ($n = 81$, 81.0%) described the scenario as an example of sexual violence (e.g., “sexual assault”). Ten (10.0%) participants described the situation in a way that justified the male behaviour (e.g., “he misperceived the situation as consensual”). Four (4.0%) participants described the scenario in a way that minimized the perpetrator’s behaviour (e.g., “He rushed her”). Finally, five (5.0%) participants described the situation as consensual sex (e.g., “two people having sexual intercourse”). See Table 1 for more details.

Table 1

Participants’ Understanding of Rape Scenario 1, ($N = 100$)

Category	Example quote	<i>n</i> (%)
Sexual Violence	Rape	46 (46.0)
	Non-consensual sex	15 (15.0)
	Sexual assault	11 (11.0)
	Forced sex	9 (9.0)
Justified Perpetration	He lost control	5 (5.0)
	He misperceived the situation as consensual	5 (5.0)
Minimized Perpetration	He acted selfishly	2 (2.0)
	He rushed her into sex	2 (2.0)

Participants were asked if they think both parties consented to have sex in this scenario. Responses ($N = 97$) fell into three distinct categories. The majority of participants ($n = 89, 91.8\%$) believed that the woman in this scenario did not consent to having sex, five (5.1%) participants believed both parties gave consent to have sex, and three (3.1%) participants were not sure if consent was obtained.

Similarly, when participants were asked whether both parties were interested in having sex in this scenario, responses ($n = 98$) fell into three distinct categories. The majority of participants ($n = 90, 91.8\%$) believed that the woman was not interested in having sex, five (5.1%) participants believed both parties were interested in engaging in sexual intercourse, and three (3.1%) participants were unsure if both parties showed interest in having sex.

Participants were asked whether they think either party should have done something differently in the scenario. Responses ($N = 113$) fell into three distinct categories. Seventy-five (66.4%) participants believed the male in the scenario should have done something differently (e.g., “he should have respected her decision”). Thirty-four (31.1%) participants believed the female in the scenario should have acted differently (e.g., “she should not have been drinking”). Four (3.5%) participants believed that there was nothing that any parties should have done differently. See Table 2 for more information.

Table 2

Breakdown of Responses to the Question “Do you think either party should have done something differently?” (N = 113)

Category	Example quote	n (%)
Male	Should not have forced sex	39 (34.5)
	Should not have respected her decision	29 (25.6)
	Should have called a Taxi for her	7 (6.2)
Female	Should not have stayed over at his place	15 (13.3)
	Should not have been drinking	10 (8.8)
	Should not have gone to his place	5 (4.4)
	Should have refused his advancing	4 (3.5)
No one	No one is at fault	4 (3.5)

Participants were asked to report how old they think the female was. Responses ($N = 96$) fell into three distinct categories. The majority of participants ($n = 89, 92.7\%$) believed the female was 16 years or older, four (4.2%) participants believed the female was younger than 16, and three (3.1%) participants were unsure and reported that the female could be any age.

When asked if they think anything, including the wording, seems unclear in the scenario, responses ($N = 99$) fell into three distinct categories. Sixty-eight (68.7%) participants did not think there was anything stated unclearly in the scenario, 23 (23.2%) individuals did not understand what the word petting meant in the scenario, and eight (8.1%) participants found the female’s behaviour confusing and asked for more clarification. More specifically, they wanted to know why she agreed to drink alcohol and stay over.

Scenario 2

When asked about their understanding of what was happening in the scenario, responses ($N = 102$) fell into four main categories. Seventy (68.6%) participants interpreted this scenario as an incident of sexual violence, including rape, non-consensual sex, forced sex, and sexual assault. Sixteen (15.8%) participants responded in a way that blamed the victim in the scenario (e.g., “she does not want to seem easy”). Two (1.9%) individuals responded in a way that minimized the perpetrator’s behaviour in the scenario stating that “he was too attracted to her.” Fourteen (13.7%) participants did not identify anything wrong in this situation (e.g., “mutual attraction/connection.”) See Table 3 for more details.

Table 3

Participants’ Understanding of Rape Scenario 2 ($N = 102$)

Category	Category	<i>n</i> (%)
Sexual Violence	Rape	25 (24.6)
	Non-consensual sex	19 (18.6)
	Forced sex	12 (11.8)
	Using fear to obtain sex	11 (10.8)
	Sexual assault	3 (2.9)
Blamed the Victim	She failed to stop him	7 (6.9)
	She wants sex but does not want to appear easy	4 (3.9)
	She wants sex but is shy/nervous	2 (1.9)
	She wants sex but not ready	3 (2.9)
Justified Perpetration	He was too attracted to her	2 (1.9)
Consensual	Sexual intercourse	10 (9.8)
	Mutual attraction	2 (1.9)
	She is returning a favour	2 (1.9)

When asked whether they think both parties consented to have sex in this scenario, responses ($N = 100$) fell into three categories. Most participants ($n = 80$, 80.0%) did not think the scenario was consensual, nine (9.0%) participants were not sure whether consent was obtained, and eleven (11.0%) participants thought both parties consented to have sex.

Further, regarding being interested in having sex, responses ($N = 100$) fell into 3 main categories. Seventy-two (72.0%) participants did not think both parties wanted to have sex, seven (7.0%) believed that the female is undecided, seven (7.0%) felt that it was not clear whether both individuals were interested in sex, and 14 (14.0%) decided that both parties were interested in having sex in this scenario.

When asked whether they think either person should have done something differently, responses ($N = 109$) fell into three different categories. Seventy (64.2%) participants thought the male should have done something differently, including “he should have respected her decision,” and “he should not have forced her to have sex.” Thirty-two (29.3%) participants believed the female in the scenario should have acted differently (e.g., she should have resisted, she should have left, she should have called for help). Seven (6.5%) participants believed that no one should have done something differently. See Table 4 for more information.

Table 4

Breakdown of Responses to the Question “Do You Think Either Party Should Have Done Something Differently?” ($N = 109$)

Category	Example quote	n (%)
----------	---------------	---------

Male	Should have respected her decision not to have sex	41 (37.6)
	Should not have forced her to have sex	29 (26.6)
Female	Should have resisted more	25 (22.9)
	Should have left	5 (4.5)
	Should have called for help	2 (1.8)
No one	No one is at fault	7 (6.4)

When asked what the female’s “lack of resistance” meant, responses ($N = 95$) fell into two distinct categories. Sixty-six (69.5%) participants viewed women as victims who had no choice (e.g., “she was too scared to fight back”). Twenty-nine (30.5%) participants believed that a female’s lack of resistance meant interest in sex (e.g., “she enjoys teasing”). See Table 5 for more information.

Table 5

Views on Female’s “Lack of Resistance in Scenario 2” ($N = 95$)

Category	Example quote	n (%)
Victim not interested in sex	Too scared to fight back	46 (48.4)
	Did not think she has a choice	20 (21.0)
Victim interest in sex	Wanted to have sex	19 (20.0)
	Confused about what she wants	4 (4.2)
	Enjoyed being chased by him	4 (4.2)
	Enjoyed teasing him	1 (1.1)
	She is shy	1 (1.1)

When asked how old they think the female is in the scenario, responses ($N = 98$) fell into 3 distinct categories. Ninety-five (96.9%) participants thought she was over 16,

two (2.0%) participants believed the female could be younger than 16 years old, and 1 (1.0%) participant reported that she could be any age.

When asked whether there was anything unclear or vague in the scenario, responses ($N = 83$) fell into two distinct categories. Sixty (72.3%) participants thought there was nothing that seemed unclear in the scenario. However, twenty-three (27.7%) participants indicated that they wanted to understand a female's behaviour (e.g., “why play hard to get”). See Table 6 for more information.

Table 6

Breakdown of Responses to the Question “Did You Find Anything Unclear About The Scenario?” ($N=83$)

Category	Example quote	<i>n</i> (%)
No	Everything seems clear in this scenario	60 (72.2)
Female’s Behaviour	Why did she allow him to have sex with her?	11 (13.2)
	Why did she change her mind?	6 (7.2)
	Why did she spend the night at his place?	5 (6.0)
	Why did she play hard to get?	1 (1.2)

Scenario 3

Participants were asked about their understanding of what is happening in the scenario. Responses ($N = 99$) fell into three distinct categories. Most participants ($n = 84$, 85.7%) described the scenario as an incident of sexual violence (e.g., “sexual assault”). Fifteen (11.2%) participants believed the scenario to be an indication of consensual sex (e.g., “females engaged in sexual activity to get promoted”). See Table 7 for more information.

Table 7

Participants' Understanding of Rape Scenario 3 (N=99)

Category	Category	<i>n</i> (%)
Sexual Violence	Sexual exploitation	56 (57.1)
	Sexual coercion	18 (18.3)
	Rape	9 (9.1)
	Sexual harassment	1 (1.0)
	Sexual assault	1 (1.0)
	Consensual	She agreed to sex to get promoted
	Sexual intercourse	4 (3.1)

When asked whether both parties were interested in having sex, responses ($N = 96$) fell into two distinct categories. The majority of participants ($n = 83, 86.5\%$) did not think the female in the scenario was interested in having sex. However, thirteen (13.5%) participants felt that both parties mentioned in this scenario were interested in having sex. When asked whether both parties consented to have sex, thirty-three (34.4%) participants felt that both parties consented to have sex. Sixty-three (65.6%) participants believed that the female in this scenario did not consent to sex.

Participants were asked whether they think anyone in the scenario should have done something differently. Responses ($N = 100$) fell into four distinct categories. Forty-six (46.0%) participants believed that the male should have acted differently (e.g., “should not have abused his power to obtain sex”). However, forty-four (44.0%) participants believed the female in this scenario should have done differently (e.g., “she should not have used sex to get a promotion”). Five (5.0%) participants did not think either party should have acted differently, and five (5.0%) participants were not sure. See table 8 for more information.

Table 8

Breakdown of Responses to the Question “Do you think either party should have done something differently?” (N = 100)

Category	Example quote	n (%)
Male	Should not have abused his power to obtain sex	42 (42.0)
	Should have backed off when asked to do so	4 (4.0)
Female	Should have been clearer about her intentions	26 (26.0)
	Should not have used sex to get promoted	13 (13.0)
	Should have called for help	5 (5.0)
No one	No one is at fault	5 (5.0)
Not Sure	Not sure what could have been done differently	5 (5.0)

When asked how old you think the female is in this scenario, responses ($N = 98$) fell into two distinct categories. The majority of participants ($n = 95, 96.9\%$) believed that the female is over 16. However, three (3.1%) participants believed that the female was under 16 years of age.

Participants were asked whether there is anything that seems unclear in the scenario. Responses ($N = 93$) fell into three distinct categories. The majority of participants ($n = 76, 81.7\%$) believed there was nothing unclear about the scenario. Ten (10.7%) participants found the wording of the scenario ambiguous. Seven (7.5%) participants believed the female's behaviour was unclear (e.g., “did she want to have sex?”). For more information, see Table 9.

Table 9

Breakdown of Responses to the Question “Did you find anything unclear about the scenario?” (N = 93)

Category	Example quote	n (%)
No	Everything seems clear in this scenario	76 (81.7)
Ambiguous Wording	“Get on with female staff specifically well”	4 (4.3)
	“Being on good terms with”	3 (3.2)
	“She might ask you in”	1 (1.1)
	“Moving out of reach”	1 (1.1)
	“Career prospects”	1 (1.1)
Female’s Behaviour	Whether she wanted to have sex	3 (3.2)
	Whether she led him	3 (3.2)
	Whether she was sexually attracted towards him	1 (1.1)

Scenario 4

Responses to what is happening in the scenario ($N = 100$) fell into 4 distinct categories. Sixty-Seven (67.0%) participants interpreted the scenario as an incident of sexual violence (e.g., “sexual assault”). Twenty-four (24.0%) participants described the scenario in a way that blamed the victim (e.g., “she led him on”). Four (4.0%) participants described the scenario in a way that justified the male’s behaviour (e.g., “the man could not control his sexual urges”). Two (2.0%) participants minimized the perpetrator’s behaviour (e.g., “he misunderstood the situation”). Finally, three (3.0%) participants described the scenario as consensual (e.g., “mutual sexual attraction”). See Table 10 for more information.

Table 10

Participants' Understanding of Rape Scenario 4 (N = 100)

Category	Example quote	n (%)
Sexual Violence	Rape	45 (45.0)
	Non-consensual sex	12 (12.0)
	Forced sex	5 (5.0)
	Sexual assault	5 (5.0)
Blamed the Victim	She is confused/conflicted	13 (13.0)
	She led him on	6 (6.0)
	She teased him	5 (5.0)
Justified the perpetrator	He could not control his urges	4 (4.0)
Minimized perpetration	He misunderstood the situation	2 (2.0)
Consensual	Sexual intercourse	2 (2.0)
	Mutual sexual attraction	1 (1.0)

Participants were then asked whether they think the female invited the male with the intention of having sex. Responses to this question ($N = 105$) fell into 4 distinct categories. Fifty-five (52.4%) participants responded yes, twenty-four (22.9%) participants responded no, twenty-three (21.9) participants responded probably, and three (2.8%) were not sure.

When asked whether they think both parties consented to sex, responses ($N = 96$) fell into three distinct categories. Most participants ($n = 79$, 82.3%) believed that consent was not given by both parties. Nine (9.4%) participants believed both parties consented to sex, and eight (8.3%) participants believed the female initially consented to sex but then revoked her consent.

Further, participants were asked whether they think both parties wanted to have sex. Responses to this question ($N = 93$) fell into three distinct categories. Most

participants ($n = 70$, 75.3%) believed that both parties did not want to have sex. Eighteen (19.3%) participants believed both parties wanted to have sex, and five (5.4%) participants were not sure.

Participants were asked whether they think anyone in the scenario should have done something differently. Responses to this question ($N = 98$) fell into four distinct categories. Most participants ($n = 67$, 68.4%) believed the male should have done something differently (e.g., “he should have stopped when asked”). Twenty-three (23.4%) participants believed the female should have done something differently (e.g., “she should not have invited the man over”). Four (4.1%) participants believed that no one should have done anything differently, and three (3.1%) participants believed they were not sure if anyone depicted in the scenario should have done something differently.

Table 11 includes more information.

Table 11

Breakdown of Responses to the Question “Do you think either party should have done something differently?” ($N=98$)

Category	Example quote	n (%)
Male	Should have stopped when asked to	40 (40.8)
	Should not have forced himself	24 (24.5)
	Should have asked for consent	3 (3.01)
Female	Should not have invited him over	12 (12.2)
	Should have been clearer	5 (5.1)
	Should have called for help	4 (4.1)
	Should not have teased him	2 (2.0)
No one	No one should have done anything differently	5 (4.1)

Not sure	Maybe	3 (3.1)
----------	-------	---------

Participants were asked what they think female's resistance meant in the scenario. Responses ($N=104$) fell into two distinct categories. Most participants ($n = 87, 83.7\%$) believed the female pushed the man away because he was not interested in having sex with him (e.g., “she does not want to have sex”). However, seventeen (16.3%) participants believed the female was interested in having sex but failed to refuse sex for some other reason (e.g., “she is teasing him”). For more information see Table 12.

Table 12

Breakdown of Responses to the Question “What do you think female’s resistance means?” ($N=104$)

Category	Example quote	<i>n</i> (%)
Not interested in sex	She does not want to have sex	69 (66.3)
	She changed her mind	18 (17.3)
Interested in sex but	She is teasing him	8 (7.7)
	She has a boyfriend	4 (3.8)
	Does not want to seem easy	3 (2.9)
	Alcohol/drugs wore off	2 (1.9)

Further, to ensure that the scenario is worded clearly, individuals were asked to guess how old the female was. Most participants ($n = 91, 92.9\%$) believed that the female was over 16 years old, and seven (7.1%) participants shared that the female could be any age.

When asked whether there is anything that seemed clear in the scenario presented to them, response ($N = 94$) fell into four distinct categories. Most participants ($n = 69$, 75.5%) did not find anything unclear about the scenario. Sixteen (17.0%) participants found female’s reasoning for changing her mind to have sex confusing. Three (3.0%) participants felt that the female’s age was not clearly stated in the scenario, and three (3.6%) participants did not understand what the word “fondle” meant.

Scenario 5

Participants were asked to share their understanding of what the scenario entails. Responses ($N = 98$) fell into two distinct categories. The majority of participants ($n = 92$, 93.9%) described the scenario as an incident of sexual violence (e.g., “rape”). Further, five (5.1%) participants described the situation in a way that minimized the male behaviour. For more information, see Table 13.

Table 13

Participants’ Understanding of Rape Scenario 5 ($N = 98$)

Category	Example quote	<i>n (%)</i>
Sexual Violence	Rape	76 (77.6)
	Sexual assault	6 (6.1)
	Forced sex	6 (6.1)
	Non-consensual sex	4 (4.1)
Minimized Perpetration	He misunderstood the situation	5 (5.1)

When asked if both parties consented to have sex, responses ($N = 96$) fell into three distinct categories. The majority of participants ($n = 93$, 96.9%) indicated that both individuals did not consent to have sex in this scenario. Two (2.1%) participants thought

both individuals in the scenario consented to have sex, and one (1.0%) participant was not sure whether both parties consented to sex.

When asked if both parties wanted to have sex, responses ($n = 96$) fell into two distinct categories. The majority of participants ($n = 94, 97.9%$) did not think that both individuals wanted to have sex. However, two (2.1%) participants thought both parties in the scenario were interested in having sex.

Further, participants were asked whether they think anyone in the scenario should have done something differently. Responses ($N = 102$) fell into three distinct categories. Sixty-seven (65.7%) participants thought the male should have done something differently (e.g., he should have left when he was asked to do so). Thirty-one (30.4%) participants believed that the woman should have done something differently (e.g., “she should not have invited him to her place”). Four participants (3.9%) did not think anyone should have acted differently in this scenario. For more information see Table 14.

Table 14

Breakdown of Responses to the Question “Do you think either party should have done something differently?” ($N=102$)

Category	Example quote	n (%)
Male	Should have left when asked to	42 (41.1)
	Should not have forced himself	25 (24.5)
Female	Should not have invited him over	27 (26.4)
	Should have called for help	4 (3.9)
No one	No one should have done anything differently	4 (3.9)

Participants were asked to report how old they think the female in this scenario is. All participants who responded to this question ($n = 97$) believed the female is older than 16 years old.

When asked if there is anything in the situation or the wording of the scenario that seems unclear, responses ($N = 96$) fell into 3 distinct categories. The majority of participants ($n = 92, 95.8\%$) did not find anything unclear about the situation. Further, two (2.1) participants thought it was not clearly stated why the male in the scenario misperceived the situation. Also, two (2.1%) participants were not clear about why the female invited him to her house.

Across the scenarios, the majority of participants (67.8% to 93.0%) described scenarios included in the Rape Proclivity Measure in a way that fit the description of sexual violence. However, there were discrepancies in how participants perceived each scenario. There were some scenarios that elicited more responses that fit the category of sexual violence. Table 15 includes more information.

Table 15

Percentage of Participants who Perceived Scenarios as an Incident of Sexual Violence

Scenario	<i>N</i>	%
Scenario 1	81	81.0
Scenario 2	70	68.6
Scenario 3	89	85.8
Scenario 4	67	67.0
Scenario 5	92	93.9

Discussion

This study took a qualitative approach to examine individuals' understanding of scenarios included in the Rape Proclivity Measure. Results provide an interesting perspective into how participants viewed five non-consensual sexual scenarios. The majority of participants (67.0% to 93.9%) understood the scenarios as an indication of sexual violence. However, there were variations in how participants perceived each individual scenario. For instance, 68.6% of individuals perceived the second and fourth scenarios as an incident of sexual violence, whereas 93.9% determined the fifth scenario as rape.

Examining the results further indicates that scenarios such as the last one, where the perpetrator was a stranger to the victim and used a degree of physical abuse to obtain sex, were more likely to be labelled as rape. For example, only 24.2% of participants used the word rape to describe the second scenario which entailed acquaintance rape. However, 77.6% of participants identified the scenario that included stranger rape as rape.

Match and Motivation Model

These results are consistent with previous findings where individuals were found to be more likely to label instances of stranger rape as incidents of sexual violence (Kahn et al., 2003). More specifically, the results of this study can be explained by the match and motivation model. As explained in earlier sections, according to the match and motivation model, how an individual labels an event is determined by the match between the individual's scripts and the event experienced. A rape script is an individual's perception of what typically occurs during a rape scenario. The common rape script in North American culture entails a male stranger violently and forcefully attacking a

female who has not alluded to sexual interest (Littleton & Axom, 2003). Therefore, individuals are more likely to label those incidents as rape. The same pattern emerged in the results of this study. Participants were more likely to label the last scenario, which included a stranger using physical force to obtain sex, as an incident of sexual violence. However, scenarios that involve acquaintance rape (i.e., scenario 2), or the victim drinking alcohol prior to being raped (scenario 4) were less likely to be labelled as incidents of sexual violence by participants.

Further, participants were asked to report whether they think any of the parties depicted in the scenarios were interested in having sex and if they both gave consent to engage in sex. Responses to these two questions were very similar in all of the scenarios, except for scenarios that involved acquaintances sex (i.e., scenarios 2 and 4). For scenario 2, which involved acquaintance rape, 20% believed the female gave consent. However, 28.0% of participants believed that the female in the scenario may have been or was interested in having sex, even though she was clearly depicted as verbally refusing to have sex. Similarly, for scenario 4, which involves an acquaintance rape where the victim invites the perpetrator to her house, 18% of participants believed that the female did consent to sex. However, 26.7% of participants reported that they think the female may have been or was interested in having sex despite the fact that the female is depicted as pushing the man away while saying she wants him to stop.

These beliefs are consistent with socially assigned gender roles that perceive men as the initiator of sex and women as gatekeepers of sex (e.g., Edgar & Fitzpatrick, 1993). Because women are believed to be sex gatekeepers, they may be perceived as hesitant to say yes too quickly or as refusing sex even when they are really interested in sex. These

results are not surprising given that previous research found college students' views of sexual scenarios to be consistent with traditional sexual scripts (Humphreys et al., 2007). Similarly, the emerging themes in this study seem to endorse stereotypical beliefs about women's and men's roles in relation to sexual behaviour.

Endorsement of Rape Supportive Beliefs

Furthermore, when asked whether any of the parties involved should have done something differently, many participants (23.0% to 44.0% depending on the scenario) believed that the female should have acted differently. For example, that she should not have invited him over, she should not have gotten drunk, she should not have teased him. The emerging themes are consistent with prevalent rape myths. A common theme in rape myths is that the victim is at least somewhat to blame for the incident of rape or that they could have somehow prevented being raped (Peterson & Muehlenhard, 2004). For instance, some forms of rape beliefs blame women for behaving in a way that invites sexual violence (e.g., if a woman is raped while she is drunk, she is somewhat responsible). As previously stated, rape myths can narrow the definition of rape and how individuals perceive sexual violence. The same rape myths have been communicated by many participants in this study, blaming the women in these scenarios for inviting rape or not doing more to prevent rape.

Content Validity

The second main goal of the study was to determine if the Rape Proclivity Measure has content validity. Overall, participants have a good understanding that the scenarios involve non-consensual sex. Further, the second group of questions examined the clarity of scenarios (How old do you think the female is? Is there anything that is

unclear in this scenario?) to investigate item ambiguity and ensure that each item is clearly understood. When asked whether there is anything unclear in the scenarios, most participants (68.7% to 95.8% depending on the scenario) reported that items were worded clearly and that they understood what each scenario entailed. Further examination of responses revealed that most of the ambiguity reported by participants revolved around the female's behaviour. For example, for scenario 2, 27.7% could not understand why the female allowed the male to have sex with her. This was unexpected as I expected answers regarding ambiguous wording of the scenarios. However, it goes to show the extent of rape myth beliefs that prevails in society to the extent that most answers regarding ambiguity of the scenarios involved questioning female's behaviour.

Overall, most respondents showed a clear understanding that the scenarios entail non-consensual sex, and did not find wording of the scenarios ambiguous. More specifically, it is safe to conclude that participants' interpretation of the questions is what the construct aims to measure, and the measure is worded clearly. Therefore, it is determined that the Rape Proclivity Measure reflects good content validity. Given that most participants had an understanding that the various scenarios entail incidents of sexual violence, and there were no indications of significant ambiguity in the scenarios presented, the original Rape Proclivity Measure will be used in the further studies of this dissertation.

Limitations and Future Directions

The current study provides insight into students' interpretation of rape scenarios and examines whether rape proclivity measures the intended construct by assessing whether participants identify the scenarios as non-consensual, or find the scenarios clear.

However, there are several limitations to this study. First, given the qualitative nature of the study, and the relatively small sample size, the data may not be statistically generalizable to all university students. Future research should include bigger sample sizes to ascertain whether the same findings will emerge.

In addition, data was collected from students attending one university, and thus the result might not be generalizable to other students or the general population. It is important that future research is conducted at numerous universities and colleges across communities to ensure the generalizability of the findings. Further, it is likely that university students receive more education regarding consent and what constitute sexual violence. Therefore, to get a more accurate picture of how scenarios on the Rape Proclivity Measure are perceived, it would be valuable to include samples of community men to include a more diverse sample and allow for generalizability of findings.

Lastly, the data has been coded by the main researcher only and thus interrater reliability cannot be determined. Future research should examine and interpret data using multiple trained coders to ensure that the data is coded consistently and that there is interrater reliability. Computer-aided analysis may also be used to improve reliability of coding.

Conclusion

Despite its' limitations, the current study sheds light on participants' perspectives on sexual violence and their interpretations of rape scenarios. It also improves understanding of problematic attitudes and beliefs regarding rape that may lead to perpetration of sexual violence. The information from this study can inform strategies

designed to prevent sexual violence as it identifies the prevalence of problematic beliefs regarding sexual violence.

Further, the results from this study reveal that most individuals had a sufficient understanding of each scenario on the Rape Proclivity Measure. Even though there were discrepancies in how individuals perceived different scenarios, the majority of participants identified all scenarios as incidents of sexual violence. Furthermore, as the scenarios are intended to assess proclivity for sexual violence, it is expected that at least some individuals being assessed will view the scenarios as acceptable (i.e., those that may have a proclivity). Also, most participants did not find the scenarios to be ambiguously worded. Therefore, it would be safe to conclude that the Rape Proclivity Measure is clear, comprehensible and has good content validity.

Chapter 3: Rape Proclivity and Related Constructs

One way to determine if rape proclivity plays a meaningful role in perpetration of sexual violence is to identify how closely rape proclivity scores relate to scores on other constructs known to be related to sexual offending. The following section reviews the literature on some of the factors related to the perpetration of sexual violence, including deviant sexual arousal (more specifically arousal to coercive sexual behaviour) and distorted cognition (rape and antisocial).

Deviant Sexual Arousal

As previously mentioned in the introduction chapter, deviant sexual interest involves arousal to sexual behaviour including a nonconsenting victim or minors. A number of studies have attempted to examine the correlates of sexual violence by examining the relationship between deviant sexual interests and perpetration of sexual offences (Abel et al., 1977; Barbaree et al., 1979; Hows, 1998). Often, these studies present images, audio or video depictions of coercive and non-coercive sexual interactions to individuals. Participants' level of sexual arousal is determined by either subjective level of reported arousal or changes in erectile responses (i.e., Phallometry) during the presentation of each scenario. Individuals' relative preference for rape is then measured by a Rape Index (Abel et al., 1997), which is derived by average arousal to rape stimuli relative to average arousal to consenting stimuli. Results indicate that individuals who have a history of engaging in sexual violence against women show different patterns of sexual arousal (i.e., higher arousal) to rape scenarios than those without this history (Abel et al., 1997; Lalumiere et al., 2003).

There is evidence to suggest that individuals convicted of rape show greater sexual arousal to stimuli depicting coercive sex. In a meta-analytic review of the literature, Lalumiere and Quinsey (1994) reviewed 16 studies with a total sample size of 415 individuals convicted of rape and 192 individuals not convicted of a sexual offence. Results indicated that individuals convicted of sexual offences were significantly more aroused to stimuli depicting rape than men who were not convicted of rape. Similarly, in a more recent review of literature, Lalumiere et al. (2003) compared erectile responses of 24 rapists and 30 non-rapists (including community men and violent non-sexual offenders) to audio depictions of consensual and non-consensual sex. Results indicated that the erectile response of community men and violent offenders were not significantly different from one another and both groups exhibited different responses from rapists. More specifically, individuals convicted of rape showed greater arousal to rape scenarios.

In addition, unlike other men, sexually aggressive men fail to show inhibitory responses to violence and coercion cues depicted in rape scenarios. Studies have found that individuals convicted of rape show equal arousal levels to rape and consensual sex scenarios (Barbaree & Marshal, 1991; Barbaree et al., 1979). For example, Lohr et al. (1997) examined penile arousal response of 24 male students. Using the Sexual Experience Survey (Koss & Oros, 1982), they gathered information regarding past perpetration of sexual violence. All men were then presented with audio depictions of different sexual scenarios. Results indicated that men with a self-reported history of sexual coercion showed significantly greater physiological and subjective arousal in response to scenarios involving sexual coercion. Furthermore, the introduction of force and coercion into sexual scenarios inhibited sexual arousal among individuals without a

history of sexual coercion. However, men with a history of sexual coercion showed equal level of arousal to both consenting and nonconsenting sexual scenarios. Barbaree et al. (1979) interpreted these findings using an inhibitory model of rape arousal to suggest that individuals with a history of rape fail to show the same inhibitory response to the depiction of violence and suffering.

There is evidence to suggest that arousal to sexually coercive behaviour can be a risk factor for committing sexual offences. For example, in a meta-analytic review of 82 recidivism studies that included data from 29,450 individuals convicted of sexual offences, Hanson and Morton-Bourgon (2005) found deviant sexual preferences to be one of the strongest indicators of sexual recidivism.

Similarly, deviant arousal is related to the perpetration of sexual offences among men not convicted of sexual offences. As part of a study examining the mediating role of self-talk in the relationship between sexual arousal and sexual aggression, Porter and Critelli (1994) examined arousal to rape among 92 male undergraduate students. Based on the participants' self-reported history of sexual violence, they assigned them to groups of high sexual aggression (SA), low SA, and non-SA. Participants were randomly assigned to listen to one of two audio recordings that depicted either a consensual sexual scenario or a date rape scenario within each group. Participants were then asked to report their thoughts and arousal level on a 7- point scale (1 indicating no arousal and 7 indicating extreme arousal). Results indicated that participants with a self-reported history of engaging in sexual violence did not differ significantly in their arousal level to each scenario. This means that those with a history of sexual violence were equally

aroused to both consensual and date rape scenarios. However, individuals with no self-reported history of sexual violence were significantly less aroused to date rape scenarios.

Rape Proclivity and Arousal to Rape

Understanding the relationship between arousal to rape and self-reported tendency to perpetrate sexual violence is important in determining whether rape proclivity is associated with risk factors for sexual offending. Studies have examined the relationship between rape proclivity and other risk factors for sexual offending, such as rape supportive cognition. However, there are only a limited number of studies that have examined the role of arousal to deviant sexual behaviour and rape proclivity. For example, in a study aiming to understand the relationship between arousal to rape and proclivity to rape, Malamuth and Check (1983) asked 145 male university students to complete questionnaires regarding personality variables, past sexual behaviour, power as sexual motivation, and rape proclivity. Participants then listened to audio stimuli depicting either consenting or coercive sex. Participants' level of physiological arousal was measured using penile tumescence and self-report. Results indicated that individuals with higher rape proclivity were more aroused to coercive scenarios than the consenting ones. In a study examining the mediating role between rape supportive cognition and rape proclivity, Chiroro et al. (2004) found that anticipated sexual arousal to rape was weakly correlated with a self-reported tendency to engage in sexually violent behaviour. Even though anticipated sexual arousal is not the same construct as experiencing sexual arousal, this was one of the only studies to examine the concepts related to sexual arousal and rape proclivity.

Distorted Cognitions

Research findings in the area of risk assessment, treatment, and the prevention of sexual offending highlight the role that cognitive distortions play in sexual violence. Cognitive distortions are viewed as thinking patterns regarding problematic sexual behaviour such as rape or child molestation that minimize, rationalize, or justify perpetration of sexual offending (Abel et al., 1989; Ward 2000) and are believed to be important risk factors for sexual offending (Helmus et al., 2013). It has been suggested that endorsement of cognitive distortions may maintain or increase the likelihood that an individual may engage in sexually violent behaviour (Beech et al., 2012; Thornton, 2002; Ward & Beech, 2006).

Cognitive distortions are believed to arise from deeper cognitive structures, referred to as implicit theories, or schemas, which shape an individual's perception and interpretation of their interpersonal world (Mann & Beech, 2003; Ward & Casey, 2010; Ward et al., 2006). Ward (2000) theorized that individuals who have committed sexual offences use specific schemas to process and explain their interpersonal experiences, including the victims' intentions and behaviour. More specifically, Polaschek and Ward (2002) proposed a set of five schemas that are commonly held among individuals convicted of sexual offences: (1) Dangerous World (e.g., the world is a hostile place and people inflict harm on each other to promote their own interests); (2) Entitlement; (e.g., men are entitled to get their sexual needs met when they demand); (3) Male Sex Drive is Uncontrollable (e.g., women who wear revealing clothing should expect to get raped); (4) Women as Sex Objects (e.g., women constantly seek sex even when they are forced into it); and (5) Women are Unknowable (e.g., women say no when they really mean yes). Polaschek and Gannon (2004) later found support for each of these schemas using

interviews with a sample of individuals convicted of rape. These schemas are common targets in treatment programs designed for individuals who have committed sexual offences as they are believed to be related to sexual offending (Hanson & Harris, 2000).

A closer examination of schemas proposed by Polaschek and Ward (2000) reveals that each one represents either rape supportive beliefs and attitudes (i.e., Women as Sex Objects, Women are Unknowable, Male Sex Drive is Uncontrollable) or more general antisocial beliefs and attitudes (i.e., Entitlement, Dangerous World). Similarly, other studies have consistently found that individuals who perpetrated acts of sexual violence endorsed distorted cognitions that are both uniquely related to sexual offences and to general antisocial cognition related to offending behaviour (McCrary et al., 2008; Ward et al., 2001). Specifically, men who sexually offend against women demonstrate antisocial cognitions that justify general criminal behaviour (e.g., Bohner & Dickel, 2011) as well as distorted sexual beliefs (i.e., rape supportive cognition) that minimize and excuse sexually violent behaviour (Thornton, 2002).

Rape Supportive Cognitions

Rape supportive cognitions refer to widely held beliefs, attitudes, and stereotypes that rationalize and justify rape (Burt, 1980; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994; Maruna & Mann, 2006). For example, Knight, Sims Knight, and Brown-Mc Bride (2009) defined rape supportive cognition (i.e., rape attitudes) as beliefs and stereotypes regarding sexual roles, rape, victims of rape, and women, in general, which serve to justify or minimize sexual violence. Cognitions supportive of perpetration of sexual violence are referred to in the literature as rape supportive attitudes, rape myths, or rape supportive cognitions.

For the purpose of this dissertation, the term rape supportive cognitions will be used to refer to problematic beliefs regarding sexual violence.

There is a large body of research indicating that rape supportive cognitions play a role in the onset and maintenance of sexually violent behaviour (DeGue & DiLillo, 2004; Lanier, 2001). Rape supportive cognitions are also found to be related to sexual recidivism among men convicted of sexual offences (Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2004; Helmus et al., 2012; Mann et al., 2010). For example, Hanson and Harris (2000) found that compared to non-recidivists, recidivists were more likely to justify and minimize perpetration of sexual violence. Further, in a more recent metaanalytic review, Helmus et al. (2012) found a small but significant relationship between rape supportive cognition and sexual recidivism.

Although this relationship between rape supportive cognition and convictions for sexual violence is concerning, some have argued that those convicted of sexual offences may be motivated to offer such justifications as a means of explaining their behaviour post hoc, as opposed to distorted cognitions playing an explanatory role in offending (Mann & Hollin, 2007). Examining the relationship between rape supportive cognition and perpetration of sexual violence among men who have not been convicted of sexual offences could be less subject to bias since these individuals may not have the same motivation to justify or excuse sexually violent behaviour as men convicted of rape. Further, among men who have not been convicted of sexual offending, rape supportive cognitions are found to be associated with the perpetration of self-reported sexual violence (Koss et al, 1985). For example, in an attempt to examine common characteristics among sexually aggressive men, Rapaport and Burkhart (1984)

administered a set of questionnaires to 201 undergraduate males. These measures consisted of those assessing general sex role beliefs, and those measure attitudes towards sexual violence. As part of this assessment, the authors included a measure of men's past sexual behaviour, including sexual violence. They found that attitudes supportive of sexual violence were significantly related to perpetration of sexual violence. Similarly, in a longitudinal study examining characteristics of men who perpetrated sexual violence, Abbey and McAuslan (2004) found that men who reported repeated perpetration of sexual violence had significantly higher levels of rape supportive cognitions.

In addition, rape supportive cognitions are associated with the future perpetration of sexual violence (Abbey et al., 2012; Loh et al., 2005). In a longitudinal study examining factors predictive of sexual offending, Thomspson et al., (2011) collected information about attitudes, pornography use, drinking, and adverse childhood experiences from 1472 male university students. One year later, they asked participants to report their sexual behaviour using the revised Sexual Experiences Survey (SES; Koss & Oros, 2007). Results indicated that men who endorsed rape supportive cognition were more likely to perpetrate sexual violence in the year to come.

Similarly, as part of a longitudinal study examining the role of distorted sexual beliefs in sexual violence, Wegner, et al. (2015) asked 470 community men to report their history of sexual behavior (using the Sexual Experience Survey), and to complete a measure of rape supportive attitude, and a post-assault justification questionnaire. The study focused on the 183 men who reported perpetrating sexual violence since the age of 14. They were also asked to think back to the interaction with the victim and recall characteristics of the incidents such as alcohol consumption. Participants were contacted

a year after and asked to report on their sexual behavior since they participated in the study. Results indicated that perpetrators' use of justification predicted future perpetration of sexual violence over a 1-year follow-up interval.

Rape Proclivity and Rape Supportive Cognitions

Understanding the relationship between rape proclivity and rape supportive cognition can shed light on whether rape proclivity is related to constructs that have been demonstrated to predict sexual aggression. Although limited, research indicates that individuals who endorse rape supportive beliefs also report a higher likelihood of engaging in sexually violent behaviour. Malamuth (1981) validated a rape proclivity measure on various samples of college men and found an average of 21% to 35% of males indicated some likelihood of raping if they could be assured of not being caught. He found that men who indicated greater likelihood were more similar to convicted rapists both in rape myth beliefs and in sexual arousal to rape depictions. Pryor (1987) also reported that acceptance of rape myths, adversarial sexual beliefs, and lack of empathy were associated with greater reported proclivities in his sample to engage in sexual exploitation and aggression.

Although most research findings indicate a relationship between rape supportive cognition and rape proclivity, inconsistencies emerge regarding the causal nature of these two constructs. Some research findings suggest that rape supportive cognitions act as the antecedent to rape proclivity and can therefore predict an individual's self-reported likelihood to rape (Bohner et al., 1998, Bohner et al., 2005, Bohner et al., 2006). Bohner and his colleagues (1998) first put this theory to test. They asked male participants to report their likelihood of engaging in sexually violent behaviour before or after

completing a 20-item Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (RMA; which measures rape supportive attitudes). Findings revealed that the relationship between rape supportive cognitions and rape proclivity were significantly stronger when participants completed the RMA scale first, suggesting that rape supportive cognitions predict rape proclivity.

More recently, as part of a study examining precursors to rape, Strain et al., (2015) presented a 50-item list of non-coercive and coercive sexual behaviours to 192 university students and asked participants to report their attitudes, and their perception of normative acceptance regarding each attitude. The researchers asked 99 of the heterosexual participants to also complete a measure of rape proclivity. Results indicated that distorted attitudes towards rape significantly predicted self-reported likelihood to engage in sexual violence. However, both rape proclivity and rape supportive cognitions predicted each other (O'Connor, 2019), thus there seems to be a bidirectional relationship between these two constructs.

The research examining the relationship between rape proclivity and rape supportive cognition is scant and some results are contradictory, thus it is difficult to draw definitive conclusions based on the limited number of studies. Understanding the relationship between cognitive distortions and rape proclivity can shed light on whether rape proclivity is a meaningful construct related to other factors strongly associated with sexual offending, and therefore more research in this area is warranted.

Antisocial Cognitions

Antisocial cognitions, or criminal thinking, refers to beliefs or values that justify, facilitate, or minimize criminal behaviour (Walters, 2012; Walters, 2016). Beliefs endorsing entitlement, interpersonal violence, antisocial associates are examples of

antisocial cognitions (Mills et al., 2004). Further, antisocial cognitions are considered to be one the “Big Four” factors associated with criminal behaviour that act as both a primary contributing and predicting factor to criminal behaviour (Andrews et al., 2006; Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Andrews et al., 2006). For example, in a meta-analytic review of 37 research studies examining factors associated with criminal behaviour, Gendreau and colleagues (1992) found antisocial cognitions to be one of the important factors related to offending.

In a longitudinal study examining the characteristics associated with criminal behaviour, Simourd (2004) completed The Level of Service Inventory–Revised (LSI-R), a dynamic risk assessment tool, on a sample of 129 individuals who were incarcerated in the Canadian federal prison system for an average of 5 years. Participants were followed up for 15 months. Results indicated that recidivists had significantly higher levels of criminal thinking and orientation than non-recidivists. Antisocial cognitions have also been associated with poor treatment outcomes among incarcerated individuals (Best et al., 2009).

Even though research in the area of distorted cognition among individuals convicted of sexual offences has mainly focused on rape supportive beliefs, antisocial cognitions are similarly found to be related to perpetration of sexual offences (Mills et al., 2004). Mills et al. (2004) also found that in both individuals convicted of sexual offences and those convicted of non-sexual offenders, antisocial cognition was significantly related to higher number of incarcerations.

More specifically, antisocial cognitions, such as beliefs supportive of interpersonal violence, hostile masculinity, and entitlement, are related to self-reported perpetration of

sexual violence (Hill & Fischer, 2001; Malamuth, 1998; Trueman et al., 1996). For example, in an examination of factors related to rape, Malamuth (1986) found that beliefs supportive of hostility towards women and interpersonal violence were significantly related to history of perpetrating sexual violence.

Rape Proclivity and Antisocial Cognitions

There is a dearth of research focused on the association between rape proclivity and antisocial cognitions. In one study examining the relationship between attitudes and rape proclivity among 134 male students, Duran et al. (2018) found that students who reported more hostile attitudes towards women also reported significantly higher levels of rape proclivity. However, to date, no study has directly examined the relationship between rape proclivity and antisocial cognitions. Understanding the relationship between rape proclivity and antisocial cognitions can shed light on whether rape proclivity is related to constructs that have been demonstrated to predict sexual aggression.

Past perpetration of sexual violence

Past criminal behaviour is generally viewed as one of the “Big Four” predictors of future offending (Andrews and Bonta, 2006). Not surprisingly, prior sexual offending is a predictive factor for sexual recidivism (Harris et al., 2003; Phenix et al., 2008). In one of the first studies aiming to determine factors strongly associated with sexual offending, Hanson and Bussière (1998) conducted a meta-analysis of 61 studies. They found that prior sexual offences were one of the best predictors of sexual recidivism. Prior sexual offences are hence included in actuarial risk assessment tools such as Static 99 (Hanson,

& Thornton, 1999) as one of the main historical (static) risk factors associated with future sexual offending.

Given the importance of past sexual violence in predicting future perpetration, assessing perpetration history is an important task. Although official criminal reports are seen as most reliable, they are not always easy to access and it is well established that official convictions are a gross under-representation of the true extent of sexual offending that occurs (Truman & Langton, 2015). Thus, self-reported past perpetration has been mostly used to study sexual violence, and its correlates, among individuals not convicted of sexual offending. Examining the association between perpetration of sexual violence and rape proclivity can shed light on the role rape proclivity plays in sexual violence.

Overall, in order to assess whether rape proclivity is a meaningful construct related to problematic sexual behaviour, it is useful to understand how rape proclivity is related to other constructs known to contribute to sexual violence. Further, it is important to examine whether rape proclivity is distinct from constructs related to sexual offending or if it may be part of a larger umbrella of constructs. This will inform understanding of rape proclivity and whether it can have meaningful implications for prevention and intervention of sexual violence. A limited number of research studies have focused on examining the relationship between rape proclivity and common risk factors for sexual offending such as deviant sexual interests (i.e., arousal to rape) and cognitions facilitating sexual aggression.

Purpose

This study explored the relationship between rape proclivity and constructs found to be related to sexual offending. In addition, this study examined the underlying latent

construct of rape proclivity and related constructs to assess whether rape proclivity is a distinct construct. More specifically, the objectives of the study were to:

- 1) explore whether constructs related to sexual offending such as arousal to rape and distorted cognitions can predict rape proclivity.
- 2) examine the relationship between rape proclivity and common risk factors for sexual offending, namely sexual arousal to coercive behaviour, cognitions facilitating sexual aggression (both rape and antisocial), and past perpetration of sexual violence.
- 3) examine the underlying structure of rape proclivity, deviant arousal, distorted cognition (both rape and antisocial), and past perpetration of sexual violence to identify whether rape proclivity represents a distinct construct.

Methods

Participants

Participants were 389 male undergraduate students from Ontario Tech University enrolled in various undergraduate psychology courses. To control for inattention and fake responding, two quality control questions (asking participants to respond in a certain way) were implemented. Participants were excluded from the sample if they failed any of the two quality control questions ($n = 9$). In addition, participants with missing data and incomplete data ($n = 30$) and those who identified as homosexual ($n = 6$) were also excluded from the sample. This resulted in a final sample size of 344 men ranging from 18 to 45 years old ($M = 20.52$, $SD = 3.39$). In regard to ethnicity, 91 (26.5%) were Caucasian, 94 (27.3%) were South Asian, 43 (12.5%), 31 (9.0%) were Southeast Asian, were East Asian, 28 (8.1%) were African American, 29 (8.4%) were Middle Eastern, 15

(4.4%) were mixed race, 8 (2.3%) were Caribbean, 4 (1.2%) were Hispanic or Latino, and 1(.3%) was Pacific Islander.

Participants mostly identified as heterosexual ($n = 327$; 95.1%). However, 14 (4.1%) men identified as bisexual, and 3 (0.9%) men identified as pansexual. On average, participants had four ($SD = 8.68$) lifetime female sexual partners; however, 119 (35.7%) participants reported having had no female sexual partners. Participants who reported never having female sexual partners did not differ significantly in their level of reported likelihood to rape ($t(327) = 2.69, p = .10$) and therefore were not excluded from the study. These participants were also retained in the sample because, although they did not report prior sexual partners, some did indicate relevant experiences on the Sexual Experiences Survey. Most participants ($n = 312$; 95.4%) reported having no male sexual partner in their lifetime. See Table 16 for more information.

Table 16

Demographic Characteristics of Student Participants

Category	<i>N</i>	%
Age^a		
18-19	173	50.6
20-24	141	41.0
25-29	16	4.7
30-34	7	2.2
35-39	5	1.5
Female Sexual Partners^b		
0	119	35.7
1	82	24.6
2	33	9.9
3	27	8.1

4	17	5.1
5	8	2.4
6 or more	47	14.2
Male Sexual Partner^c		
0	312	95.4
1	5	1.5
2	3	1.0
3 or more	7	1.1

^an = 4 participants missing data

^bn = 2 participants missing data

^cn = 5 participants missing data

Procedure

This study was reviewed and approved by the Ontario Tech University Research Ethics Board. The data collection occurred between September 2017 and August 2021, with participants being recruited using the Ontario Tech University's Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities Research Participant Pool.

From September 2017 to March 2020, participants completed the survey on Qualtrics using a laptop provided by Ontario Tech University. Due to the sensitive nature of the study, participants were emailed the consent form in advance (see Appendix F). Upon entering the laboratory, participants were given a hard copy of the consent form. A research assistant explained the details of the consent form and gave participants a chance to ask questions. Upon agreement to participate in the study, participants were provided with an anonymous link to access the survey on Qualtrics. At the start of the survey, participants provided three memorable words (i.e., initials, mother's maiden name, last 3

digits of the phone number) to facilitate possible withdrawal from the study at a later date.

Participants were presented with a demographics questionnaire (Appendix B) first and then completed the following set of measures: Sexual Interest Cardsort, Rape Proclivity Measure, Likelihood to Rape Measure, Rape Scale, Rape Myths Acceptance Scale, Costin R scale, Acceptance of Modern Myth Scale, Measure of Criminal Attitudes and Associates, Coercive Sexual scale, Sexual Experiences Survey-Tactics First Revised-, in a counterbalanced order. Participants were debriefed (Appendix Q), provided with support if needed, and given the opportunity to ask questions. Participants received 1.5 credits towards the Psychology course in which they were enrolled. The study took approximately 90 minutes to complete.

Participants were also asked whether they were interested in participating in a follow-up survey 6 weeks following the completion of the initial survey. Specifically, at the bottom of the debriefing form, participants had the option to consent to be contacted by email for a follow-up study that would allow them to receive an additional .5 credit towards the same psychology course in which they were enrolled. Participants who agreed to participate in the follow-up study were contacted by email 6 weeks following participation in the initial study. Participants were instructed to use the Ontario Tech University's Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities Research Participant Pool to sign up for the follow-up study and access the study's anonymous link. The follow up study did not take place in the laboratory. Participants were asked to use the anonymous link to complete the study using any electronic device. More information about the content of the follow up study is provided in Chapter 4.

From March 2020 to August 2021, due to restrictions set in place to limit the spread of COVID-19, participants completed the survey on Qualtrics remotely using their own electronic devices. Participants used the Ontario Tech University's Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities Research Participant Pool to sign up for the study. Once participants completed the survey, they were redirected to a new URL page to enter their email address. This ensured that responses were not linked to any identifying information such as email addresses. The email address provided were used to invite participants to take part in the follow up study (Wave 2).

Measures

Measures were selected to assess the various constructs of interest. Specifically, rape proclivity was assessed by the Rape Proclivity Measure, Likelihood to Rape Question, and Proclivity Sexual Experiences Survey-Tactics First Revised. Sexual arousal to coercive behaviour was assessed by the Sexual Interest Cardsort Questionnaire. Rape supportive cognitions were assessed by the Rape Scale, Rape Myth Acceptance Scale, Costin's R Scale, Acceptance of Modern Myths about Sexual Aggression Scale. Antisocial Cognitions were measured by Measure of Criminal Attitude and Associates, and finally, past perpetration of sexual violence was measured by Behaviour Sexual Experiences Survey-Tactics First Revised, and Coercive Sexuality Scale.

Demographic Questionnaire

A brief demographic questionnaire was used to collect information regarding participants' age, sexual orientation, ethnicity, and number of life time sexual partners (Appendix B).

Rape Proclivity Measures

Rape Proclivity Scale. The Rape Proclivity Scale (Bohner, 1998, Appendix C) is designed to measure individuals' proclivity to rape. Information regarding this measure is included in Chapter 2.

Likelihood to Rape Question. The Likelihood to Rape Scale (LR; Malamuth, 1981, Appendix G) is a single question that asks participants whether they would commit rape knowing that they would not be apprehended or punished. Participants are asked to respond on a 5-point Likert scale (1= *Very Likely* to 5 = *Not at all Likely*) with higher scores indicating higher rape proclivity. The measure has reasonable test-retest reliability ($r = .75$; Malamuth & Ceniti, 1986).

Sexual Experiences Survey-Tactics First Revised (SES-TFR). The SES-TFR scales (Behaviour SES-TFR, Evaluations SES-TFR, and Proclivity SES-TFR; Appendix H) are three scales that are combined into one scale and presented to participants. The original SES scale was designed by Koss and Colleagues (Koss & Gidycz, 1985; Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987; Koss & Oros, 1982), the Tactics first revision was introduced by Koss and colleagues (2007) and the Behaviour, Evaluations, and Proclivity SES-TFR scales were revised by Hermann et al. (2016). Each scale includes 42 items and requires participants to self-report on a number of sexual behaviours (e.g., sexual touching, oral sex, intercourse) by using any of the following coercive tactics: (1) arguments and pressure, (2) lies or false promises, (3) guilt or displeasure, (4) giving someone drugs or alcohol, (5) taking advantage of someone when they are incapacitated by drugs or alcohol, and/or (6) physical force. Overall, the SES-TFR has demonstrated excellent internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.94$; Hermann et al., 2016).

Proclivity SES-TFR. The Proclivity SES-TFR measures the proclivity of engaging in sexually aggressive behaviour by asking participants to report how likely they would be to engage in sexual behaviour using the sexually coercive and aggressive tactics listed in the previous section. Each item is rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = *Very unlikely* to 7 = *Very likely*). Overall, items on Proclivity SES-TFR demonstrated excellent internal consistency in the current study ($\alpha = .92$).

Measures for Sexual Interest

The Sexual Interest Cardsort Questionnaire. The Sexual Interest Cardsort Questionnaire (SI; Abel & Becker, 1979, Appendix I) is a 75- item self-report measure of deviant and non-deviant sexual interest. The items use present tense (e.g., “I’m standing naked beside the car. A 20-year-old girl in a bikini is coming from the swimming pool. I feel my hard penis in my hand as she sees me and looks shocked”), therefore assessing current sexual interest.

The SI was developed using statements of deviant interests and behaviors reported by known sexual offenders to clinicians during clinical interviews. Categories measure heterosexuality, homosexuality, extrafamilial molestation of girls, extrafamilial molestation of boys, intrafamilial molestation of girls, intrafamilial molestation of boys, voyeurism, frotteurism, exhibitionism, sadism, masochism, rape, transvestic fetishism, male gender identification, and female gender identification. Participants are instructed to rate their interest on 75 statements, describing a variety of sexual activities, on a 7- point Likert scale (ranging from -3 = extreme repulsion to +3 = extreme interest). Overall, items on the SI demonstrated excellent internal consistency ($\alpha = .71$ to $.96$, Holland et al., 2000; ($\alpha = .75$ to $.94$ in the current study).

For the purpose of this study, to capture a general arousal to unwanted sexual acts, responses to items that depict sexual behaviour involving nonconsenting adults (i.e., voyeurism, frotteurism, exhibitionism, and arousal to rape) are summed and referred to as “sexual arousal to coercive behaviour.” Also, there is debate in the literature regarding whether sexual interest in sadism is conceptually different than arousal to coercive behaviour. Sexual sadism, defined as sexual arousal to inflicting pain, violence, and injury (Berner et al., 2003), has been associated with extreme forms of sexual violence such as sexual homicide (Briken et al., 2006). Some research indicates that sadism is not inherently different from arousal to rape and that sadistic sexual offenders also show high arousal to coercive scenarios (Kinght et al., 2013; Longpre et al., 2020). However, consistent with recent research indicating that sadism primarily involves arousal to depiction of violence rather than arousal to sexual contact with nonconsenting individuals (Seto et al., 2012; Zinink & Padilla, 2016), responses that capture interest in sadistic sexual behaviour are not included in the arousal to coercive behaviour category.

Measures for Rape Supportive Cognitions

The RAPE Scale. The RAPE Scale (Bumby, 1996; Appendix J) is a 36- item measure designed to assess cognitive distortions related to rape. For each statement (e.g., “most women are sluts and get what they deserve”), participants are asked to rate how much they agree with the statement on a 4-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 *strongly agree* to 4 *strongly disagree*). The responses are summed with higher score indicating a higher acceptance of rape related cognitive distortions (Bumby, 1996). Overall, RAPE Scale scores have demonstrated excellent internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.96$, Bumby, 1996; $\alpha = 0.92$ in the current study). Good test-retest reliability ($r = .86$) across a 2-week interval

and convergence validity (Bumby, 1996). Furthermore, the RAPE Scale was not found to be significantly related to the Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) indicating that socially desirable responding is not a concern (Bumby, 1996).

Rape Myth Acceptance Scale. The Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (Burt, 1980; Appendix K) is a self-report measure consisting of 19 items designed to assess respondents' level of rape supportive beliefs. There are 11 items on the scale that ask participants to rate how much they agree with each statement (e.g., women who get raped while hitchhiking get what they deserve) on a 7-point Likert scale (1 *strongly agree* to 7 *strongly disagree*). In addition, 2 items on the scale ask participants to report what percentage of women would fabricate allegations of rape in an attempt to retaliate or protect their reputation on a 5-point likert scale (1 *Almost all* to 5 *Almost none*). Furthermore, 6 items on the scale ask participants to rate how likely they would be to believe individuals (e.g., close friends, white women, black women) if they reported being raped on a 5-point likert scale (1 *always* to 5 *never*). The responses are summed with higher scores indicating greater endorsement of rape supportive beliefs. The Rape Myth Scale scores have demonstrated good internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.87$, Burt, 1980; $\alpha = 0.92$, Marshal & Hambley, 1996; $\alpha = 0.87$, in the current study), good item-to-total correlation ($r = .38$ to $.73$). Furthermore, the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale was not found to be significantly related to the Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960), suggesting that socially desirable responding is not a concern (Klein et al., 2009).

Costin's R Scale. The R Scale (Costin, 1985; Appendix L) is a 20-item measure designed to assess stereotypical beliefs about rape. For each item, participants are asked to rate how much they agree with each statement (e.g., many women really want to be raped) on a 7-point Likert Scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*). The responses are such that with higher scores indicate greater acceptance of rape supportive belief. Overall, the R Scale scores have demonstrated good internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.70$ to 0.80 , Costin, 1985; $\alpha = 0.76$ in the current study) and test-retest reliability ($r = .81$ to $.85$; Bohner, 2006) across a 3-week interval.

Acceptance of Modern Myths about Sexual Aggression Scale. The Acceptance of Modern Myths About Sexual Aggression scale (AMMSA; Gerger et al., 2007; Appendix M) is a 30-item measure designed to assess acceptance of more subtle, modern beliefs about rape. For each item, participants are asked to rate how much they agree with each statement (e.g., if a woman invites a man to her home for a coffee, that means that she wants to have sex) on a 7-point likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*). The responses are summed with higher scores indicating greater adherence to rape supportive beliefs. Overall, AMMSA scores have demonstrated excellent internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.90$ to 0.95 , Gerger et al., 2007; $\alpha = 0.93$ in the current study), good test-retest reliability ($r = .67$ to $.84$) and convergent validity (Greger et al., 2007).

Measures for Antisocial Cognitions

Measure of Criminal Attitude and Associates. The Measure of Criminal Attitude and Associates (MCAA; Mills and Kroner, 1999, Appendix N) is a two-part self-report measure designed to assess criminal attitudes/beliefs and associates. Part A measures the number of criminal associations participants currently have in their lives.

Part B, which was used in this study, includes a 46-item measure comprised of four different but related sub-scales of criminal attitudes/beliefs towards: Violence (12 items); (2) Entitlement (12 items); (3) Antisocial Intent (12 items); and (4) Associates (10 items). Items are rated on a 2-point scale (1 = Agree and 2 = Disagree). Overall, the scale shows acceptable internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.92$ Mills, 1997; $\alpha = 0.85$, in the current study), and test-retest reliability ($r = .81$, Mills et al., 2002) across a 4-weeks interval. Convergent validity was demonstrated by MCAA's strong relationship with other validated measures of antisocial attitudes (Mills et al., 2002).

Measures for Past Perpetration of Sexual Violence

Behaviour SES-TFR. The Behaviour SES-TFR asks participants to self-report whether, since the age of 16, they have engaged in any sexual behaviors by using any of sexually coercive or aggressive tactics listed in the previous section. Each item is rated a 9- point Likert-type scale (0 = *Never* to 9 = *9 times or more*). Overall, items on Behaviour SES-TFR demonstrated excellent internal consistency in the current study ($\alpha = .87$).

Coercive Sexuality Scale. The Coercive sexuality scale (Appendix O) developed by Rapaport and Burkhart (1981) was developed to assess participants' prior sexually coercive behaviour. There are 19 items rated on a 4-point Likert scale (0 = *Never* to 3 = *Often*). Responses are summed with the higher total score indicating higher engagement in sexually coercive behaviour in the past. Overall, items on Coercive Sexuality Scale demonstrated moderate internal consistency in the current study ($\alpha = .72$).

Quality Control Questions

Participants were asked to respond to two quality control questions (Appendix P) at random points throughout the survey. These were used to screen out participants who

were not paying attention to the survey instructions and items (indicated by incorrect responses). For example, participants were asked “Please choose item B.”

Results

Descriptive analyses and internal consistency for each measure are presented in Table 17. Overall, the rape proclivity measures had excellent internal consistency, as did the subscales on the Sexual Interest Cardsort measures. The exception to this was male gender identity and transvestic fetishism, which had moderate internal consistency. As well, the measures for rape supportive cognition demonstrated excellent internal consistency. The exception to that was Rape Myth Acceptance Scale and R Costin Scale, which had moderate internal consistency. Subscales of Measure of Antisocial Attitudes and Associates also demonstrated excellent to moderate internal consistency. In addition, measures assessing perpetration of sexual violence including Behaviour SES-TFR and Coercive Sexuality Scale had excellent to moderate internal consistency. Table 17 includes more information.

Table 17

Internal Consistency and Descriptive Statistics for Proclivity to Rape, Sexual Interest, Supportive Cognitions, Antisocial cognitions, and Past Perpetration of Sexual Violence

Measures	α	Range	$M (SD)$	n	95% CI
Proclivity to Rape					
Rape Proclivity	0.93	15-89	29.66 (16.39)	336	0.92 to 0.94
LR	-	0-4	0.23 (0.62)	341	0.13 to 0.29
SES-TFR	0.92	36-92	39.94 (9.74)	305	0.90 to 0.93
Sexual Interest					
SI- Adult Homosexuality	0.94	5-35	7.90 (6.08)	341	0.93 to 0.95
SI-Adult Heterosexuality	0.91	5-35	30.05 (6.92)	337	0.88 to 0.92

SI-Voyeurism	0.93	5-35	17.29 (8.70)	340	0.92 to 0.94
SI-Exhibitionism	0.87	5-30	7.34 (4.13)	340	0.85 to 0.89
SI-Frotteurism	0.86	5-28	8.36 (4.96)	341	0.83 to 0.88
SI-Rape of Adults	0.88	5-23	6.12 (2.91)	341	0.85 to 0.89
SI-Extrafam Molest Girls	0.80	5-22	6.27 (2.88)	341	0.78 to 0.84
SI-Intrafam Molest Girls	0.91	5-22	5.65 (2.36)	338	0.89 to 0.93
SI-Extrafam Molest Boys	0.93	5-21	5.27 (2.24)	339	0.92 to 0.95
SI-Intrafam Molest Boys	0.79	5-20	5.41 (1.58)	341	0.75 to 0.82
SI-Sadism	0.81	5-20	5.89 (2.26)	340	0.78 to 0.84
SI-Masochism	0.81	5-26	8.06 (4.32)	342	0.78 to 0.85
SI-Male Gender Identity	0.75	5-35	28.75 (5.41)	336	0.70 to 0.78
SI-Female Gender Identity	0.88	5-34	8.66 (5.24)	338	0.86 to 0.90
SI-Transvestic Fetishism	0.79	5-25	7.70 (3.95)	343	0.70 to 0.82
Rape Supportive Cognitions					
The RAPE Scale	0.94	36-116	56.70 (14.98)	319	0.93 to 0.95
Rape Myth Scale	0.74	46-91	67.91 (7.32)	333	0.68 to 0.79
R Costin Scale	0.76	20-103	63.75 (13.32)	333	0.72 to 0.80
AMMSA	0.93	30-167	99.91 (29.55)	319	0.93 to 0.95
Antisocial Cognitions					
MCAA-Violence	0.80	0-12	4.75 (2.93)	319	0.76 to 0.83
MCAA-Entitlement	0.68	0-12	4.41 (2.58)	330	0.63 to 0.73
MCAA-Intent	0.75	0-11	3.59 (2.67)	328	0.70 to 0.78
MCAA-Associate	0.79	0-10	2.73 (2.28)	331	0.71 to 0.79
MCAA-Total	0.85	2-36	15.20 (7.18)	302	0.82 to 0.87
Past Perpetration					
SES-TFR	.87	36-111	39.10 (9.10)	308	.85 to .89
Coercive Sexuality Scale	.72	19-33	19.89 (1.76)	319	.67 to .76

Note. SI= Sexual Interest Cardsort Questionnaire, SES-TFR = Sexual Experience Survey–Tactics First Revised, LR = Likelihood to Rape Question, AMMSA= Acceptance of Modern Myths About Sexual Aggression Scale, MCAA= Measure of criminal Attitude and Associates.

Rape Proclivity

Descriptive statistics were calculated to measure the proportion of participants who indicated some likelihood to engage in sexually violent behaviour (See Table 18).

Participants who reported anything other than *very unlikely* on any of the items on the Rape Proclivity Measure were categorized as having a proclivity to engage in sexual violence. Of 339 participants who responded to the Rape Proclivity Measure (1 *very unlikely* to 5 *very likely*), 42.5% ($n = 144$) indicated a 2 or above in response to whether they would behave the same if they were in that situation, indicating some likelihood of engaging in sexually violent behaviour.

Similarly, of 308 participants who responded to the rape proclivity measure on the SES-TFR (1 *not at all likely* to 7 *very likely*), 32.8 % ($n = 100$) indicated a 2 or above in response to whether they are likely to engage in sexually coercive or aggressive behaviour. Specifically, 27.0% ($n = 86$) reported the likelihood to use tactics such as using arguments and pressure, making false promises, making women feel guilty, swearing, or getting angry to engage in a variety of sexual behaviours. Another 8.6 % ($n = 27$) of participants reported likelihood of using aggressive tactics such as giving a woman drugs or alcohol to obtain sexual activity or using physical force to engage in sexual activity. Of 341 participants who responded to the Likelihood to Rape question (1

Extremely likely to 5 Extremely unlikely), 12.6 % ($n = 43$) reported some likelihood to rape.

Predictors of Rape Proclivity

A multiple linear regression was calculated to examine whether, arousal to coercive sexual behaviour, rape supportive cognition, antisocial cognition, and past perpetration of sexual violence predict the Rape proclivity Measure. For this analysis, continuous proclivity scores were used as the dependent variable. It was important to report possible differences between those who might be considered to have a proclivity and those who do not, but it was more appropriate to use continuous proclivity scores for the regression to maintain variability in the responses. Also, the Rape Scale was used as a measure of rape supportive cognition as it had higher internal consistency among the rape supportive cognition scales and had the highest correlation with the Rape Proclivity Measure.

A significant regression equation was found ($F(4, 248) = 80.39, p < .05$) indicating that 56% ($R^2 = .56, P = 0.00$) of the variability in rape proclivity can be predicted by arousal to coercive sexual behaviour, rape supportive cognition, and antisocial cognition, and past perpetration of sexual violence. The individual predictors were examined further and indicated that arousal to coercive behaviour ($\beta = .49, t = 10.42, P < .001$), rape supportive cognition ($\beta = .28, t = 5.31, p < .001$), antisocial cognition ($\beta = .34, t = 3.23, p < .001$), and past perpetration of sexual violence ($\beta = .21, t = 2.64, p < .001$) were each significant predictor in the model.

Rape Proclivity and Related Constructs

To improve understanding of both rape proclivity as a construct and the utility of the Rape Proclivity Measure, the relationship between correlates of rape and the Rape

Proclivity Measure have been examined (Table 18). Pearson correlation was used to examine the relationship between measures of deviant arousal, rape supportive cognition, antisocial cognition, and history of sexual violence to rape proclivity.

Pearson correlation was used to examine the relationship between measures of deviant arousal, rape supportive cognition, antisocial cognition, and history of sexual violence to rape proclivity. For correlations, an r -value of .10 to .29 is considered weak, .30 to .49 is considered moderate, and .5 and higher is considered strong (Cohen, 1992). There were moderate to strong relationships between rape proclivity (measured by the Rape Proclivity Measure) and arousal to sexually coercive behaviour, including rape ($r = .49, p < .001$), exhibitionism ($r = .57, p < .001$), voyeurism ($r = .54, p < .001$), frotteurism ($r = .65, p < .001$). Overall, a combined score representing arousal to coercive behaviours against female adults, including arousal to rape, frotteurism, exhibitionism, and voyeurism, were found to have a strong relationship with rape proclivity ($r = .69, p < .001$).

For rape supportive cognitions, there were mostly significant moderate to strong relationships with rape proclivity. Correlations varied depending on the rape supportive scale used with the Rape Scale ($r = .56, p < .001$) and Rape Myth Acceptance scale ($r = .49, p < .001$) having the strongest relationship with rape proclivity. Costin R ($r = .36, p < .001$), and Acceptance of Modern Myths ($r = .47, p < .001$) both had moderate relationships with rape proclivity.

For antisocial cognitions there was a significant moderate relationship between the total score on Measure of Antisocial Attitudes and Associates and rape proclivity ($r = .41, P < .001$). Further examination of the subscales revealed moderate association between

Attitudes Towards Violence ($r = .36, p < .001$), Antisocial Intent ($r = .36, p < .001$), Attitudes of Entitlement ($r = .28, p < .001$) and rape proclivity. However, attitudes of associates was not found to be significantly correlated to rape proclivity ($r = .09, p = .86$). See Table 18 for more information.

Table 18

Pearson Correlations Between Rape Proclivity, Arousal to Coercive Behaviour, Rape Supportive Cognition, Antisocial Cognition, and Past Perpetration of Sexual Violence

Measures	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1.Rape Proclivity	.															
2.SES-TFR Proclivity	.49**	.														
3.LR	.34**	.33**	.													
4.Voyerism	.54**	.25**	.16**	.												
5.Exhibitionisim	.57**	.28**	.14**	.45**	.											
6.Frotteurism	.65**	.38**	.24**	.57**	.75**	.										
7.RapeofAdults	.49**	.43**	.28**	.36**	.57**	.72**	.									
8.Rape Scale	.56**	.37**	.27**	.43**	.34**	.45**	.26**	.								
9. RMA	.49**	.27**	.25**	.25**	.24**	.31**	.19**	.72**	.							
10.Costin R	.39**	.24**	.22**	.27**	.21**	.32**	.22**	.69**	.62**	.						
11.AMMSA	.47**	.30**	.22**	.42**	.28**	.37**	.23**	.77**	.62**	.68**	.					

12.AttitudesViolences	.36**	.29**	.19**	.25**	.15**	.21**	.11*	.46**	.32**	.33**	.45**	.				
13.AntisocialIntent	.36**	.35**	.19**	.35**	.18**	.26**	.15**	.20**	.12*	.14*	.21**	.35**	.			
14.MCAAEntitlement	.23**	.17**	.10*	.15**	.13*	.13*	.09	.26**	.28**	.30**	.29**	.41**	.31**	.		
15.MCAA Associates	.11*	.18**	.03	.16**	.02	.11*	.10	.08	.02	.02	.04	.14*	.52**	.07	.	
16.Coercive Sexuality Scale	.28**	.33**	.07	.23**	.27**	.38**	.30**	.20**	.13*	.09	.17**	.09	.28**	.10	.20**	.
17. SES-TFR Behaviour	.32**	.59**	.17**	.11*	.19**	.24**	.25**	.17**	.19**	.14*	.15**	.18**	.26**	.10	.22**	.53**

Note. SES-TFR = Sexual Experience Survey–Tactics First Revised, LR = likelihood to rape, RMA = Rape Myths Acceptance, AMMSA = Acceptance of Modern Myths About Sexual Aggression Scale. *p < .05. **p < .01.

The moderate to strong relationship between rape proclivity and other related constructs, suggest these measures of rape proclivity, arousal to coercive behavior, rape supportive attitudes, antisocial cognitions, and past perpetration of sexual violence may be measuring aspects of the same construct or that they may be measuring distinct, but closely related, constructs.

Further, the Rape Proclivity Measure had a moderate to strong positive relationship with other measures assessing rape proclivity including Likelihood to Rape ($r = .34, P < .001$), and SES-TFR Proclivity ($r = .49, P < .001$). This indicate that the measures of rape proclivity may not necessarily be measuring the same construct. Further examination is needed to determine how measures of rape proclivity relate to other constructs related to rape to find out what they truly measure.

Does rape proclivity form distinct or overlapping factors?

In order to determine whether rape proclivity represents a distinct construct, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted to examine the underlying latent constructs for rape proclivity, sexual arousal to coercive behaviour, rape supportive cognitions, antisocial cognitions, and past perpetration of sexual violence. Several criteria were used to determine if a factor analysis would be appropriate for use on this set of data. First, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .82, indicating that the strength of the relationship between variables were high. Second, Bartlett's Test for Sphericity was significant ($\chi^2 = (136) = 1905.76, p < .05$) indicating that the correlation matrix is an identity matrix. Finally, the commonalties were all between .60 and .87 suggesting that each scale shared common variance with other scales. Given the above indications, a factor analysis with all 17 measures was deemed to be suitable.

To determine the appropriate number of the factors to retain, the Kaiser criterion and scree plots were used. However, relying only on visually determined methods, such as eigenvalues and scree plots, to estimate factors can undermine the reliability of results (O'Connor, 2000). As a result, the Parallel analysis and Velicer's Minimum Average Partial test (MAP) were also used to determine the appropriate number of factors to retain. The Scree plot and Kaiser criterion suggested retaining three factors with eigenvalues greater than 1. Parallel analysis and MAP, however, indicated that five factors should be retained (see Table 19). Considering factors determined by Kaiser - Meyer-Olkin measure and the more data driven result of parallel analysis and MAP, the factor analysis resulted in retaining five factors explaining 70.50 % of the variance for the entire set of scales.

Table 19

Eigenvalues and Proportion of Variance Explained for Retained Factors

Factor	Initial Eigenvalue	Proportion of Variance Explained	95 th Percentile Eigenvalue
1	5.69	33.50%	1.69
2	2.32	13.65%	1.47
3	1.76	10.35%	1.35
4	1.18	6.92%	1.29
5	1.03	6.08%	1.10

Note: a. The point where the parallel analysis eigenvalue exceeds the initial eigenvalue. Only the results for the raw data permutations ($n = 1,000$ data sets) 95th percentile eigenvalues are presented in the table.

Factors were rotated using an orthogonal rotation method (Varimax) and an oblique rotation method (Promax). Varimax rotation assumes that the factors are not correlated

(Orthogonal). Promax first assumes the factors are orthogonal and then relaxes the rotation to allow them to correlate (Russell, 2002). There was no difference between the factor loadings using varimax and promax solutions which increased confidence in the results. To interpret the factor structure, the rotated factors were examined for factor loadings greater than .40 (Schmitt & Sass, 2011).

The first factor was robust with an eigenvalue of 5.69 and accounted for 33.50 % of the variance. Scales loading on the first factor included measures of rape supportive cognitions, including the Rape Scale, Rape Myth Acceptance Scale, Costin R, and Acceptance of Modern Rape Myths. Factor 2 had an eigenvalue of 2.23 and accounted for 13.65 % of the variance. Scales loading on this factor included the Rape Proclivity Measure and offence-related arousal subscales on Sexual Interest Cardsort, including sexual Voyeurism, Exhibitionism, Rape of Adults, and Frotteurism. Factor 3 had an eigenvalue of 1.76 and accounted for 10.35% of the variance. It included SES-TFR proclivity, and measures assessing perpetration of sexual violence, including SES-TFR Behaviour, and Coercive Sexuality Scale. Factor 4 had an eigenvalue of 1.18 and accounted for 6.92% of the variance. It included the Likelihood to Rape measure and factors related to antisocial cognitions, including Attitudes Towards Violence and Attitudes of Entitlement. Factor 5 had an eigenvalue of 1.03 and accounted for 6.08 % of the variance. It included distorted cognitions related to an antisocial lifestyle, including Antisocial Intent and Attitudes of Associates.

Overall, the factor analysis revealed five independent underlying factors: (1) rape supportive cognitions, including Acceptance of Modern Myths, the Rape Scale, Costin R, and Rape Myth Acceptance, (2) arousal to coercive behaviour (deviant sexual interest)

and rape proclivity measured by the Rape Proclivity Measure, (3) rape proclivity measured by SES-TFR and past perpetration of sexual violence, (4) rape proclivity measured by Likelihood to Rape and antisocial attitudes related to endorsing violence and intent, and finally (5) antisocial cognitions endorsing an antisocial lifestyle. It is important to note that rape proclivity did not form a distinct factor. Thus, it seems that different rape proclivity measures do not share the same underlying latent construct and may in fact measure different constructs. See Table 20 for more information.

Table 20

EFA Rotated Factor Loadings

Measure	Factor Loading				
	1	2	3	4	5
Acceptance of Modern Rape Myths	.86	.18	.06	.17	.08
Rape Scale	.84	.23	.15	.22	.01
Costin's R	.84	.15	.04	.18	.01
Rape Myth Acceptance	.83	.08	.10	.16	.06
SI-Frotteurism	.21	.87	.18	.05	.07
SI-Rape of Adult	.01	.83	.23	.17	.06
SI-Exhibitionism	.13	.82	.08	.07	.01
SI-Voyeurism	.32	.60	.07	.04	.30
Rape Proclivity	.27	.57	.33	.41	.09
SES-Behaviour	.07	.05	.89	.00	.15
Coercive Sexuality Scale	.11	.22	.77	.05	.17
Proclivity: SES-TFR	.13	.33	.57	.39	.08
Likelihood to Rape	.10	.27	.18	.60	.24
MCAA: Attitudes towards Violence	.38	.03	.04	.62	.26

MCAA: Attitudes of Entitlement	.27	.07	.17	.59	.24
MCAA: Antisocial Intent	.05	.12	.18	.34	.79
MCAA: Attitude of Associate	.03	.07	.19	.07	.81

Note: N= 225. Factor loadings above .40 are on bold.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between rape proclivity and other constructs related to sexual offending, such as deviant sexual arousal and distorted cognition (rape and antisocial). The proportion of students who reported proclivity to rape was examined, with 42.5% of participants indicating at least some likelihood to rape using the Rape Proclivity Measure. However, when asked whether they would commit rape if they were assured of not being caught, only 16% of participant reported likelihood to rape. One explanation for this inconsistency would be the use of the term ‘rape’ in the Likelihood to Rape item. One explanation for the inconsistency in the self-reported measures of rape proclivity is the term ‘rape’ in the Likelihood to Rape item. When asked directly about rape, participants may respond in a socially desired way. In fact, the Rape Proclivity Measure was shown to be unrelated to social desirability (Bohner 1989), whereas Likelihood to Rape measure showed small but significant correlation with measure of social desirability (Bohner, 1989; Chiroro, 2004).

Further, measures of rape proclivity, deviant arousal, rape supportive cognitions, and antisocial cognitions demonstrated excellent to moderate internal consistency. The Rape Proclivity Measure was strongly correlated with arousal to coercive behaviour against adult females including arousal to rape, frotteurism, exhibitionism, and

voyeurism. This was one of the few studies that examined the relationship between deviant sexual interest and rape proclivity. Further, there was a moderate to strong relationship between the rape proclivity measures and rape supportive cognitions. This is consistent with previous research suggesting that there is a significant positive relationship between distorted cognitions and rape proclivity (Bohner, 2006). Lastly, there was a significant moderate relationship between rape proclivity and the total score on MCAA, which measures antisocial cognition. However, the antisocial intent and antisocial associates subscales on the MCAA did not have a significant relationship with rape proclivity.

Overall, the current study found a significant positive relationship between rape proclivity and constructs related to sexual offending, indicating that there is an association between rape proclivity and indicators of sexually violent behaviour. Generally, these findings are consistent with the notion that individuals with self-reported likelihood to rape share similar problematic attitudes and interests with individuals who have been convicted of committing sexual offences.

Regression analysis indicated that arousal to coercive sexual behaviour, rape supportive cognition, and antisocial cognition, and past perpetration of sexual violence independently predicted scores on the Rape Proclivity Measure. Also, the multiple regression model was significant indicating that these measures predict 52% of variability in rape proclivity scores. This indicates that these constructs together were more strongly predictive of rape proclivity than either one alone. Furthermore, these findings suggest that perhaps the incidence and prevalence of rape proclivity could be decreased by

educational interventions that target minimizing men's distorted cognitions about sexual and antisocial behavior.

Further, exploratory factor analysis was used to examine the underlying latent construct of rape proclivity, arousal to coercive sexual behaviour, rape supportive cognitions antisocial cognitions, and past perpetration of sexual violence. A five-factor model suggests that rape proclivity does not represent an independent construct. These findings suggest that rape proclivity measured by the Rape Proclivity Measure might actually be assessing deviant sexual arousal. This is not surprising given the hypothetical nature of questions posed on the Rape Proclivity Measure asking individuals to imagine rape scenarios. However, rape proclivity measured by SES-TFR may be more related to behaviour as the same latent construct as past perpetration of sexual violence. This is understandable given the questions on SES-TFR proclivity asks individuals if they see themselves likely to engage in specific behaviour. Therefore, SES-TFR might be a more accurate measure of rape proclivity. Lastly, Likelihood to Rape may be measuring antisocial attitudes regarding violence and intent. Given that this measure directly asks individuals if they see themselves likely to rape anyone in the future, it may make sense that this measure has the same latent construct as antisocial attitudes.

Limitations and Future Directions

Although this study provides unique insight into the association between rape proclivity and other constructs related to sexual offending, there are several limitations to note. With regards to the sample, this data was collected from university students. It is not clear if findings with university students would generalize to a non-student population, such as men who perpetrate sexual violence or those convicted of sexual

violence. The MCAA was developed for, and typically used with, individuals convicted of criminal behaviour and university students are different from men convicted of offending in many ways. However, research with community men can shed light on the seriousness of sexual violent behaviour among those who have not been convicted of sexual offending. The economy and efficacy of conducting research with students can also make an ideal first step to explore questions. However, future research should replicate these findings with other samples such as men in the community or those convicted of sexual violence.

Future research should further explore the relationship between rape proclivity and constructs related to sexual offending, using a variety of samples to determine whether rape proclivity represents a distinct factor. It is important to establish whether proclivity assesses deviant sexual arousal, particularly arousal to coercive sexual behaviour, or a tendency to commit sexually offensive behaviour.

Also, further research should continue to investigate whether different rape proclivity measures assess different constructs or whether they indeed tap into the same construct. Solidifying the answer to this question can help inform which measure of rape proclivity measure would best capture the intended construct and would best inform prevention strategies.

Conclusion

The current study shed light on the relationship between rape proclivity and constructs related to perpetration of sexual offending. The results from this study reveal that rape proclivity is significantly related to correlates of rape, such as deviant sexual arousal and distorted cognitions. However, the results from this study suggest that rape

proclivity does not appear to represent a distinct construct. Rape proclivity measured by various measures did not have the same latent construct. This may indicate that measures assessing rape proclivity do not measure the same construct. It seems that rape proclivity measured by the Rape Proclivity Measure is more indicative of sexual arousal to behaviour involving a nonconsenting individual. However, rape proclivity measured by SES-TFR has the same latent construct as perpetration of sexual violence. Future research is needed to shed light on the latent construct of rape proclivity assessed by various measures.

Chapter 4: Longitudinal study examining the relationship between rape proclivity and sexually aggressive behaviour

Predicting offending behaviour is one of the most critical tasks of forensic psychology. As discussed in previous chapters, examining factors that may contribute to the perpetration of sexual violence can inform prevention and intervention strategies. This chapter will examine the relationship between rape proclivity and perpetration of sexual violence including engagement in future sexual offences.

Issues with Identifying Perpetrators of Sexual Violence Among Non-Convicted Individuals

A number of issues have been identified when considering sexual violence perpetration. For instance, although much can be learned from studying men in the community, they are often neglected. There is also a lack of focus on behaviours that could be considered coercive instead of aggressive. The importance of these considerations will be outlined below.

Failing to Include Community Men

As discussed in previous chapters, most studies examining factors related to sexual violence have mainly used incarcerated samples. However, only a small number of sexual violence perpetrations are reported to the police (Brennan & Taylor-Butts, 2008; Fisher et al., 2000), and even fewer result in convictions and incarcerations (Koss, 1987; Public Safety Canada, 2010). It has also been found that more extreme forms of sexual violence are generally reported and more likely to lead to conviction (Fisher et al., 2003). This means that incarcerated samples are not a full representation of sexually aggressive men. Therefore, studying the general topic of sexual violence using only incarcerated samples is not adequate.

Of those research studies examining sexual violence among the non-offending population, most have used student samples. While data collected from student samples is valuable and complementary to incarcerated samples, students are also not fully representative of sexually aggressive men. There are, understandably, a number of ways that these two groups would be expected to differ (e.g., age, criminal history, substance abuse, self-regulation, and emotion regulation). Studying men from the wider community can address this gap, as they can provide a more diverse sample in terms of age, education, and sexual experiences (Casler et al., 2013).

To date, fewer studies have examined sexual violence perpetration among community men (e.g., Abbey et al., 2006; Calhoun et al., 1997; Merrill et al., 2001). Similar to studies using student samples, studies examining the rate of sexual violence among samples of community men have found alarmingly high rates of sexual perpetration. For example, Widman et al. (2013) examined the rate of self-reported sexual perpetration in 49 community men and 63 men convicted of sexual offences using the Sexual Experiences Survey (SES; Abbey et al., 2005; Koss et al., 1987). Results indicated that 68% of individuals convicted of committing sexual offences and 59% of community men reported perpetrating sexual violence acts for which they have not been apprehended. Further, in a study examining factors associated with perpetration of sexual violence in the wider community, Abbey et al. (2006) asked 163 men to complete questionnaires regarding past perpetration of sexual violence and other variables associated with rape. Results indicated that up to 64% of participants reported engaging in at least one form of sexual violence since they were 14 years old.

Results from the above studies reveal higher rates of sexual violence perpetration reported by community men than the 20-30% reported by student samples (Koss et al, 1987; White & Smith, 2004). However, there are also studies using community men who have found results similar to the studies using student samples. For example, in a longitudinal study exploring factors associated with sexual violence among men, Jacques-Tiura et al. (2015) asked 423 community men in Detroit, Michigan to complete questionnaires regarding variables that may be related to perpetration of sexual violence. At the 1-year follow-up interview, participants were asked to report on their sexual behaviour during the past year using the Sexual Experiences Survey. The results from this study indicated that approximately 25% of participants reported engaging in unwanted sexual activity within the past year.

Considering the discrepancies in the reported rates of perpetration of sexual violence by community men, more research using wider community samples is warranted. Further, including samples of community men can increase the generalizability of the sample and help paint a more accurate picture of sexual violence perpetration among men not convicted of sexual offences. Therefore, this study aims to include both samples of students and community men to examine the role of rape proclivity in the perpetration of sexual violence.

Not Making a Distinction Between Coercion and Aggression

The terms sexual assault, sexual aggression, sexual coercion, and sexual offence are often used interchangeably to refer to a range of unwanted sexual behaviour (White et al., 2006). Although these terms might imply physical force, perpetration of sexual violence can involve the use of non-physical tactics (psychological or verbal pressure) or

physical force (forcible rape). Perpetration involving the use of physical force, such as forcible rape, incapacitated rape, and drug-facilitated rape, is referred to as sexual aggression (Kilpatrick et al., 2007; Testa & Dermen, 1999) and is mostly accompanied by legal consequences. On the other hand, the use of non-physical tactics to engage in unwanted sexual acts, such as manipulations, lies, or pressure, is referred to as sexual coercion (Craig et al., 1989; Koss et al., 1985; Livingston et al., 2004) and is seen to represent a less severe or legal form of perpetration.

Historically, many researchers have tended to collapse sexual coercion and aggression into one category of sexual violence when examining characteristics of individuals who committed sexual offences (Aberle & Littlefield, 2001). More specifically, perhaps due to the less violent nature of sexual coercion, fewer studies have specifically examined the use of non-physical tactics in obtaining unwanted sex. However, evidence suggests that this form of sexual perpetration is used significantly more often than physically aggressive tactics, both among samples of community men and among individuals with a history of sexual offending (DeGue & Dillilo 2010; Widmen et al., 2013; Lyndon et al., 2007). For example, as part of a study aimed at examining the characteristics of men based on the type of tactics they used to obtain sex, Lyndon et al. (2007) had 536 male university students complete the Sexual Experience Survey, which assessed sexual aggression perpetration. Result indicated that 15.7% of participants reported engaging in coercive tactics, such as verbal pressure to engage in sexual behaviour. In comparison, 6.2% of the sample reported engaging in sexually aggressive behaviour, such as using physical force.

Further, there are discrepancies in the literature regarding the extent to which those who have been convicted of sexual offences differ on certain characteristics compared to men who have not been convicted of sexual offences. Some studies have found differences in key characteristics between individuals convicted of sexual offending and controls (e.g., Knight & Sims-Knight, 2011; Malamuth, 2003), whereas others have not been able to find significant differences between the two groups (Chan & Beauregard, 2016; Moyano & Sierra, 2016). One explanation for this discrepancy may be the way researchers have typically identified sexually aggressive individuals. A large number of unidentified sexually coercive men among the control groups (i.e., individuals never convicted of sexual offences) may mask the detection of unique characteristics of sexually aggressive males. Failing to identify sexually coercive males in control samples will continue to yield substantial Type II errors of non-discrimination. Further, examining differences between the two categories may inform and improve strategies aimed at the prevention of sexual violence.

In line with previous research, sexual coercion will be used in this dissertation to refer to a broad range of non-physical tactics used to obtain sexual contact. Sexual aggression will be used to refer to a broad range of physical tactics used to obtain sexual contact. The terms ‘tactics’ will be used to refer to perpetrators' strategies to engage in any form of unwanted sexual contact including completed sexual intercourse.

Correlates of Rape and Past Perpetration of Sexual Violence

Past self-reported sexual offending has been strongly associated with correlates of rape. Men who reported at least one act of sexual violence perpetration endorsed more rape supportive cognitions, such as hostility towards women (Abbey & McAuslan, 2004),

hypermasculinity, rape myth acceptance (Degue et al., 2010), and a need for dominance over women (Lisak & Roth, 1988). Further, endorsing attitudes of misogyny and violence was found to be more common among college men who reported committing repeated acts of sexual violence than amongst those who committed one isolated act of sexual violence (Hall et al., 2006).

Rape Proclivity and Past Perpetration of Sexual Violence

As discussed in previous chapters, studies have investigated the relationship between rape proclivity and variables associated with rape to determine if individuals with rape proclivity have characteristics similar to those who have been convicted of rape (Bohner et al., 1998; Bohner et al., 2006; Malamuth, 1981; Malamuth & Check, 1980; Malamuth et al., 1980). For example, rape-prone men have been found to exhibit high levels of hostility towards women (Malamuth, 1986), experience feelings of anger toward women (Lisak & Roth, 1988), perceive dominance as a motive for sexual behaviour (Malamuth, 1986), and reported experiencing high levels of arousal in response to forced-sex depictions (Malamuth & Check, 1980).

However, fewer studies have explored the relationship between the self-reported likelihood to rape and the perpetration of sexual violence. In one such study, as part of a larger research design examining factors associated with sexual coercion, Degue and Dillilo (2004) investigated the relationship between sexual coercion and rape proclivity among 304 male university students. Participants completed measures of rape proclivity, rape supportive cognitions, interpersonal reactivity, psychopathic personality inventory and sexual experience questionnaires. Results indicated that men who reported using

sexually coercive tactics to engage in sexual behaviour reported a significantly greater likelihood to rape.

Rape Proclivity and Future Perpetration of Sexual Violence

The theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1991) posits that an individual's intent to use behaviour is the best predictor of subsequent engagement in that behaviour. From this point of view, it might be fair to assume that men's intention of engaging in sexual violence might indicate their future perpetration. Therefore, it would be valuable to ascertain if participants who indicate a possible interest in rape, particularly under hypothetical circumstances, are, in fact, more likely to commit future acts of sexual violence.

While a number of studies have investigated the relationship between rape proclivity and other related constructs, there is a dearth of information available on the role of rape proclivity in predicting sexual aggression. In the only study aimed at examining the role of rape proclivity in predicting sexual aggression, Gidycz (2011) asked 432 male university students to report on the likelihood that they find themselves engaging in a variety of coercive and violent tactics, including using arguments, authority, or physical force to engage in sexual behaviour in the next three months. At the three-month follow-up, students were asked to complete the Sexual Experience Survey, which assessed sexual aggression perpetration. Results indicated self-reported tendency to rape at baseline was significantly associated with perpetration of sexual aggression at follow-up.

To date, Gidycz (2011) is the only research study examining the predictive validity of rape proclivity. As noted previously, there is a paucity of such data available at present. Although many factors might potentially explain the lack of research in this area,

one explanation would be that some scholars have argued that research examining rape proclivity is classifying anyone with self-reported likelihood to rape as “potential rapists” (Brannigan & Goldenberg, 1987, P. 273). In response to such critics, Malamuth (1989) argued that from a scientific point of view, individuals have the potential to engage in any type of behaviour, and studying those inclinations does not equate to identifying potential rapists.

Further, there seems to be an inclination towards assuming that the non-offending population is inherently different than those convicted of sexual offences. That assumption remains despite the consistent findings indicating that perpetration of sexual violence is not an uncommon occurrence among community men (Abbey et al., 2006) and university students (Koss et al., 1987). In addition, recent research points to the fact that sexually violent behaviour falls on a continuum rather than representing separate classes of behaviour (Knight, 2010; Longpre et al., 2020). In fact, studies examining undetected rape indicate that there are similarities between individuals who have reported committing sexual violence in the past and those who have been convicted of sexual violence in terms of rape supportive attitudes (Lisak & Roth, 1990; Malamuth, 1986), lack of empathy (Lisak & Ivan, 1995), and antisocial traits (Kosson et al., 1997).

Despite some evidence suggesting the high rates of sexual perpetration among community men, not much is known about factors associated with sexual violence among this population. In the face of this lack of data, we do not currently know what rape proclivity can tell us in terms of future sexual offending. The predictive validity of rape proclivity measures has not been systematically analyzed. If rape proclivity predicts sexual violence, it might be used as a valuable tool for intervention and prevention of

sexual offending. Therefore, examining the role rape proclivity plays in sexual offending is important.

Study Purpose

The primary purpose of this study was to address the gap in research by examining the relationship between rape proclivity and sexually aggressive behaviour in a longitudinal research design. In addition, to better understand individuals who commit acts of sexual violence, this study examined the relationship between sexually aggressive behaviour and constructs related to sexual offending. More specifically, using both samples of students and community men the study addressed the following research questions:

- 1) To what extent do individuals with a history of engaging in sexual violence differ in their levels of coercive arousal and distorted cognitions (both rape supportive attitudes and antisocial attitudes) and rape proclivity?
- 2) Does rape proclivity influence the frequency of coercive or aggressive tactics used to engage in sexual behavior?
- 3) Does rape proclivity at Wave 1 predict engaging in sexual violence 6 weeks later at Wave 2?

Methods

Participants

Student Sample

Student participants were the same 389 male undergraduate students from Ontario Tech University used in Study 2.

Community Sample

The community sample consisted of 228 men recruited from a social platform called Reddit. For the purpose of this study, participants were limited to adult English-speaking men who resided in North America. To control for inattention and fake responding, two quality control questions (asking participants to respond in a certain way) were implemented. Participants were excluded from the sample if they failed any of the two quality control questions ($n = 6$). Further, participants with missing data ($n = 10$), or those who identified as homosexual ($n = 11$) were excluded. This resulted in a final sample size of 201 community men ranging from 19 to 45 years old ($M = 31.45$, $SD = 5.72$).

Participants mostly identified as heterosexual ($n = 174$; 87.9%) and 24 (12.1%) men identified as bisexual. All participants reported having at least one female sexual partner in their lifetime. On average, participants had 3 ($SD = 1.56$) female sexual partners in their lifetime. Furthermore, most participants ($n = 161$, 81.3%) reported having no male sexual partner in their lifetime. More information is provided in Table 21.

In regards to ethnicity, 174 (87.9%) were Caucasian, 12 (6.1%) were African American, 11 (5.6%) were Hispanic or Latino, and 1 (0.5%) participant reported their ethnicity as South Asian.

Table 21

Demographic Characteristics of the Male Students and Community Samples.

Demographic Characteristics	Students	Community Participants	X^2 (df)
	n (%)	n (%)	
Age ^{a,b}			

18-19	101 (50.2)	1 (0.5)	228.09 (6), $p < .001$
20-24	82 (40.8)	10 (5.1)	
25-29	10 (5.0)	71 (36.2)	
30-34	5 (2.5)	67 (34.2)	
35-39	3 (1.5)	22 (11.2)	
40-44	-	24 (12.2)	
45 or older	-	1 (0.5)	
Female Sexual Partners ^b			
0	67 (33.0)	-	130.42 (6), $p < .001$
1	45 (22.2)	31 (15.9)	
2	21 (10.2)	34 (17.4)	
3	18 (8.8)	50 (25.6)	
4	11 (5.4)	28 (14.4)	
5	2 (1.0)	40 (20.5)	
6 or more	39 (17.2)	12 (6.1)	

^a n = 4 students missing data, ^b n = 5 community men missing data, ^c n = 2 students missing data, ^d n = 6 community men missing data.

Procedure

Wave 1

Student Participants. Student participants were recruited from Ontario Tech University through the psychology participant pool (i.e., SONA). The manner in which students took part in Wave 1 is described in Chapter 2.

Community Men. The data collection for community men occurred between March 2020, to June 2020. Community men were recruited through Reddit. English speaking adult men in North America were invited to take part in a study that examine

sexual interests, behaviour, and attitudes for \$10 compensation. Participants were provided with an anonymous link that took them to the survey on Qualtrics. The first 222 who took part in the study were considered for data analysis. Participants were first presented with a consent form (Appendix R) outlining the study. If participants agreed to participate, they were asked to provide a memorable word of their choosing to facilitate withdrawal from the study at a later date. Participants were presented with a demographics questionnaire first and then completed the set of Sexual Interest Cardsort, Rape Proclivity Measure, the Rape Scale, MCAA, Coercive Sexual Scale, Sexual Experiences Survey-Tactics First Revised-Perpetrator Versions and Sexual Experiences Survey-Tactics First Revised, in a counterbalanced order. They were then debriefed (Appendix S) and provided with contact information for support. At the end of the study, participants were automatically taken to another Qualtrics survey to enter their email addresses so they could receive their compensation. They were also asked if they would give consent to be contacted for a follow-up survey in 6 weeks that would allow them to receive a \$20 Amazon gift card. Participants were sent a \$10 amazon e-gift card for participating in Wave 1.

Wave 2

Student Participants. At the 6-week follow-up, students who consented to take part in the follow-up study were contacted by email and were invited to participate in Wave 2 of the study. Participants could sign up for the study using a password that was included in the email. Once student participants signed up, they were provided with an anonymous link that took them to the survey on Qualtrics. Wave 2 did not take place in the lab. More specifically, students could participate in the study remotely using any

electronic device. Participants were first presented with a consent form outlining the study (Appendix T). If participants agreed to participate, they were asked to provide three memorable words (i.e., initials, mother's maiden name, last 3 digits of the phone number) to facilitate withdrawal from the study at a later date. Memorable words were also used to link responses from Wave 1 to Wave 2, while also ensuring students' anonymity.

Participants were then presented with the Sexual Experience Survey (SES-TFR) and were asked to rate how many times they have engaged in different acts of sexual violence since Wave 1. The SES-TFR measures were presented together by tactic, such that participants rated each behaviour for each tactic on all three Likert-type scales (Past Behavior, Evaluation, and Proclivity) before moving on to the next tactic. Participants were then debriefed (Appendix U). Upon participation in the study, students were given .5 credit towards the same psychology course in which they were enrolled.

Community Men. Participants who agreed to participate in the follow-up study were contacted by email 6 weeks following participation in Wave 1. They were provided with an anonymous link that took them to the survey on Qualtrics. Participants were first presented with a consent form (Appendix V) outlining the study. If participants agreed to participate, they were asked to provide a memorable word (preferably the same memorable word they provided in Wave 1). The memorable words were used as a way to facilitate withdrawal from the study and to link participants who responded from Wave 1 and Wave 2. Participants were then presented with the Sexual Experience Survey (SES-TFR) and were asked to rate how many times they have engaged in different acts of sexual violence since Wave 1. The SES-TFR measures were presented together by tactic, such that participants rated each behaviour for each tactic on all three Likert-type scales

(Past Behavior, Evaluation, and Proclivity) before moving on to the next tactic.

Participants were then debriefed (Appendix W). They were then automatically taken to another Qualtrics survey, where they entered their email address. Participants were sent a \$20 Amazon e-gift card.

This study was reviewed and approved by the Ontario Tech University Research Ethics Board. As a result of the sensitive nature of this study, several safeguards were put in place to protect participants (both students and community members). First, to ensure only adults completed the survey, participants who reported being less than 18 years old on the demographics questionnaire were automatically screened out of the study. Second, both prior to completing the study (consent form) and after completing the study (debrief form) participants were provided with national and international sources in case they experienced distress.

Measures

Descriptions of the Demographic questionnaire (Appendix B), Rape Proclivity Measure (Appendix C), Sexual Interest Card Sort (Appendix I), Rape Scale (Appendix J), Measure of Criminal Attitude and Associate (MCCA) (Appendix N), and Sexual Experience Survey–Tactics First Revised (SES-TFR) (Appendix H) are available in Chapter 3. It is worthwhile to note that for the purpose of this study, the Rape Scale was used as a measure of rape supportive cognitions, as it had higher internal consistency among the rape-supportive cognitions scales and had the highest correlation with the Rape Proclivity Measure.

Sexual Experience Survey–Tactics First Revised (SES-TFR)

The SES-TFR was modified for the current study to assess sexually aggressive behaviour engaged during the 6-week period between Wave 1 and Wave 2. Specifically,

participants were asked “how many times in the PAST 6 WEEKS (or since Time 1)” have they engaged in sexual activity using a number of different sexually coercive and sexually aggressive tactics. The same tactics, sexual activity, and scoring method as presented in chapter 3 were used in the current study.

Quality Control Questions

Participants were asked to respond to two quality control questions at random points throughout the survey. These were used to screen out participants who were not paying attention to the survey instructions and items (indicated by incorrect responses). For example, participants were asked “Please choose item B.” Those who did not answer both quality control questions correctly were screened out.

Results

For the community sample, descriptive statistics and internal consistency for each measure are presented in Table 23. In both the student and community samples, measures of rape proclivity have excellent internal consistency among both students and community men. The subscales for the sexual interest scale have good to excellent internal consistency. The exception to this was male gender identity in both samples, adult homosexuality and voyeurism among community men, and Transvestic Fetishism among students, which only had moderate internal consistency. Further, in both male students and community men, the measure of rape supportive cognitions had excellent internal consistency. The measure of antisocial cognitions had good to excellent internal consistency among both samples. In both samples, the subscale entitlement attitudes had moderate internal consistency among the community sample and poor internal consistency among the student sample. The range of scores for some of the scales differs

between the student participants and community men resulting in the slightly different internal consistency scores. Table 22 includes more information.

Table 22

Internal Consistency and Descriptive Statistics for Sexual Interest, Rape-Supportive Cognition, Antisocial cognition, and Proclivity to Rape for the Sample of Community Men.

Measures	α	Range	$M (SD)$	n	95% CI
Proclivity to Rape					
Rape Proclivity	0.87	15-96	74.47 (12.18)	196	0.84 to 0.89
LR	-				
SES-TFR	0.96	36-200	112.15(31.51)	181	0.94 to 0.97
Sexual Interest					
SI- Adult Homosexuality	0.75	5-35	14.93 (6.43)	189	0.69 to 0.80
SI-Adult Heterosexuality	0.84	5-35	27.75 (5.92)	195	0.80 to 0.97
SI-Voyeurism	0.74	10-35	27.00 (4.58)	195	0.68 to 0.79
SI-Exhibitionism	0.90	5-32	16.00 (4.13)	198	0.88 to 0.92
SI-Frotteurism	0.85	5-34	18.85 (6.74)	195	0.82 to 0.88
SI-Extrafam Molest	0.92	5-32	13.34 (7.58)	194	0.90 to 0.93
Girls					
SI-Intrafam Molest Girls	0.92	5-32	13.34 (7.56)	191	0.90 to 0.93
SI-Extrafam Molest	0.90	5-32	11.96 (7.10)	191	0.88 to 0.92
Boys					
SI-Intrafam Molest Boys	0.89	5-32	11.91 (6.32)	195	0.87 to 0.91
SI-Rape of Adults	0.91	5-32	15.68 (7.83)	193	0.88 to 0.92
SI-Sadism	0.89	5-31	15.26 (7.33)	193	0.82 to 0.91
SI-Masochism	0.88	5-32	15.11 (7.19)	195	0.86 to 0.91
SI-Male Gender Identity	0.75	12-34	27.28 (5.27)	195	0.69 to 0.78
SI-Female Gender	0.86	5-34	13.11 (6.31)	195	0.82 to 0.89
Identity					

SI-Transvestic Fetishism	0.87	5-31	13.92 (6.91)	192	0.85 to 0.90
Rape Supportive Cognition					
The RAPE Scale	0.93	45-129	91.33 (17.01)	190	0.92 to 0.95
Antisocial Cognition					
MCAA-Violence	0.83	0-12	4.29 (3.21)	185	0.80 to 0.87
MCAA-Entitlement	0.74	0-12	4.35 (2.68)	187	0.69 to 0.79
MCAA-Intent	0.68	1-12	3.14 (2.31)	192	0.61 to 0.74
MCAA-Associate	0.79	0-8	1.94 (2.33)	190	0.75 to 0.83
MCAA-Total	0.91	3-44	13.20 (8.48)	168	0.89 to 0.93
Past Perpetration					
SES-TFR					

Note. SES-TFR = Sexual Experience Survey–Tactics First Revised, LR= Likelihood to Rape, MCAA= Measure of Criminal Attitude and Associate.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Wave 1

Comparing Community Men to Students

Overall, in comparison to students, the community sample was significantly older and less ethnically diverse. In addition, community men reported significantly higher levels of rape proclivity, as assessed by both the Rape Proclivity Measure, $t(529) = 38.92$, $p < .001$, $d = 15.01$, and the Proclivity SES-TFR, $t(484) = 135.42$, $p < .001$, $d = 20.71$. Similarly, community men reported significantly higher arousal to coercive sexual behaviour, including voyeurism, $t(533) = 142.95$, $p < .001$, $d = 7.43$, Exhibitionism, $t(536) = 237.57$, $p < .001$, $d = 5.86$, frotteurism $t(534) = 81.67$, $d = 5.55$, and arousal to rape, $t(532) = 521.38$, $d = 5.23$. Overall, community men reported significantly higher arousal to coercive sexual behaviour, including voyeurism, exhibitionism, frotteurism, and

arousal to rape $t(534) = 81.67, d = 5.55$. However, community men and students were not significantly different on measures of distorted cognitions, including the Rape Scale, $t(506) = .11, d = 15.66$, attitudes towards violence, $t(501) = .57, p = .44$, beliefs endorsing antisocial intent, $t(516) = 1.23, p = .39$, attitudes of entitlement, $t(515) = .64, p = .42$, and attitudes of associate $t(519) = .83, p = .36$.

Prevalence of Sexual Coercion and Aggression

Responses to the Sexual Experiences Survey (Abbey et al., 2005) were examined to find the proportion of men who reported using coercive or aggressive tactics to engage in sexual behaviour since they were 16 years old. Among students, 27 % ($n = 86$) reported engaging in at least one coercive tactic (including arguments, pressure, lying) to have some form of sexual contact with women. Further, 9.55% ($n = 30$) of students reported perpetrating more than one act of sexual assault. This information is further broken down by tactics used to obtain sexual activity (see Table 25). Of the full sample, 71.8 % ($n = 221$) reported not ever engaging in any type of coercive or aggressive tactics in order to engage in sexual behaviour; these will be referred to as consensual participants.

Among community men, only 2.6% ($n = 5$) reported never using coercive or aggressive tactics to engage in sexual behaviour. Of the full sample, 1.0% ($n = 2$) of individuals reported engaging in sexual coercion since the age of 16. Further, 96.4% ($n = 185$) of the sample reported engaging in sexually aggressive behaviour since the age 16. Table 23 reports the number and percentage of men in each of the original categories by the tactic group.

Table 23

Self-Reported Frequency of Sexually Aggressive Behavior by Tactic Used for the Samples of Students and Community Men

SES-TFR Tactics	Students		Community		F	d
	(N = 344)		(N = 195)			
	n	%	N	%		
Coercive Tactics						
1. Arguments and pressure	51	15.5	186	96.4	429.45**	7.80
2. False promises and lies	60	18.0	184	96.8	479.53**	7.98
3. Making a woman feel guilty, or getting angry	46	14.3	186	96.4	556.98**	8.02
Aggressive Tactics						
4. Giving a woman drugs or alcohol without permission	8	2.6	183	94.3	989.40**	7.28
5. Woman passed out or too drunk to object advances	18	5.7	182	93.8	819.86**	7.34
6. Using of Physical force	15	4.7	184	94.8	719.69**	.742

**p < .01

Perpetration of Sexual Violence and Constructs Related to Sexual Offending

In order to investigate the characteristics of men who reported perpetrating sexual violence, a series of independent sample *t*-tests were conducted to compare the level of constructs related to sexual offending among men who did and did not report engaging in sexual violence. Among students, those who reported engaging in either coercive or aggressive tactics were grouped into coercive/aggressive ($n = 74$) and those who reported never engaging in any form of sexual violence were labelled consensual ($n = 112$). These two groups were compared on measures of sexual interest, rape supportive attitudes, and antisocial cognitions. Results indicated that students who reported engaging in sexual violence were significantly higher on correlates of rape including sexual interest in coercive sexual behaviour, distorted cognitions (both rape supportive and antisocial).

Since only 2.6% ($n = 5$) of community men reported never engaging in sexual violence, they were grouped based on whether they were one-time perpetrators or repeated perpetrators of sexual violence. Of these community men, 41.5% ($n = 78$) reported using any type of coercive or aggressive tactic to engage in sexual behaviour only once and were assigned to the one-time perpetrator group. The remaining 58.5% ($n = 110$) of individuals reported engaging in any type of coercive or aggressive tactic more than one time and were labelled as repeated perpetrators.

Rape proclivity, sexual interest in rape, voyeurism, exhibitionism, frotteurism, rape supportive cognitions, and antisocial attitudes towards violence and intent were significantly higher among community men who were repeated perpetrators than those who reported only one act of sexual violence perpetration. See Table 24 for more information.

Table 24

Measures Related to Sexual Offending by Perpetration of Sexual Violence

Measure	Students				<i>F</i>	<i>d</i>	Community Men				<i>F</i>	<i>d</i>
	Consensual		Nonconsensual				One Time		Repeated			
	M	SD	M	SD			M	SD	M	SD		
Rape Proclivity	25.17	13.16	39.65	18.04	21.86**	.99	76.11	7.66	73.39	14.79	47.98**	.22
Proclivity SES-TFR	37.02	4.08	47.60	14.60	90.96**	1.22	103.00	19.82	119.50	36.66	58.44**	.54
Voyeurism	16.19	8.52	22.24	8.31	2.82*	.50	25.56	4.58	29.47	3.18	24.37**	.96
Exhibitionism	6.74	3.56	8.48	4.89	7.48**	.44	8.93	3.75	21.55	5.91	24.46**	.98
Frotteurism	7.47	3.77	10.40	6.06	32.95**	.65	12.83	2.37	22.85	5.74	43.14	2.15
Rape of Adult RS	5.59	1.93	7.51	4.50	73.87**	.67	9.19	3.11	20.13	7.01	69.17**	1.92
MCAA Violence	53.99	13.79	64.57	15.73	3.91*	.65	88.45	4.90	94.29	5.21	68.28**	1.34
MCAA Intent	4.52	2.80	7.50	3.03	6.49*	.30	2.07	0.73	6.02	3.40	62.97**	1.51
MCAA Entitlement	3.13	2.46	4.85	2.89	5.64*	.66	1.20	0.74	4.49	2.07	70.18**	1.99
	4.22	2.54	4.98	2.70	.41	.29	3.14	0.80	5.30	3.23	146.72**	.88

MCAA Associate	2.39	2.17	3.28	2.44	4.01*	.39	0.14	0.57	3.19	2.29	164.40**	1.72
MCAA Total	14.15	6.70	17.97	7.90	2.84*	.54	6.56	2.23	19.28	7.68	82.54**	2.21

Note. SES-TFR = Sexual Experience Survey–Tactics First Revised. MCAA= Measure of Criminal Attitude and Associate. RS = The Rape Scale.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Wave 2

Perpetration of Sexual Violence

Among students, 29.56% ($n = 55$) of the initial sample participated in Wave 2, and 21.0% ($n = 12$) of these individuals reported engaging in some form of sexual violence since Wave 1 (i.e., a 6-week timeframe). More specifically, 21% ($n = 12$) of the sample reported using coercive tactics to have sexual contact with women since Wave 1, and 5.5% ($n = 3$) of the sample reported engaging in sexually aggressive behaviour since Wave 1. Further, 75% ($n = 9$) of individuals who reported engaging in sexual violence at Wave 2, also reported engaging in some sort of sexual violence at Wave 1. Among the community sample, 64.51% ($n = 125$) participated in Wave 2. Of these, 100% ($n = 125$) of individuals who participated at Wave 2 reported using both coercive and aggressive tactics to engage in any form of sexual behaviour with women since Wave 1.

Rape Proclivity and Perpetration of Sexual Violence

A third series of analyses were conducted to examine the level of concurrence between participants' reported likelihood to engage in sexual violence and their actual perpetration since the age of 16. Among the student sample, 97 (47%) participants reported no likelihood of engaging in sexual violence and were assigned to the no

proclivity group. In the student sample, 107 (52.2%) reported at least some likelihood of engaging in sexual violence and were assigned to the some proclivity group.

The same method was not applied to community men, as the number of men who self-reported proclivity to rape was high ($n = 195$; 99.5%). Only 1 participant (.5%) reported no likelihood of engaging in sexual violence. Therefore, a median split method was used to divide community men into those who reported low and high levels of rape proclivity. Scores on rape proclivity ranged from 15 to 102 ($M = 74.47$, $SD = 12.25$). The median score for rape proclivity was 76.

Self-reported perpetration of sexual violence was measured using the Sexual Experience Survey (SES). Participants were asked whether they have used a series of coercive and aggressive tactics to engage in sexual behaviour since they were 16 years old. Among students, a series of independent sample t -tests compared perpetration in each of the tactics on SES between individuals with or without self-reported rape proclivity. Results indicated that students who reported at least some likelihood of engaging in sexual violence used significantly more coercive and aggressive tactics to engage in sexual behaviour (see table 26). Similarly, a series of t -tests compared self-reported perpetration in each of the tactics on SES between community men with high and low levels of proclivity to rape. Results indicated that community men with high rape proclivity reported using significantly more coercive and aggressive tactics to engage in sexual behaviour in the past (see Table 25).

Table 25

Rape Proclivity and History of Sexual Violence Perpetration

Students	Community Men
----------	---------------

No RP		RP		<i>F</i>	<i>d</i>	Low RP		High RP		<i>F</i>	<i>d</i>
M	SD	M	SD			M	SD	M	SD		
Have engaged in sexual behavior through arguments or pressure											
6.43	2.28	7.59	4.55	21.24**	.34	16.48	8.25	22.52	14.59	68.76**	.51
Have engaged in sexual behavior through false promises and lies											
6.42	2.74	7.86	5.09	23.01**	.36	16.78	9.29	22.39	14.16	48.93**	.46
Have engaged in sexual behavior through anger, swearing											
6.32	1.46	7.70	4.27	28.19**	.37	16.93	9.91	22.11	14.34	38.09**	.42
Have engaged in sexual behavior by giving a woman drugs and alcohol											
6.00	0.00	6.17	0.91	23.81**	.27	16.04	8.50	21.95	14.00	49.12**	.51
Have engaged in sexual behavior when the woman was passed out											
6.07	0.68	6.80	0.87	10.45*	.16	16.16	9.03	21.74	13.95	32.05**	.47
Have engaged in sexual behavior by using physical force											
6.04	0.38	6.84	3.24	23.23*	.26	16.86	8.64	21.49	13.98	47.07**	.39

Note. No RP = No Rape Proclivity. RP = Some Rape Proclivity. Low RP = Low Rape Proclivity.

High RP = High Rape Proclivity.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Rape Proclivity and Likelihood to Engage in Sexual Violence

A simple linear regression was run to examine the degree to which rape proclivity measured by the Rape Proclivity Measure at Wave 1 was able to predict engaging in sexual violence at Wave 2. For this analysis, continuous proclivity scores were used as the dependent variable. Among the student sample, examining the Cook's distance revealed that any outliers did not have undue influence. There was no significant relationship between proclivity measured by the Rape Proclivity Measure at Wave 1 and perpetration of sexual violence at Wave 2 ($F(1, 51) = .289, p = .591$ with an R^2 of .003). Therefore, we fail to reject the null hypothesis; in other words, there is no linear

relationship between rape proclivity (as measured by the Rape Proclivity Measure) and self-reported perpetration of sexual violence six weeks later.

Similarly, among the community sample, the collinearity statistics for tolerance and VIF were acceptable for the regression analyses. Examining the Cook's distance reveals that any outliers do not have any undue influence on the model. The relationship between rape proclivity measured by the Rape Proclivity Measure at Wave 1 and perpetration of sexual violence at Wave 2 was not significant ($F(1,122) = .11, p = .739$ with an R^2 of .001). See Table 26 for more information.

Table 26

Regression Analysis Summary for Rape Proclivity Predicting sexual violent behaviour

Variable	Students			Community Participants		
	B	β	SE	B	β	SE
Rape Proclivity Measure	.17	.14	.16	.17	.03	.51

Further, it would be worthwhile to examine how predictive validity of the Rape Proclivity Measure compares to predictive validity of other rape proclivity measures. Therefore, to examine this a simple linear regression was calculated to examine the degree to which rape proclivity measured by the Proclivity SES-TFR at Wave 1 predicted engaging in sexual violence at Wave 2. Among the student sample, examining the Cook's distance reveals that any outliers do not have an undue influence. There was a significant relationship between rape proclivity measured by SES Proclivity at Wave 1 and perpetration of sexual violence at Wave 2 ($F(1,46) = 18.50, p < .001$ with $R^2 = .27$). This means that 27% of variation in sexual violence perpetration among students is explained by rape proclivity measured by SES-TFR.

Similarly, among the community sample, examining the Cook's distance revealed that any outliers do not have undue influence on the model. There was a significant relationship between rape proclivity measured by the SES-TFR at Wave 1 and perpetration of sexual violence at Wave 2 ($F(1, 114) = 23.37, p < .001$ with $R^2 = .16$). This means that 16% of variation in perpetration of sexual violence among community men was explained by self-reported rape proclivity at Wave 2. See Table 27 for more information.

Table 27

Regression Analysis Summary for the Rape Proclivity Measure Predicting sexual violent

Variable	Students			Community Participants		
	B	β	SE	B	β	SE
Rape Proclivity (SES-TFR)	.30	.53	.07	.78	.41	.16

Discussion

The results from this study extend our knowledge about the link between rape proclivity and the perpetration of sexual violence. This is one of the few longitudinal designs examining the role rape proclivity plays in sexual violence. The proportion of participants who engaged in sexual violence was examined. Among students, 41% of the sample engaged in at least one form of violence. More specifically, 25.3% reported engaging in at least one coercive tactic (including arguments, pressure, and lying) to have some form of sexual contact with women. Further, 14.5% of students reported perpetrating more than one act of sexual assault (including using physical force). The result for the student sample is consistent with previous research examining the rate of

self-reported perpetration of sexual violence. For example, in a longitudinal study aimed at understanding male students' perpetration of sexual violence, White and Smith (2004) found that 34% reported at least one act of sexual assault. Further, the results are also consistent with previous research asserting the self-reported rate of engaging in coercive tactics to obtain sex significantly are significantly higher than physically aggressive tactics (DeGue & Dillilo 2010; Lynden, 2007).

The community sample reported much higher rates of sexual violence. Even though previous studies have found a high rate of sexual violence among community men (e.g., Widman et al., 2013), self-reported rates of past sexual perpetration in this sample were higher than previously documented. Among community men, 97.4% individuals reported using any coercive tactics to have sexual contact with women. Only 3.6% of community men reported *not* engaging in aggressive tactics, such as using physical force to engage in sexual behaviour.

Further, the results from this study indicate that among students, those with a history of perpetrating sexual violence scored significantly higher on rape proclivity, sexual arousal to coercive behaviour, rape supportive cognitions, and antisocial cognitions. Among community men, those who engaged in repeated acts of sexual violence were significantly higher on rape proclivity, sexual arousal to coercive behaviour, rape supportive cognitions, and antisocial cognitions. These findings seem to be in line with previous research indicating that past sexual behaviour is associated with other rape correlates. However, findings also indicate that men with high rape proclivity might fit the characteristic of individuals who perpetrate sexual violence in that they score higher on correlates of rape. Despite the differences between samples noted above,

the pattern of relationship between rape proclivity and other correlates of rape remains very similar across the sample of students and community men.

In order to examine if rape proclivity is related to the self-reported history of sexual violence, a series of *t*-tests were performed. Results indicated that among students, those with self-reported likelihood to rape engaged in significantly more coercive and aggressive tactics to have some sexual contact with women. Similarly, among the community sample, those with higher rates of rape proclivity engaged in significantly more acts of sexual violence. This may indicate that men who do have a history of engaging in sexual violence are more likely to see themselves likely to engage in future sexual violence.

Lastly, a regression analysis indicated that rape proclivity (as measured by the Rape Proclivity Measure) at Wave 1 is not predictive of perpetration of sexual violence at Wave 2. This may indicate that the problem is with the Rape Proclivity Measure (Bohner, 1998), rather than the construct of rape proclivity as a potential predictor of sexual violence as a whole. Therefore, another simple linear regression analysis was conducted to examine the predictive validity of rape proclivity measured by SES-TFR in both samples. Results indicated that rape proclivity measured by SES-TFR at Wave 1 significantly predicted perpetration of sexual violence at Wave 2 among both students and community men. These results indicated that rape proclivity may in fact predict perpetration of sexual violence but perhaps the Rape Proclivity Measure and the SES-TFR proclivity are not measuring the same construct. This is in line with findings from the previous chapters indicating that these two measures may not have the same latent

construct. In chapter 3, the Rape Proclivity Measure was found to be tapping into arousal to coercive sexual behaviour as opposed to actual likelihood of committing rape.

Limitations

Results from this study should be interpreted with caution, given the characteristics of both samples. Among the student sample, 33% reported never having female sexual partners. Even though some of those participants reported engaging in coercive tactics to engage in some form of sexual behaviour, the lack of opportunity to engage in acts of sexual violence might have been a contributing factor to the results. Further, the community sample consisted of individuals who almost exclusively perpetrated sexual violence. In fact, all individuals who participated at Wave 2 reported perpetrating sexual violence since Wave 1 (i.e., in the past 6 weeks). Therefore, none of these two samples might be fully representative of men not convicted of sexual offences.

A second limitation of this study relates to its generalizability to the population. Even though efforts were made to include a sample of community men to improve generalizability, the small sample size (both students and community men) reduces power and may make the results difficult to interpret. Also, there was a high attrition rate from Wave 1 to Wave 2, meaning that a reduced number of participants agreed to engage in Wave 2. This was particularly true among the student sample, as they were not offered monetary incentives to participate in Wave 2. Therefore, the number of participants to include in the regression analysis was low among the student sample. Thus, the attrition rate may have affected the statistical power of the analyses and may reduce the generalizability of the results. Future research should consider ways in which participation can be increased in Wave 2.

Future Directions

Results of the current dissertation should be replicated and expanded upon to determine if there is empirical support for a causal relationship between rape proclivity and sexual violence, perhaps using larger samples with more sexually experienced participants would improve the generalizability of results. Also, future research should extend the follow-up time frame from 6 weeks to longer periods in order to examine behaviour over longer periods of time.

Further, in order to provide causal evidence for the relationship between rape proclivity and sexually aggressive behaviour, future research could use incarcerated and non-incarcerated samples of sexually aggressive men. If future research finds that rape proclivity can demonstrate meaningful change and that this change is associated with a change in sexually aggressive behaviour, then it would be important to include targeting rape proclivity in prevention programs targeted at students and community men. However, the results from the current study do not support this.

Conclusion

This research aimed to better understand the relationship between rape proclivity and perpetration of sexual violence to develop preventive and intervention strategies that are effective at reducing the rates of sexual violence. Findings are promising as they shed light on the significant relationship between rape proclivity and self-reported perpetration of sexual violence. Among both the student and the community sample, those who reported higher rape proclivity engaged in more acts of sexual violence in the past. Furthermore, rape proclivity (as measured by SES-FTR) was found to be predictive of future perpetration of sexual violence at a six-week follow-up. Results from this study

indicate that rape proclivity may be a meaningful factor in the perpetration of sexual violence and therefore could be targeted in programs designed to prevent sexual violence.

Chapter 5: General Discussion

The overall purpose of the current dissertation was to improve understanding of rape proclivity as a potential factor associated with the perpetration of sexual violence. The findings revealed interesting information regarding rape proclivity and the role it plays in sexual violence. The first study aimed to examine male participants' understanding of rape scenarios included in the Rape Proclivity Measure (Bohner, 1998). More specifically, it aimed to check for the content validity of this measure by investigating whether participants clearly understood what each scenario entails. Findings revealed that most participants perceived the non-consensual scenarios included in the Rape Proclivity Measure as involving the perpetration of sexual violence. Further, most participants did not find the wording of scenarios ambiguous, indicating that the Rape Proclivity Measure is relevant, comprehensible and has good content validity.

Participant's Interpretations of Rape Scenarios

However, interesting results emerged when examining how some participants viewed the scenarios. Participants were more likely to label rape scenarios involving a stranger perpetrator and use of physical force as incidents of rape. This is consistent with previous findings indicating that individuals are more likely to label an incident as rape if it matches prevalent rape scripts (Peterson & Muehlenhard, 2011). Therefore, participants' interpretations of rape scenarios are indicative of their perception of what rape entails. A prevalent rape script in North America includes a male stranger violently attacking a female victim (Humphreys et al., 2007). Examining participants' perception of scenarios included in the Rape Proclivity Measure revealed that the same pattern emerges with regard to how participants viewed non-consensual scenarios. Thus, given

that scenarios that involve acquaintance perpetrators were not perceived as incidents of rape, this illustrates that these common rape scripts continue to persist among male university students. This is particularly problematic as more than two-thirds of rape incidents involve perpetrators known to the victim (Fisher et al., 2000).

Further, victims of rape are much less likely to report incidents of sexual violence if their experience does not match the common rape scripts (McMullin & White, 2006; Wolitzki-Taylor et al., 2013). More specifically, the absence of physical injuries, alcohol consumption by the victim, and perpetrator type (e.g., acquaintance) are factors associated with nonreporting incidents of sexual violence (Celeen et al., 2016). Unfortunately, nonreporting of sexual violence incidents limits victims' ability to access services (Marchetti, 2012) and impede intervention strategies designed for perpetrators of sexual violence.

Similarly, results from the first study suggest that up to 44% of participants endorsed beliefs that blamed the victim (e.g., she should have acted differently to avoid being raped) and/or justified the perpetrator's behaviour (e.g., he lost control). These findings reveal the extent of false beliefs regarding rape and victims of sexual violence among university students. The results from this study are particularly concerning as there is evidence to suggest that rape supportive cognitions are associated with the perpetration of sexual violence both among community men (DeGue & DiLillo, 2004) and individuals convicted of sexual offending (Helmus et al., 2012).

Current university responses and prevention strategies do not seem to be very successful in reducing offence-supportive beliefs (Palermo et al., 2019). The rape supportive attitudes and rape scripts endorsed by students may suggest areas that can be

targeted in strategies designed to prevent sexual violence on campuses and in the general community. Research findings examining the efficacy of treatment programs for individuals convicted of sexual offending suggest that targeting rape supportive attitudes shows a significant decrease in the rate of reoffending (Mpofu et al., 2018). The same strategies may be used to target and challenge beliefs supportive of sexual violence among university students.

Relationship Between Rape Proclivity and Risk Factors for Sexual Violence

The second study aimed to examine the relationship between rape proclivity and common factors associated with sexual offending, including sexual arousal to coercive behaviour and distorted cognitions (rape supportive and antisocial), and past preparation of sexual violence. In addition, the underlying structure of rape proclivity, arousal to coercive behaviour, and distorted cognitions were examined to determine whether rape proclivity represents a distinct construct. Overall, a significant relationship was found between rape proclivity and correlations of sexual violence, including arousal to coercive behaviour and distorted cognition.

These results may suggest that there is an association between certain risk factors for sexual violence and rape proclivity. More specifically, individuals with higher levels of rape proclivity share certain similarities to individuals who have perpetrated sexual violence. Further, individuals who endorse offence-related beliefs and find sexually coercive behaviour arousing might be more likely to report a tendency to engage in sexually violent behaviour. Therefore, strategies aimed at reducing men's offence supportive beliefs and manage sexual urges to coercive behaviour may decrease their self-reported likelihood of sexual offending.

However, results from Chapter 3 also suggest that rape proclivity does not appear to represent a distinct construct. Rather, rape proclivity measured by different scales loaded on different factors. More specifically, rape proclivity measured by the Rape Proclivity Measure had the same underlying construct as arousal to coercive behaviour. However, rape proclivity measured by SES-TFR has the same underlying construct as antisocial intent and attitudes of associate. Even though we hypothesized that rape proclivity assessed by all different measures would have the same underlying construct, results are not surprising given the nature of questions posed in each measure.

First, this study found a moderate relationship ($r = .49$) between the Rape Proclivity Measure and proclivity measured by SES-TFR, suggesting that these two scales may not be measuring the same construct. Further, in the Rape Proclivity Measure, participants are asked to imagine being in situations involving non-consensual sex and to report how aroused they are, how much they enjoy getting away with it, and whether they would do the same as the man in the scenario. It may be that the imaginative nature of scenarios and questions on the Rape Proclivity Measure tap into individuals' level of arousal to rape scenarios as opposed to their actual tendency to commit rape. However, questions included on SES-TFR proclivity ask participants to report whether they see themselves using a range of specific coercive and aggressive tactics to engage in sexual behaviour in the future. Therefore, individuals are asked whether they would commit specific acts of sexual violence if they get the chance. Therefore, it makes more sense that proclivity measured by SES-TFR be more indicative of behaviour.

Lastly, rape proclivity measured by the Likelihood to Rape Scale had the same underlying construct with the endorsement of certain antisocial cognitions, including

attitudes towards violence and attitudes of entitlement. The weak relationship between the Likelihood to Rape Scale and other measures of Rape Proclivity, including the Rape Proclivity Measure and the SES-TFR Proclivity (.28 to .32), explains why the Likelihood to Rape may not share the same underlying construct as the other rape proclivity measures. Further, the Likelihood to Rape scale contains one question asking individuals whether they would commit rape if they had the chance. Therefore, it is not surprising that it strongly correlates with the endorsement of violence and entitlement.

Predictive Validity of Rape Proclivity

Few empirical studies have yet examined the role of rape proclivity as a predictor of sexual offending. The third study in this dissertation examined the relationship between rape proclivity and perpetration of sexual violence using both samples of students and community men. More specifically, the study aimed at understanding the extent to which individuals with a history of sexual violence differ in their level of rape proclivity and other related constructs, including arousal to coercive behaviour and distorted cognitions (rape supportive and antisocial). Results indicated that rape proclivity, sexual interest in rape, voyeurism, exhibitionism, frottteurism, rape supportive cognition, and antisocial attitudes towards violence and intent were significantly higher among students with a history of engaging in sexual violence. Similarly, all those factors were significantly higher among community men who reported that they had repeatedly engaged in acts of sexual violence.

This study also examined whether rape proclivity is related to individuals' frequency of engaging in sexually coercive and aggressive behaviour. Results indicated that students who reported at least some likelihood to rape reported using significantly

more coercive and aggressive tactics to engage in sexual behaviour. Similarly, community men with high rape proclivity reported using significantly more coercive and aggressive tactics to engage in sexual behaviour in the past. This indicates that higher rape proclivity is related to the perpetration of sexual violence. This may mean that individuals who have already committed acts of sexual violence see themselves more likely to commit another act of sexual violence in the future. It could also mean that individuals with a self-proclaimed likelihood to rape are more likely to have engaged in past perpetration of sexual violence and are more likely to benefit from intervention strategies aimed at reducing the rates of sexual violence.

Lastly, Chapter 4 investigated whether rape proclivity can predict engaging in sexual violence. Results indicated that the Rape Proclivity Measure did not predict engaging in sexual violence in students or community men. However, in line with previous research (Gidycz, 2011), rape proclivity measured by the SES-TFR predicted future sexual offending both among students and community men. This again may indicate that the Rape Proclivity Measure and the SES-TFR are not measuring the same construct. Therefore, it seems that SES-TFR is a more accurate measure for rape proclivity, and it in fact, predicts sexual violence. Results from this study are in line with theory of planned behaviour and suggest that that men's intention of engaging in sexual violence may indicate their future perpetration of sexually violent behaviour.

Community Sample

In Chapter 4, samples of university students and community men were recruited to examine the predictive validity of rape proclivity in a longitudinal design. As noted in Chapter 4, research examining factors associated with sexual violence has mostly used

samples of incarcerated individuals convicted of sexual offending or university students. However, none of these populations are fully representative of men who engage in acts of sexual violence. Therefore, using a sample of community men could address this limitation and provide more generalizable results.

In Chapter 4 Wave 1, differences between the students and community sample were examined. Participants in the community were significantly older, and Caucasian; university students were younger and more ethnically diverse. Further, the sample of community men recruited for this study seemed to be more sexually experienced. For example, 35% of student participants reported never having sexual intercourse, whereas all community men reported having at least one female sexual partner. However, the sample of community men reported engaging in sexual violence at a much higher rate than the student sample. Most community men (97.4%) reported engaging in at least one act of sexual coercion or aggression since they were 16 years old. However, 71% of students reported never engaging in any form of sexual violence. This could be explained by the fact that students were significantly younger and less sexually experienced. The community sample had more opportunities to perpetrate sexual violence since they were both older and had more sexual partners. However, the high rates of sexual violence reported by the community sample are higher than previous research examining rates of sexual violence among community men (Widman et al., 2013). This may impact the generalizability of the results, and future research is needed to replicate and expand on the results.

Interestingly, there were also significant differences between students and the sample of community men in terms of their proclivity to rape, rape supportive attitudes,

and antisocial attitudes. Community men were significantly more likely to report a tendency to engage in rape or endorse distorted beliefs supportive of sexual violence or antisocial behaviour. Similarly, community men reported significantly higher levels of arousal to sexual behaviour involving a nonconsenting adult female (rape of adults, exhibitionism, voyeurism, and frotteurism). Overall, the sample of community men seemed to have more criminal tendencies than the students.

Despite the difference between these two samples, the same patterns of relationship between rape proclivity and past perpetration of sexual violence have emerged. Also, rape proclivity measured by SES-TFR predicted future sexual violence. This may indicate that rape proclivity is a meaningful factor associated with sexual violence and that it could be generalizable to both student samples and community men. This study also indicates that the role rape proclivity plays in sexual violence should be examined further.

Limitations

While this dissertation makes important contribution to understanding rape proclivity as a construct related to sexual offending, it includes several limitations. First, the study relied on self-report data to gather information on a socially taboo topic such as sexual violence and proclivity to rape. Considering the sensitive nature of the phenomenon being studied, some participants may have responded in a socially desired manner rather than being truthful. Although there is evidence to suggest that using self-report measures for examining factors related to sexual violence is reliable and valid (Piquero, 2014), the prevalence of individuals interpreting scenarios as incidents of sexual violence might be slightly skewed. In order to mitigate this effect, participants

were assured that their responses were completely anonymous. However, future studies may include a measure for social desirability to appropriately address possible social favorable responses.

Furthermore, the self-selection biased may have contributed to the results being slightly skewed. Before participating in the study, both the student sample and the community sample were informed that they would be taking part in a survey regarding sexual behaviour. Therefore, those who participated may have been different perspectives about sexual attitudes and behaviour than those who chose not to participate in this type of research. A larger, more diverse sample may reveal different patterns of attitudes and behaviour among participants.

Lastly, for the purpose of this dissertation, data has been collected from students attending Ontario Tech University in Ontario taking psychology courses and community men residing in North America. Therefore, the results of this study cannot be generalized to all university students across North America or community men across the globe. Given the cultural diversity in what is considered sexual violence, future research should consider using a variety of samples from different regions and countries to examine whether rape proclivity is a meaningful factor related to sexual violence. Also, it would be useful to increase the diversity of student participants by including students from different programs. Doing so will ensure that results are generalizable to all students.

Future Research and Implications

As previously noted, very few studies have examined the link between rape proclivity and future perpetration of sexual violence. Furthermore, to the best of my knowledge, this is the first study to examine the predictive validity of rape proclivity

using different measures using a longitudinal design. Therefore, we do not know much about the inherent construct of each rape proclivity measure and the relationship between rape proclivity and sexual offending.

It is imperative that using different research methodologies, future research replicates and expands our knowledge about rape proclivity using larger and more varied samples of participants (students, community men, and individuals convicted of sexual offending). For example, future research could shed light on which measure of rape proclivity most accurately measures rape proclivity.

Furthermore, in order to investigate the causal relationship between rape proclivity and perpetration of sexual offending, future research should examine whether a decrease in rape proclivity will decrease the level of sexual violence among both incarcerated and nonincarcerated individuals. This type of research will allow us to examine whether a change in rape proclivity could lead to a change in sexual offending. Results from these types of studies would shed light on the causal role of rape proclivity on the perpetration of sexual violence.

If the results from future studies confirm the causal role of rape proclivity on sexual offending, there will be important implications for prevention strategies aimed to reduce sexual violence. If changes in rape proclivity can cause meaningful change in the likelihood of perpetration of sexual offending, then prevention strategies aimed to target university students and community men to reduce their level of rape proclivity. Rape proclivity may also be used in risk assessment and treatment management of individuals convicted of sexual offending.

Also, future research should investigate the relationship between correlates of rape and rape proclivity. If future studies confirm these findings, one way to reduce rape proclivity would be to target risk factors for sexual offending such as distorted cognitions (both rape supportive and antisocial) and sexual arousal to coercive behaviour. Reducing those factors may not only reduce the reported tendency to commit rape but will also reduce the perpetration of sexual violence.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the current dissertation provides interesting and novel insight into rape proclivity as a potential factor related to sexual offending and how accurately it is being measured. Further, the current dissertation examined the association between rape proclivity and other factors related to sexual violence and whether rape proclivity can in fact, predict the perpetration of sexual violence. The Rape Proclivity Measure (Bohner,1998) is a comprehensible measure indicating it has content validity. Even though most participants interpreted the scenarios included in the Rape Proclivity Measure as incidents of sexual violence, the way in which scenarios were understood reflects current rape scripts in the North American culture. For example, rape scenarios that involved the use of physical force and stranger perpetrators were more likely to be labelled as “rape.” Also, consistent with prevalent rape myths in North America, many participants blamed the victim and/or justified the perpetrator’s behaviour.

Further, a significant correlation was found between rape proclivity and factors associated with rape, including distorted cognition (rape supportive and antisocial), and sexual arousal to coercive behaviour (rape of adults, exhibitionism, voyeurism, and frotteurism), and past perpetration of sexual violence. This may indicate that individuals

with higher self-proclaimed tendencies to commit rape are similar in some aspects to individuals with a history of committing acts of sexual violence.

In addition, rape proclivity measured by different measures did not form the same underlying construct. It seems that rape proclivity assessed by the Rape Proclivity Measure is more indicative of arousal to coercive behaviour. However, rape proclivity measured by SES-TFR captures behavioral tendencies. Also, rape proclivity assessed by likelihood to rape was more indicative of endorsing antisocial beliefs toward violence and intent. Finally, rape proclivity captured by SES-TFR at Wave 1 predicted engaging in sexually violent behaviour among both students and the community sample. Future research should replicate and expand on these findings to shed light on the role rape proclivity plays in sexual offending behaviour and which measure or measures accurately measure rape proclivity as a construct.

References

- Abbey, A., & Jacques-Tiura, A. (2010). Sexual assault perpetrators' tactics: Associations with their personal characteristics and aspects of the incident. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*(14), 2866–2889.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260510390955>
- Abbey, A. & McAuslan, P. (2004). A longitudinal examination of male college students' perpetration of sexual assault. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 72*(5), 747–756. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.72.5.747>
- Abbey, A., Parkhill, M. R., BeShears, R., Clinton-Sherrod, A. M., & Zawacki, T. (2006). Cross-sectional predictors of sexual assault perpetration in a community sample of single African American and Caucasian men. *Aggressive Behavior, 32*(1), 54–67. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20107>
- Abbey, A., Parkhill, M. R., & Koss, M. P. (2005). The effects of frame of reference on responses to questions about sexual assault victimization and perpetration. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 29*(4), 364–373. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2005.00236.x>
- Abbey, A., Wegner, R., Pierce, J., & Jacques-Tiura, A. J. (2012). Patterns of sexual aggression in a community sample of young men: Risk factors associated with persistence, desistance, and initiation over a 1-year interval. *Psychology of Violence, 2*(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026346>
- Abel, G. G., Barlow, D. H., Blanchard, E. B., & Guild, D. (1977). The components of rapists' sexual arousal. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 34*, 895–903.
doi:10.1001/archpsyc.1977.01770200033002

- Abel, G.G., & Becker, J.V. (1979). The sexual interest card sort. Unpublished manuscript
- Abel, G. G., Gore, D. K., Holland, C. L., Camp, N., Becker, J. V., & Rathner, J. (1989). The measurement of the cognitive distortions of child molesters. *Annals of Sex Research*, 2, 135-153. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.1963.01720160014002
- Aberle, C. C., & Littlefield, R. P. (2001). Family functioning and sexual aggression in a sample of college men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16(6), 565–579. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088626001016006005>
- Acierno, R., Brady, K., Gray, M. (2002). Psychopathology following interpersonal violence: A comparison of risk factors in older and younger adults. *Journal of Clinical Geropsychology* 8, 13–23 (2002). <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1013041907018>
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Akerman, G., & Beech, A. R. (2012). A Systematic review of measures of deviant sexual interest and arousal. *Psychiatry, Psychology, and Law*, 19(1), 118–143. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13218719.2010.547161>
- Alleyne, E., Gannon, T., Ciardha, C., & Wood, J. (2014). Community males show multiple-perpetrator rape proclivity: Development and preliminary validation of an interest scale. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 26(1), 82–104. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063213480819>

- Amelang, M., & Borkenau, P. (1981). Untersuchungen zur Validität von Kontrollskalen für soziale Erwünschtheit und Akquieszenz (Studies on the validity of control-scales of social desirability and acquiescence). *Diagnostica*, 27, 295-312.
- Anderson, I., & Doherty, K. (2008). *Accounting for rape: Psychology, feminism and discourse analysis in the study of sexual violence*. Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2003). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (3rd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J., & Wormith, J. S. (2006). The recent past and near future of risk and/or need assessment. *Crime & Delinquency*, 52, 7-27.
- Andrews, D. & Bonta, J. (2010). Rehabilitating criminal justice policy and practice. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 16(1), 39-55.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018362>
- Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J., & Wormith, J. S. (2006). The recent past and near future of risk and/or need assessment. *Crime & Delinquency*, 52(1), 7-27.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128705281756>
- Aulette, J., & Connell, R. (1991). Gender and power: Society, the person and sexual politics. *Social Forces*, 69, 953.
- Barbaree, H. E., & Marshall, W. L. (1991). The role of male sexual arousal in rape: Six models. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 59(5), 621-630.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.59.5.621>

- Barbaree, H. E., Marshall, W. L., & Lanthier, R. D. (1979). Deviant sexual arousal in rapists. *Behaviour research and therapy*, *17*(3), 215–222.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-7967\(79\)90036-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-7967(79)90036-6)
- Barone, R. P., Wolgemuth, J. R., & Linder, C. (2007). Preventing sexual assault through engaging college men. *Journal of College Student Development*, *48*(5), 585–594. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2007.0045>
- Beech, A., & Ward, T. (2004). The integration of etiology and risk in sexual offenders: A theoretical framework. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *10*(1), 31–63.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2003.08.002>
- Beech, A., Bartels, R., & Dixon, L. (2012). Assessment and treatment of distorted schemas in sexual offenders. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, *14*(1), 54–66.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838012463970>
- Berner, W., Berger, P., & Hill, A. (2003). Sexual sadism. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *47*(4), 383–395. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X03256131>
- Best, D., Day, E., Campbell, A., Flynn, P., & Simpson, D. D. (2009). Relationship between drug treatment engagement and criminal thinking style among drug-using offenders. *European Addiction Research*, *15*(1), 71–77,
<https://doi.org/10.1159/000189785>
- Black, M. C., Basile, K. C., Breiding, M. J., Smith, S. G., Walters, M. L., Merrick, M. T., Chen, J., & Stevens, M. R. (2011). *National Intimate Partner and sexual violence survey: 2010 summary report*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Center for Disease Control and Prevention.

- Blake, E., & Gannon, T. (2010). The implicit theories of rape-prone men: An information-processing investigation. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 54(6), 895–914.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X09347732>
- Bohner, G. & Dickel, N. (2011). Attitudes and attitude change. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 62(1), 391–417.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.121208.131609>
- Bohner, G., Jarvis, C. I., Eyssel, F., & Siebler, F. (2005). The causal impact of rape myth acceptance on men's rape proclivity: comparing sexually coercive and noncoercive men. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 35(6), 819–828.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.284>
- Bohner, G., Reinhard, M., Rutz, S., Sturm, S., Kerschbaum, B., & Effler, D. (1998). Rape myths as neutralizing cognitions: evidence for a causal impact of anti-victim attitudes on men's self-reported likelihood of raping. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 28(2), 257–268. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-0992\(199803/04\)28:2<257::AID-EJSP871>3.0.CO;2-1](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992(199803/04)28:2<257::AID-EJSP871>3.0.CO;2-1)
- Bohner, G., Siebler, F., & Schmelcher, J. (2006). Social norms and the likelihood of raping: perceived rape myth acceptance of others affects men's rape proclivity. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32(3), 286–297.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167205280912>
- Brannigan, A., & Goldenberg, S. (1987). The study of aggressive pornography: The vicissitudes of relevance. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 4(3), 262–283. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15295038709360135>

- Breiding, M., Smith, S., Basile, K., Walters, M., Chen, J., & Merrick, M. (2014). Prevalence and characteristics of sexual violence, stalking, and intimate partner violence victimization — National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, United States, 2011. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report: Surveillance Summaries*, 63(8), 1–18
- Brennan, S., & Taylor-Butts, A. (2008). *Sexual assault in Canada, 2004 and 2007*. Statistics Canada.
- Briken, P., Habermann, N., Kafka, M. P., Berner, W., & Hill, A. (2006). The paraphilia-related disorders: an investigation of the relevance of the concept in sexual murderers. *Journal of forensic sciences*, 51(3), 683–688.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1556-4029.2006.00105.x>
- Bumby, K. M. (1996). Assessing the cognitive distortions of child molesters and rapists: Development and validation of the MOLEST and RAPE scales. *Sexual Abuse*, 8(1), 37–54. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02258015>
- Bureau of Justice Statistics . (2014). Special report: Rape and sexual assault victimization among college-age females, 1995-2013 (NCJ 248471). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/rsavcaf9513.pdf>
- Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38(2), 217–230. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.38.2.217>
- Calhoun, B. (1997). Sexual coercion and attraction to sexual aggression in a community sample of young men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12(3), 392–406.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/088626097012003005>

- Campbell, R., Seft, T., & Ahrens, C. (2003). The physical health consequences of rape: Assessing survivors' somatic symptoms in a racially diverse population. *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 31(1/2), 90–104. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/233632980/>
- Campbell, R., & Townsend, S. (2011). *Defining the scope of sexual violence against women. Sourcebook on violence against women, second edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Casler, K., Bickel, L., & Hackett, E. (2013). Separate but equal? A comparison of participants and data gathered via Amazon's MTurk, social media, and face-to-face behavioral testing. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29, 2156–2160. doi:[10.1016/j.chb.2013.05.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.05.009).
- Ceelen, M., Dorn, T., van Huis, F., & Reijnders, U. (2019). Characteristics and post-decision attitudes of non-reporting sexual violence victims. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 34(9), 1961–1977. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516658756>
- Chan, H. C. (Oliver), & Beauregard, E. (2016). Non-homicidal and homicidal sexual offenders: Prevalence of maladaptive personality traits and paraphilic behaviors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 31(13), 2259–2290. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515575606>
- Chapleau, K. M., Oswald, D. L., & Russell, B. L. (2008). Male rape myths: The role of gender, violence, and sexism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23, 600-615.
- Chiroro, P., Bohner, G., Viki, G., & Jarvis, C. (2004). Rape myth acceptance and rape proclivity: Expected dominance versus expected arousal as mediators in

- acquaintance-rape situations. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19(4), 427–442.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260503262081>
- Choudhary, E., Smith, M., & Bossarte, R. (2012). Depression, anxiety, and symptom profiles among female and male victims of sexual violence. *American Journal of Men's Health*, 6(1), 28–36. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1557988311414045>
- Costin, F. (1985). Beliefs about rape and women's social roles. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 14(4), 319–325. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01550847>
- Craig, M. E., Kalichman, S. C., & Follingstad, D. R. (1989). Verbal coercive sexual behavior among college students. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 18(5), 421–434.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design : qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (Fifth edition.). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 24, 349-354.
- DeGue, S., & DiLillo, D. (2004). Understanding perpetrators of nonphysical sexual coercion: Characteristics of those who cross the line. *Violence and Victims*, 19(6), 673-688. <https://doi.org/10.1891/088667004780927701>
- DeGue, S., DiLillo, D., & Scalora, M. (2010). Are all perpetrators alike? Comparing risk factors for sexual coercion and aggression. *Sexual Abuse*, 22(4), 402–426.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063210372140>
- DeWever, B., Schellens, T., Valcke, M., & Van Keer, H. (2006). Content analysis schemes to analyze transcripts of online asynchronous discussion groups: A review. *Computer & Education*, 46, 6-28.

- Dinos, S., Burrowes, N., Hammond, K., & Cunliffe, C. (2015). A systematic review of juries' assessment of rape victims: Do rape myths impact on juror decision-making? *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 43(1), 36–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlcrj.2014.07.001>
- Dixon, D., & Johnston, M. (2019). Content validity of measures of theoretical constructs in health psychology: Discriminant content validity is needed. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 24(3), 477–484. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjhp.12373>
- Drisko, J., & Maschi, T. (2015). *Content Analysis*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190215491.001.0001>
- Dworkin, E., Menon, S., Bystrynski, J., & Allen, N. (2017). Sexual assault victimization and psychopathology: A review and meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 56, 65–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2017.06.002>
- Durán, M., Megías, J., & Moya, M. (2016). Male peer support to hostile sexist attitudes influences rape proclivity. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 33(14), 2180–2196. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515624212>
- Durán, M., Megías, J. L., & Moya, M. (2018). Male peer support to hostile sexist attitudes influences rape proclivity. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 33(14), 2180–2196. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515624212>
- Edgar, T., & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (1993). Expectations for sexual interaction: A cognitive test of the sequencing of sexual communication behaviors. *Health Communication*, 5, 239–261. doi:10.1207/s15327027hc0504_1

- Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107–115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x>
- Elliott, D. M., Mok, D. S., & Briere, J. (2004). Adult sexual assault: Prevalence, symptomatology, and sex differences in the general population. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 17, 203-211. doi: 10.1023/B:JOTS.0000029263.11104.23
- Ellison, L., & Munro, V. E. (2010). A Stranger in the bushes, or an elephant in the room? Critical reflections upon received rape myth wisdom in the context of a mock jury study. *New Criminal Law Review*, 13(4), 781–801. <https://doi.org/10.1525/nclr.2010.13.4.781>
- Eyssel, F., Bohner, G., & Siebler, F. (2006). Perceived rape myth acceptance of others predicts rape proclivity: Social norm or judgmental anchoring? *Swiss Journal of Psychology*, 65(2), 93–99. <https://doi.org/10.1024/1421-0185.65.2.93>
- Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). The sexual victimization of college women (NCJ 182369). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/182369.pdf>
- Fisher, B., Daigle, L., Cullen, F., & Turner, M. (2003). Reporting sexual victimization to the police and others: results from a national-level study of college women. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 30(1), 6–38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854802239161>
- Gendreau P., Goggin C., Chanteloupe F., Andrews D.A. (1992) The development of clinical and policy guidelines for the prediction of criminal behaviour in

criminal justice settings, Programs Branch User Report. Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada.

- Gidycz, C. A., Warkentin, J. B., Orchowski, L. M., & Edwards, K. M. (2011). College men's perceived likelihood to perpetrate sexual aggression. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 20*(3), 260–279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2011.562480>
- Goldberg, L. R., & Digman, J. M. (1994). Revealing structure in the data: Principles of exploratory factor analysis. In S. Strack & M. Lorr (Eds.), *Differentiating normal and abnormal personality* (pp. 216–242). Springer Publishing Company.
- Gerger, H., Kley, H., Bohner, G., & Siebler, F. (2007). The acceptance of modern myths about sexual aggression scale: development and validation in German and English. *Aggressive Behavior, 33*(5), 422–440. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20195>
- Hall, G. C. N., DeGarmo, D. S., Eap, S., Teten, A. L., & Sue, S. (2006). Initiation, desistance, and persistence of men's sexual coercion. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 74*(4), 732–742. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.74.4.732>
- Hall, G. C. N., & Hirschman, R. (1991). Toward a theory of sexual aggression: A quadripartite model. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 59*(5), 662–669. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.59.5.662>
- Hanson, R. K., & Bussière, M. T. (1998). Predicting relapse: a meta-analysis of sexual offender recidivism studies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 66*(2), 348–362. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.66.2.348>

- Hanson, R., & Harris, A. (2000). Where should we intervene?: Dynamic predictors of sexual offense recidivism. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 27(1), 6–35.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854800027001002>
- Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. (2004). Predictors of sexual recidivism: An updated meta-analysis (User report No. 2004-02). Ottawa, ON: Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada.
- Hanson, R.K., & Morton-Bourgon, K.E. (2005). The characteristics of persistent sexual offenders: A meta-analysis of recidivism studies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73, 1154–1163.
- Hanson, K., R., & Thornton, D. (2000). Improving Risk Assessments for Sex Offenders: A Comparison of Three Actuarial Scales. *Law and Human Behavior*, 24(1), 119–136. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1005482921333>
- Harris, A. , Phenix, A. , Hanson, R.K. , & Thornton, D. (2003). Static-99 coding rules: Revised 2003. Ottawa: Solicitor General Canada.
- Haynes, S. N., Richard, D. C. S., & Kubany, E. S. (1995). Content validity in psychological assessment : a functional approach to concepts and methods: Methodological issues in psychological assessment research. *Psychological Assessment*, 7(3), 238–247.
- Helmus, L., Hanson, R. K., Babchishin, K. M., & Mann, R. E. (2013). Attitudes supportive of sexual offending predict recidivism: A meta-analysis. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, 14(1), 34–53. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838012462244>

- Hermann, C. A., Nunes, K. L., & Maimone, S. (2016). Examining implicit and explicit evaluations of sexual aggression and sexually aggressive behavior in men recruited online. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 1 26.
- Hill, M., & Fischer, A. (2001). Does entitlement mediate the link between masculinity and rape-related variables? *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 48(1), 39–50.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.48.1.39>
- Holland, L.A., Zolondek, S.C., Abel, G.G., Jordan A.D., & Becker, J.V. (2000). Psychometric analysis of the sexual interest card sort questionnaire. *Sexual Abuse. A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 12, 107–122.
- Howes, R.J. (1998). Plethysmographic assessment of incarcerated nonsexual offenders: A comparison with rapists. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment*, 10, 183–194.
- Humphreys, T. (2007). Perceptions of sexual consent: The impact of relationship history and gender. *Journal of Sex Research*, 44, 307–315.
doi:10.1080=00224490701586706
- Jacques-Tiura, A. J., Abbey, A., Wegner, R., Pierce, J., Pegram, S. E., & Woerner, J. (2015). Friends matter: Protective and harmful aspects of male friendships associated with past-year sexual aggression in a community sample of young men. *American Journal of Public Health*, 105, 1001-1007. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2014.302472
- Jozkowski, K. N. (2011). *Measuring internal and external conceptualizations of sexual consent: A mixed-methods exploration of sexual consent*. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

- Jozkowski, K. N., Marcantonio, T. L., & Hunt, M. E. (2017). College students' sexual consent communication and perceptions of sexual double standards: A qualitative investigation. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health, 49*(4), 237–244. <https://doi.org/10.1363/psrh.12041>
- Jozkowski, K. N., & Peterson, Z. D. (2013). College students and sexual consent: Unique insights. *The Journal of Sex Research, 50*(6), 517–523. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2012.700739>
- Kahn, A. S., Jackson, J., Kully, C., Badger, K., & Halvorsen, J. (2003). Calling it rape: Differences in experiences of women who do or do not label their sexual assault as rape. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 27*(3), 233–242. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-6402.00103>
- Kilpatrick, D. G., Resnick, H. S., Ruggiero, K. J., Conoscenti, L. M., & McCauley, J. (2007). *Drug-facilitated, incapacitated, and forcible rape: A national study*. Final report sub-mitted to the National Institute of Justice, Grant No. 2005-WG-BX-0006.
- Kilpatrick, D. G., Saunders, B. E., Veronen, L. J., Best, C. L., & Von, J. M. (1987). Criminal victimization: Lifetime prevalence, reporting to police, and psychological impact. *Crime and Delinquency, 33*, 479–489.
- Kilimnik, C. D., & Humphreys, T. P. (2018). Understanding sexual consent and nonconsensual sexual experiences in undergraduate women: The role of identification and rape myth acceptance. *The Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality, 27*(3), 195–206. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cjhs.2017-0028>

- Klein, C., Kennedy, M. A., & Gorzalka, B. B. (2009). Rape myth acceptance in men who completed the prostitution offender program of British Columbia. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 53(3), 305–315.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X08316969>
- Knight, R. A., Sims-Knight, J. E. Brown-McBride, S. (2009). Using risk factors to set an agenda for rape prevention. VAWnet: The National Online Resource Center on Violence Against Women.
<https://vawnet.org/material/using-rapist-risk-factors-set-agenda-rape-prevention>
- Knight, R. A., & Sims-Knight, J. (2011). Risk factors for sexual violence. In J. W. White, M. P. Koss, & A. E. Kazdin (Eds.), *Violence against women and children, Vol. 1. Mapping the terrain* (pp. 125–150). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/12307-006>
- Knight, R. A., Sims-Knight, J., & Guay, J. P. (2013). Is a separate diagnostic category defensible for paraphilic coercion? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 41, 90–99.
- Koss, M. P. (1993). Detecting the scope of rape a review of prevalence research methods. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 8, 198-222. doi:
10.1177/088626093008002004
- Koss, M. P. (2011). Hidden, unacknowledged, acquaintance, and date Rape: Looking back, looking forward. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 35(2), 348–354.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684311403856>
- Koss, M. P., Abbey, A., Campbell, R., Cook, S., Norris, J., Testa, M., . . . White, J. (2007). Revising the SES: A collaborative process to improve assessment of

- sexual aggression and victimization. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31, 357-370.
- Koss, M. P. & Gidycz, C. A. (1985). Sexual experiences survey: Reliability and validity. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 53(3), 422-423.
- Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. A., & Wisniewski, N. (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(2), 162-170.
- Koss, M. P., Leonard, K. E., Beezley, D. A., & Oros, C. J. (1985). Nonstranger sexual aggression: a discriminant analysis of the psychological characteristics of undetected offenders. *Sex Roles*, 12(9-10), 981-992.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00288099>
- Koss, M. P., & Oros, C. J. (1982). Sexual Experiences Survey: A research instrument investigating sexual aggression and victimization. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 50(3), 455-457. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.50.3.455>
- Kosson, D. S., Kelly, J. C., & White, J. W. (1997). Psychopathy-related traits predict self-reported sexual aggression among college men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12(2), 241-254. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088626097012002006>
- Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C. H., Warner, T. D., Fisher, B. S., Martin, S. L. (2007). The campus sexual assault (CSA) study (Document No. 221153). Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/221153.pdf>

- Lanier, C. A. (2001). Rape-accepting attitudes: precursors to or consequences of forced sex. *Violence Against Women*, 7(8), 876–885.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/10778010122182802>
- Lalumiere, M. L., & Quinsey, V. L. (1994). The discriminability of rapists from non-sex offenders using phallometric measures: A meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 21, 150–175.
- Lalumiere, M., Quinsey, V., Harris, G., Rice, M., & Trautrimas, C. (2003). Are rapists differentially aroused by coercive sex in phallometric assessments? *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 989(1), 211–224. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2003.tb07307.x>
- Levitt, H. M., Motulsky, S. L., Wertz, F. J., Morrow, S. L., & Ponterotto, J. G. (2017). Recommendations for designing and reviewing qualitative research in psychology: Promoting methodological integrity. *Qualitative Psychology*, 4, 2–22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/qup0000082>
- Lisak, D., & Ivan, C. (1995). Deficits in intimacy and empathy in sexually aggressive men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 10(3), 296–308.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/088626095010003004>
- Lisak, D., & Miller, P. M. (2002). Repeat rape and multiple offending among undetected rapists. *Violence and Victims*, 17, 73–84.
- Lisak, D., & Roth, S. (1988). Motivational factors in nonincarcerated sexually aggressive men. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 55(5), 795–802.
<https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.55.5.795>

- Littleton, H. L., & Axsom, D. (2003). The rape and seduction scripts of university students: Implications for rape attributions and unacknowledged rape. *Sex Roles*, 49, 465–475.
- Livingston, B., Buddie, J.A., Testa, M., VanZile-Tamsen, C. (2004). The role of sexual precedence in verbal sexual coercion. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 28(4), 287–297. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2004.00146.x>
- Loh, C., Gidycz, C. A., Lobo, T. R., & Luthra, R. (2005). A prospective analysis of sexual assault perpetration: Risk factors related to perpetrator characteristics. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20(10), 1325–1348. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260505278528>
- Lohr, B. A., Adams, H. E., & Davis, J. M. (1997). Sexual arousal to erotic and aggressive stimuli in sexually coercive and noncoercive men. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 106, 230–242. doi:10.1037/0021-843X.106.2.230
- Longpré, N., Sims-Knight, J. E., Neumann, C., Guay, J.-P., & Knight, R. A. (2020). Is paraphilic coercion a different construct from sadism or the lower end of an agonistic continuum? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2020.101743>
- Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1994). Rape myths: In review. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 18(2), 133–164. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1994.tb00448.x>
- Lyndon, A. E., White, J. W., & Kadlec, K. M. (2007). Manipulation and force as sexual coercion tactics: conceptual and empirical differences. *Aggressive Behavior*, 33(4), 291–303. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20200>

- Malamuth, N. M. (1981). Rape proclivity among males. *Journal of Social Issues*, 37(4), 138 – 157. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.1981.tb01075.x
- Malamuth, N. M. (1986). Predictors of naturalistic sexual aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50(5), 953–962.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.50.5.953>
- Malamuth, N. M. (1989a). The attraction to sexual aggression scale: Part one. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 26(1), 26–49.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224498909551491>
- Malamuth, N. M. (1989b). The attraction to sexual aggression scale: Part two. *Journal of Sex Research*, 26, 324-354.
- Malamuth, N. M. (1998) The confluence model as a organizing framework for research on sexually aggressive men: risk moderators imagined aggression and pornography consumption. In: Geen RG Donnerstein E, eds. *Human Aggression: Theories Research and Implications for Social Policy* New York: Academic Press, pp 229–245.
- Malamuth, N. M. (2003). Criminal and noncriminal sexual aggressors: Integrating psychopathy in hierarchical-mediational confluence model. In R. A. Prentky, E. S. Janus & M. Seto (Eds.), *Sexually coercive behavior: Understanding and management* (pp. 33-58). Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, Vol. 989.
- Malamuth, N. M., & Ceniti, J. (1986). Repeated exposure to violent and nonviolent pornography: Likelihood of raping ratings and laboratory aggression against women. *Aggressive Behavior*, 12, 129–137. doi: 10.1002/1098-2337

- Malamuth, N. M., & Check, J. V. (1980). Sexual arousal to rape and consenting depictions: The importance of the woman's arousal. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 89*(6), 763–766. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.89.6.763>
- Malamuth, N. M., & Check, J. V. (1983). Sexual arousal to rape depictions: Individual differences. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology (1965), 92*(1), 55–67. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.92.1.55>
- Malamuth, N. M., Haber, S., & Feshbach, S. (1980). Testing hypotheses regarding rape: Exposure to sexual violence, sex differences, and the "normality" of rapists. *Journal of Research in Personality, 14*(1), 121–137. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-6566\(80\)90045-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-6566(80)90045-8)
- Mann, R. E. & Beech, A. R. (2003). Cognitive distortions, schemas, and implicit theories. In Ward, T., Laws, D. R., Hudson, S. M. (Eds.), *Sexual deviance: Issues and controversies* (pp. 135–153). SAGE Publications.
- Mann, R. E., Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (2010). Assessing risk for sexual recidivism: Some proposals on the nature of psychologically meaningful risk factors. *Sexual Abuse, 22*(2), 191–217. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063210366039>
- Mann, R. E., & Hollin, C. R. (2007). Sexual offenders' explanations for their offending. *The Journal of Sexual Aggression, 13*(1), 3–9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600701365621>
- Marshal, W.L.,& Hambley, L.S. (1996). Intimacy and loneliness, and their relationship to rape myth acceptance and hostility toward women among rapists. *Journal of*

Interpersonal Violence, 11(4), 586–592.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/088626096011004009>

Maruna, S. & Mann, R. E. (2006). A fundamental attribution error? Rethinking cognitive distortions. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 11(2), 155–177.

<https://doi.org/10.1348/135532506X114608>

McCrary, F., Kaufman, K., Vasey, M., Barriga, A., Devlin, R., & Gibbs, J. (2008). It's all about me: A brief report of incarcerated adolescent sex offenders' generic and sex-specific cognitive distortions. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 20(3), 261–271. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063208320249>

McFarlane, J., Malecha, A., Watson, K., Gist, J., Batten, E., Hall, I., & Smith, S. (2005). Intimate partner sexual assault against women: frequency, health consequences, and treatment outcomes. *Obstetrics & Gynecology*, 105(1), 99–108.

<https://doi.org/10.1097/01.AOG.0000146641.98665.b6>

McGee, H., O'Higgins, M., Garavan, R., & Conroy, R. (2011). Rape and child sexual abuse: what beliefs persist about motives, perpetrators, and survivors? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(17), 3580–3593.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260511403762>

McMullin, D., & White, J. W. (2006). Long-term effects of labeling a rape experience. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 30(1), 96–105.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2006.00266.x>

Merrill, L. L., Thomsen, C. J., Gold, S. R., & Milner, J. S. (2001). Childhood abuse and premilitary sexual assault in male navy recruits. *Journal of Consulting and*

Clinical Psychology, 69(2), 252–261. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.69.2.252>

- Mills, J., Anderson, D., & Kroner, D. (2004). The antisocial attitudes and associates of sex offenders. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health, 14*(2), 134–145.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/cbm.578>
- Mills, J. F., & Kroner, D. G. (1999). Measures of criminal attitudes and associates (MCAA). Unpublished instrument and user guide
- Mills, J. F., Kroner, D. G., & Forth, A. E. (2002). Measures of criminal attitudes and associates (MCAA): development, factor structure, reliability, and validity. *Assessment (Odessa, Fla.), 9*(3), 240–253.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191102009003003>
- Mills, J. F., Kroner, D. G., & Hemmati, T. (2004). The measures of criminal attitudes and associates (MCAA): the prediction of general and violent recidivism. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 31*(6), 717–733.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854804268755>
- Moyano, N., Byers, E. S., & Sierra, J. C. (2016). Content and valence of sexual cognitions and their relationship with sexual functioning in spanish men and women. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 45*(8), 2069–2080.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-015-0659-1>
- O'Connor, J. (2019). *Rape Myths and Proclivity to Perpetrate in Male College Students*. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- O'Connor, B. P. (2000). SPSS and SAS programs for determining the number of components using parallel analysis and Velicer's MAP test. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers 32*, 396–402.
<https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03200807>

- Palermo, A., Dadgardoust, L., Caro Arroyave, S., Vettor, S., & Harkins, L. (2019). Examining the role of pornography and rape supportive cognitions in lone and multiple perpetrator rape proclivity. *Journal of Sexual Aggression: Multiple Perpetrator Sexual Offending*, 25(3), 244–257.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2019.1618506>
- Peterson, Z. D., & Muehlenhard, C. L. (2004). Was it rape? the function of women's rape myth acceptance and definitions of sex in labeling their own experiences. *Sex Roles*, 51, 129–144. doi: 10.1023/B:SERS.0000037758.95376.00
- Peterson, Z. D., & Muehlenhard, C. L. (2011). A Match-and-motivation model of how women label their non-consensual sexual experiences. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 35(4), 558–570. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684311410210>
- Phenix, A., Doren, D., Helmus, L., Hanson, R. K., Thornton, D. (2009). Coding rules for Static-2002. Ottawa, ON: Public Safety Canada. Retrieved from http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/res/cor/rep/_fl/sttc-2002-eng.pdf
- Polaschek, D. L. & Ward, T. (2002). The implicit theories of potential rapists: What our questionnaires tell us. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 7(4), 385–406.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1359-1789\(01\)00063-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1359-1789(01)00063-5)
- Polaschek, D. L. L., & Gannon, T. A. (2004). The implicit theories of rapists: What convicted offenders tell us. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment*, 16(4), 299–314. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107906320401600404>
- Porter, J. F., & Critelli, J. W. (1994). Self-talk and sexual arousal in sexual aggression. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 13(3), 223–239. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.1994.13.3.223>

- Pryor, J. B. (1987). Sexual harassment proclivities in men. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 17(5-6), 269–290. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00288453>
- Rapaport, K., & Burkhart, B. R. (1984). Personality and attitudinal characteristics of sexually coercive college males. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* (1965), 93(2), 216–221. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.93.2.216>
- Reise, S. P., Waller, N. G., & Comrey, A. L. (2000). Factor analysis and scale revision. *Psychological Assessment*, 12(3), 287–297. <https://doi.org/10.1037//1040-3590.12.3.287>
- Rice, M. E., Chaplin, T. C., Harris, G. T., & Coutts, J. (1994). Empathy for the victim and sexual arousal among rapists and nonrapists. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 9(4), 435–449. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088626094009004001>
- Rozee, P. (2002). Sexual victimization: Harassment and rape. *Issues in the Psychology of Women*, 2, 93-113.
- Russell, D. W. (2002). In search of underlying dimensions: the use (and abuse) of factor analysis in personality and social psychology bulletin. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(12), 1629–1646. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014616702237645>
- Sabina, C., & Ho, L. (2014). Campus and college victim responses to sexual assault and dating violence. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, 15(3), 201–226. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838014521322>
- Schmitt, T. A., & Sass, D. A. (2011). Rotation criteria and hypothesis testing for exploratory factor analysis: Implications for factor pattern loadings and interfactor

- correlations. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 71(1), 95–113. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164410387348>
- Seto, M., Lalumière, M., Harris, G., & Chivers, M. (2012). The sexual responses of sexual sadists. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology (1965)*, 121(3), 739–753. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028714>
- Simourd, D. (2004). Use of dynamic risk/need assessment instruments among long-term incarcerated offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 31(3), 306–323. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854803262507>
- Sheeran, P. (2002). Intention-behavior relations: A conceptual and empirical review. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European review of social psychology* (Vol. 12, pp. 1–36). Chichester: Wiley.
- Suarez, E., & Gadalla, T. M. (2010). Stop blaming the victim: a meta-analysis on rape myths. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25(11), 2010–2035. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260509354503>
- Strain, M. L., Hockett, J. M., & Saucier, D. A. (2015). Precursors to rape: Pressuring behaviors and rape proclivity. *Violence and Victims*, 30(2), 322–341. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.VV-D-13-00051>
- Terwee, C. B., Prinsen, C. A. ., Chiarotto, A., Westerman, M. J., Patrick, D. L., Alonso, J., Bouter, L. M., de Vet, H. C. ., & Mokkink, L. B. (2018). COSMIN methodology for evaluating the content validity of patient-reported outcome measures: a Delphi study. *Quality of Life Research*, 27(5), 1159–1170. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-018-1829-0>

- Testa M., Dermen K. H. (1999). The differential correlates of sexual coercion and rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 14:548–561.
- Testa, M., Livingston, J., & Hoffman, J. (2007). Does sexual victimization predict subsequent alcohol consumption? A prospective study among a community sample of women. *Addictive Behaviors*, 32(12), 2926–2939.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2007.05.017>
- Thompson, M. P., Koss, M. P., Kingree, J. B., Goree, J., & Rice, J. (2011). A prospective mediational model of sexual aggression among college men. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 26(13), 2716–2734.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260510388285>
- Thornton, D. (2002). Constructing and testing a framework for dynamic risk assessment. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 14, 139154, doi:10.1177/107906320201400205.
- Tieger, T. (1981). Self-rated likelihood of raping and the social perception of rape. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 15(2), 147–158. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-6566\(81\)90014-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-6566(81)90014-3)
- Tjaden, P., Thoennes, N. (2006). *Extent, nature, and consequences of rape victimization: findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey*. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/pur1.32754078653601>
- Truman, J. L., Langton, L. (2015). *Criminal victimization, 2014*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Truman, D., Tokar, D., & Fischer, A. (1996). Dimensions of masculinity: Relations to date rape supportive attitudes and sexual aggression in dating

situations. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 74(6), 555–562.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1996.tb02292.x>

Tucker, K.L., Ozer, D.J., Lyubomirsky, S., & Boehm, J.K. (2006). Testing for measurement invariance in the satisfaction with life scale: A comparison of russians and North Americans. *Social Indicators Research*, 78, 341–360.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11205-005-1037-5>

Ullman, S., & Brecklin, L. (2002). Sexual assault history and suicidal behavior in a national sample of women. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, 32(2), 117–

130. <https://doi.org/10.1521/suli.32.2.117.24398>

Walters, G. (2012). Criminal thinking and recidivism: Meta-analytic evidence on the predictive and incremental validity of the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS). *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17(3), 272–278.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.02.010>

Walters, G. (2016). Predicting recidivism with the Criminal Sentiments Scale: A meta-analysis of a putative measure of criminal thought content. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 43(9), 1159–1172. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854816649004>

Ward, T. (2000). Sexual offenders' cognitive distortions as implicit theories. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 5(5), 491–507.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/s1359-1789\(98\)00036-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1359-1789(98)00036-6)

Ward, T., & Beech, A. R. (2008). An integrated theory of sexual offending. In D. R. Laws & W. T. O'Donohue (Eds.), *Sexual deviance: Theory, assessment, and treatment* (2nd ed., pp. 21-36). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

- Ward, T., & Beech, A. (2006). An integrated theory of sexual offending. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 11*(1), 44–63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2005.05.002>
- Ward, T., & Siegert, R. J. (2002). Toward a comprehensive theory of child sexual abuse: A theory knitting perspective. *Psychology, Crime, and Law, 8*, 319 – 351.
- Ward, T. (2000). Sexual offenders' cognitive distortions as implicit theories. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 5*(5), 491–507. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1359-1789\(98\)00036-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1359-1789(98)00036-6)
- Ward, T., & Casey, A. (2010). Extending the mind into the world: A new theory of cognitive distortions in sex offenders. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 15*, 49-58. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2009.08.002
- Ward, T., Gannon, T. A., Keown, K. (2006). Beliefs, values, and action: The judgment model of cognitive distortions in sexual offenders. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 11*, 323–340. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2005.10.003
- Ward, T., Polaschek, D. L. L., Beech, A. (2006). *Theories of Sexual Offending*. Sussex, England: John Wiley.
- Ward, T. (2000). Sexual offenders' cognitive distortions as implicit theories. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 5*(5), 491–507. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1359-1789\(98\)00036-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1359-1789(98)00036-6)
- Ward, T., Hudson, S. M., & Keenan, T. R. (2001). The assessment and treatment of sexual offenders against children. In C. R. Hollin (Ed.), *Handbook of offender assessment and treatment* (pp. 349–361). Wiley.
- Weber, R. (1990). *Basic content analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Wegner, R., Abbey, A., Pierce, J., Pegram, S. E., & Woerner, J. (2015). Sexual assault perpetrators' justifications for their actions: Relationships to rape supportive attitudes, incident characteristics, and future perpetration. *Violence Against Women, 21*, 1018-1037. doi: 10.1177/1077801215589380
- Wertz, F. J. (2021). Objectivity and eidetic generality in psychology: The value of explicating fundamental methods. *Qualitative Psychology (Washington, D.C.)*, 8(1), 125–140. <https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000190>
- West, S. G., & Finch, J. F. (1997). Personality measurement: Reliability and validity issues. In R. Hogan, J. Johnson, & S. Briggs, *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 143 – 164). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- White, J.W., Kadlec, K.M., Sechrist, S. (2006). *Adolescent sexual aggression within heterosexual relationships. In: Barbaree HE, Marshall WL, (eds). "The Juvenile Sex Offender,"* New York: Guilford Press.
- White, J. W., & Smith, P. H. (2004). Sexual assault perpetration and reperpetration: From adolescence to young childhood. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 31*, 182-202.
- Widman, L., Olson, M. A., & Bolen, R. M. (2013). Self-reported sexual assault in convicted sex offenders and community men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 28*, 1519-1536. doi: 10.1177/0886260512468237
- Wolitzky-Taylor, K. B., Resnick, H. S., McCauley, J. L., Amstadter, A. B., Kilpatrick, D. G., & Ruggiero, K. J. (2011). Is reporting of rape on the rise? A comparison of women with reported versus unreported rape experiences in the National Women's Study-Replication. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*, 807-832.

Zinik, G., & Padilla, J. (2016). Rape and paraphilic coercive disorder. In *Sexual Offending* (pp. 45–66). Springer New York. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-2416-5_4

Appendices

Appendix A

Study 1 Consent Form

You are invited to participate in a research study. Please read this form carefully, and feel free to ask any questions you might have. If you have any questions concerning the research study or experience any discomfort related to the study, please contact the researchers Laleh Dadgardoust Laleh.dadgardoust@uoit.ca. Any questions regarding your rights as a participant, complaints, or adverse events may be addressed to Research Ethics Board through the Research Ethics Coordinator – researchethics@uoit.ca or 905.721.8668 x. 3693. This study has been approved by the UOIT Research Ethics Board REB #14734 on April 04, 2018.

Researcher(s):

This research is being carried out by Laleh Dadgardoust (PhD student) and Dr. Leigh Harkins.

Purpose and Procedure:

This study aims to investigate student views on sexual situations and to measure their characteristics and experiences. Some of the questions will be quite personal and will ask you about experiences and interests, and some of the questions/ situations that might be upsetting to some people as they are of a sexual nature. If you decide to take part in this study, you will be asked to fill out 2 questionnaires – a general information questionnaire, and a questionnaire about sexual situations that includes 5 sexual situations. Following this, you will be debriefed. The entire experiment will take

approximately 60 minutes. You could decide not to participate after reading the consent form if you feel it will be upsetting.

Potential Benefits:

This study may help you develop a better understanding of how research works.

Potential Risk or Discomforts:

Questionnaires in this study will ask about your sexual experiences and ask for your views on sexual situations. As you complete the materials involved in this study, you may feel uncomfortable or find it upsetting to answer such questions if you have been a victim of sexual crime. If so, please know you can stop the study at any time, leave questions blank, or contact the support service provided on the debriefing form. Please be assured that all of your responses will be anonymous, and your responses will not be connected to you in any way. Furthermore, we are aware that many people have engaged in different types of antisocial and illegal activities in the past. There will be no repercussions for answering the questionnaires honestly. Any information you will provide will be used anonymously and aggregated with the data of the complete pool of participants. If at any point in time during the study you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to inform the experimenter. At any point in time during the study, you also have the right to discontinue the study without any penalty.

If you should feel distressed, upset, or simply would like to speak to a counsellor about this study, please feel free to contact the Distress Centre. The Distress Centre is a 24-hour confidential support service, and can be contacted anonymously at the numbers below:

Distress Centre Durham (24-hour, confidential): 1-800-452-0688

UOIT Student LifeLine (Mon-Fri., 8:30am-4:30pm): 905-721-3392

Durham Rape Crisis Center (24-hour, crisis, and support Line): 905-444-9672

Storage of Data:

The information you provide will be entered into a computer database and stored in a locked office or lab on a password protected laptop accessible only by the research team. No identifying information, such as your name or student ID, will appear in the database. All the data will be aggregated to further protect the confidentiality of your responses. The data will be kept indefinitely and aggregated/grouped data may be shared with other researchers as required by the ethics and publication guidelines of psychology. If this is the case, none of your identifying information will be included.

Confidentiality:

It is entirely up to you if you want to take part. You will be asked to provide a memorable word at the end of the study which will be linked with your responses to protect the anonymity of your data. This will mean your responses will remain anonymous but will allow us to withdraw your data if you decide you no longer want it to be included. All data will remain anonymous by the investigator and research team. Please also rest assured that the principal investigator and research team will all be required to sign confidentiality agreements to further protect you. In addition, all data will be kept on a password protected lab computer, and will only be accessible to designated members of the research team.

Confidentiality will be provided to the fullest extent possible by law, professional practice and ethical codes of conduct. Your privacy shall be respected. No information about your identity will be shared or published without your permission unless required by law. There are some situations in which confidentiality may need to be breached - if

you report the intention to harm yourself or someone else, or if you report committing a specific previous crime with a victim that can be identified. We also may have a duty to report any abuse to identifiable children under the age of 16, and 18 in some circumstances to the Children's Aid Society (i.e. if you provide unsolicited information about an identifiable victim). Please note that we have designed the questionnaires in a way that should not result in the situations described above, so please feel free to answer the yes or no questions honestly. We do ask, however, that you not provide any extra detail regarding past offences so your confidentiality can be maintained.

Right to Withdraw:

Your participation is voluntary, and you can choose to answer only those questions that you are comfortable with. The information that is shared will be held in strict confidence and discussed only with the research team. You may withdraw from the study at any time without affecting entitlement to research credit. If you withdraw from the research project at any time, any data that you have contributed will be removed from the study, up until April 1, 2018, at which point the data will be analyzed and it will no longer be possible to identify your individual responses. As a participant, you are not waiving any rights to legal recourse in the event of research-related harm. To withdraw during the course of the study, verbally indicate to the experimenter you would like to stop and withdraw, and all of your data will be discarded without having been viewed.

The process for withdrawing from the study after completion is as follows:

1. At the beginning of the study, you will be prompted to provide a code word (your middle initial, mother's maiden name, and the last 3 digits of your phone number).

2. We recommend that you make note of your code word on your debrief form or another location you can easily access (ex. Cell phone)
3. If you wish to withdraw your data, you can contact Laleh Dadgardoust using the email or phone number provided above and on your debrief form.
4. When contacting Laleh Dadgardoust, please clearly state your intent to withdraw your data, and provide your code word.
5. Providing your code word will allow for all data collected from you to be identified and destroyed. You do not have to provide a reason for withdrawal. Once you have stated your intent for your data to be withdrawn, it will not be viewed again, even in the process of withdrawal.
6. You will be contacted to confirm your data has been withdrawn from the study

Participant Concerns and Reporting:

If you have any questions concerning the research study or experience any discomfort related to the study, please contact the researcher Laleh Dadgardoust at

Laleh.dadgardoust@uoit.ca or her supervisor Leigh Harkins at 905-721-8668 ext 5991 or leigh.harkins@uoit.ca. Any questions regarding your rights as a participant,

complaints, or adverse events may be addressed to Research Ethics Board through the

Research Ethics Coordinator – researchethics@uoit.ca or 905.721.8668 x. 3693. This

study has been approved by the UOIT Research Ethics Board #REB 14734 on April 04, 2018.

Debriefing and Dissemination of Results:

As a participant, you are entitled to be informed of the results of this study if interested.

The results may be published in an academic journal and/or presented at an academic

conference. Even in this form, all data will be aggregated and remain anonymous. If participants are interested in the results of this study please contact the researcher Laleh.dadgardoust or her academic supervisor at leigh.harkins@uoit.ca.

Consent to Participate:

1. I have read the consent form and understand the study being described.
2. I have had an opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered.
I am free to ask questions about the study in the future.
3. I freely consent to participate in the research study, understanding that I may discontinue participation at any time without penalty. A copy of this Consent Form has been given to me for my records.
4. I understand that the anonymous data I provide in this study may be subject to additional analyses not outlined in this study.
5. I understand that that by consenting to participate I do not waive any legal rights.

(Name of Participant)
(Signature of Participant)

Appendix B

Demographic Questionnaire

1. How old are you (in years)? _____

2. How do you describe yourself?

- a. Male
- b. Trans Male/Trans man
- c. Gender nonconforming
- d. Different Identity (Please specify): _____

3. What is your sexual orientation?

- a. Heterosexual
- b. Homosexual
- c. Bisexual
- d. Other: (Please specify): _____

4. Please specify your ethnicity

- a. Caucasian
- b. Black
- c. South Asian
- d. South East Asian
- e. East Asian
- f. Middle Eastern
- g. Hispanic or Latino
- h. Caribbean
- i. Pacific Islander

j. Native/Aboriginal

k. Mixed

l. Other: (Please specify): _____

5. How would you describe your political beliefs?

a. Very conservative

b. Conservative

c. Slightly conservative

d. Middle of the road

e. Slightly liberal

f. Liberal

g. Very liberal

h. Prefer not to answer

6. How religious would you say you are?

a. Very religious

b. Somewhat religious

c. Slightly religious

d. Not religious at all

e. Prefer not to answer

7. Roughly, how many, if any female sexual partners have you had? _____

8. Roughly, how many, if any male sexual partners have you had? _____

Appendix C

Rape Proclivity Measure

Situation 1

Please read the following text carefully and imagine yourself in the situation presented.

You have gone out a few times with a woman you met recently. One weekend you go to a film together and then back to your place. You have a few beers, listen to music and do a bit of petting. At a certain point your friend realises she has had too much to drink to be able to drive home. You say she can stay over with you, no problem. You are keen to grab this opportunity and sleep with her. She objects, saying you are rushing her and anyway she is too drunk. You don't let that put you off, you lie down on her and just do it.

Now please answer the following questions, ticking the answer which is most applicable to yourself:

1. In this situation, how sexually aroused would you be?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all						very
sexually						strongly
aroused						sexually
						aroused

2. In this situation, would you have done the same?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
would						would
definitely						definitely
not have						

done the
same

have done
the same

3. In this situation, how much would you enjoy getting your way?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

would not

would

enjoy it at

greatly

all

enjoy it

Situation 2

Please read the text carefully and again imagine yourself in the situation presented.

A while back, you met an attractive woman in a disco and you would like to take things a bit further with her. Friends of yours have a holiday home, so you invite her to share a weekend there. You have a great time together. On the last evening, you are ready to sleep with her, but she says no. You try to persuade her, insisting it's all part of a nice weekend. You invited her, after all, and she did accept. At that she repeats that she doesn't want to have sex, but then puts up hardly any resistance when you simply undress her and have sex with her.

Now please answer the following questions, ticking the answer which is most applicable to yourself:

1. In this situation, how sexually aroused would you be?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

not at all								very
sexually								strongly
aroused								sexually
								aroused

2. In this situation, would you have done the same?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
would						would
definitely						definitely
not have						have done
done the						the same
same						

3. In this situation, how much would you enjoy getting your way?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
would not						would
enjoy it at						greatly
all						enjoy it

Situation 3

Please read the text carefully and again imagine yourself in the situation presented.

Imagine you are a firm's Personnel Manager. You get on specially well with a new female member of staff. At the end of a busy week, you invite her out to dinner and take her home afterwards. As you want to spend some more time in her company, you suggest she might ask you in for a coffee. Next to her on the sofa, you start fondling her and kissing her. She

tries to move out of reach, but you tell her that her career prospects stand to be enhanced by her being on good terms with her boss. In due course, she seems to have accepted this, and she doesn't resist when you have sex with her.

Now please answer the following questions, ticking the answer which is most applicable to yourself:

1. In this situation, how sexually aroused would you be?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all						very
sexually						strongly
aroused						sexually
						aroused

2. In this situation, would you have done the same?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
would						would
definitely						definitely
not have						have done
done the						the same
same						

3. In this situation, how much would you enjoy getting your way?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

would not
enjoy it at
all

would
greatly
enjoy it

Situation 4

Please read the text carefully and again imagine yourself in the situation presented.

You are at a party and meet a good-looking and interesting woman. You chat, dance together and flirt. After the party, you give her a lift home in your car, and she invites you in. You both sit down on the floor, then your new friend kisses you and starts to fondle you. That's absolutely fine by you, and now you want more. When you start to undress her in order to sleep with her, she suddenly pushes you off and says she wants to stop now. Her resistance only turns you on more, and, using some force, you press her down to the floor and then penetrate her.

Now please answer the following questions, ticking the answer which is most applicable to yourself:

1. In this situation, how sexually aroused would you be?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all						very
sexually						strongly
aroused						sexually
						aroused

2. In this situation, would you have done the same?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

would	would
definitely	definitely
not have	have done
done the	the same
same	

3. In this situation, how much would you enjoy getting your way?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
would not						would
enjoy it at						greatly
all						enjoy it

Situation 5

Please read the text carefully and again imagine yourself in the situation presented.

You helped a young woman recently when her car broke down. She invites you to supper in her flat as a way of saying thank you. It's a very pleasant evening, and you have the impression she likes you. When your hostess indicates she is beginning to feel rather tired, you are not at all ready to leave. You would rather you finished the evening in bed together, and you try to kiss her. At that the woman gets mad and tells you to clear out. Instead, you grab her arms and drag her into the bedroom. You throw the woman on to the bed and force her to have sex with you.

Now please answer the following questions, ticking the answer which is most applicable to yourself:

1. In this situation, how sexually aroused would you be?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all						very
sexually						strongly
aroused						sexually
						aroused

2. In this situation, would you have done the same?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
would						would
definitely						definitely
not have						have done
done the						the same
same						

3. In this situation, how much would you enjoy getting your way?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
would not						would
enjoy it at						greatly
all						enjoy it

Appendix D

Perception of Rape Proclivity

Situation 1

Please read the following text carefully and imagine yourself in the situation presented.

You have gone out a few times with a woman you met recently. One weekend you go to a film together and then back to your place. You have a few beers, listen to music and do a bit of petting. At a certain point your friend realises she has had too much to drink to be able to drive home. You say she can stay over with you, no problem. You are keen to grab this opportunity and sleep with her. She objects, saying you are rushing her and anyway she is too drunk. You don't let that put you off, you lie down on her and just do it.

1. What is your understanding of what's happening in this scenario?
2. Do you think both people have consented to have sex?
3. Do you think both parties were interested to have sex?
4. Do you think either person should have done something differently in this scenario? If yes, what would that be?
5. How old do you think the woman is in this scenario?
6. Does anything including the wording seems unclear in this scenario?

Situation 2

Please read the text carefully and again imagine yourself in the situation presented.

A while back, you met an attractive woman in a disco and you would like to take things a bit further with her. Friends of yours have a holiday home, so you invite her to share a weekend there. You have a great time together. On the last evening you are ready to sleep with her, but she says no. You try to persuade her, insisting it's all part of a nice weekend. You invited her, after all, and she did accept. At that she repeats that she doesn't want to

have sex, but then puts up hardly any resistance when you simply undress her and have sex with her.

1. What is your understanding of what's happening in this scenario?
2. Do you think both people have consented to have sex?
3. Do you think both parties were interested to have sex?
4. Do you think either person should have done something differently in this scenario? If yes, what would that be?
5. What do you think female's lack of resistance means in this scenario?
6. How old do you think the woman is in the scenario?

Situation 3

Please read the text carefully and again imagine yourself in the situation presented.

Imagine you are a firm's Personnel Manager. You get on specially well with a new female member of staff. At the end of a busy week, you invite her out to dinner and take her home afterwards. As you want to spend some more time in her company, you suggest she might ask you in for a coffee. Next to her on the sofa, you start fondling her and kissing her. She tries to move out of reach, but you tell her that her career prospects stand to be enhanced by her being on good terms with her boss. In due course she seems to have accepted this, and she doesn't resist when you have sex with her.

1. What is your understanding of what's happening in this scenario?
2. Do you think both people want to have sex in this scenario?
3. Do you think both people have consented to have sex?
4. Do you think either person should have done something differently in this scenario? If yes, what would that be?
5. How old do you think the woman is in the scenario?
6. Is there anything that seems unclear to you in this scenario?

Situation 4

Please read the text carefully and again imagine yourself in the situation presented.

You are at a party and meet a good-looking and interesting woman. You chat, dance together and flirt. After the party you give her a lift home in your car, and she invites you in. You both sit down on the floor, then your new friend kisses you and starts to fondle you. That's absolutely fine by you, and now you want more. When you start to undress her in order to sleep with her, she suddenly pushes you off and says she wants to stop now. Her resistance only turns you on more, and, using some force, you press her down to the floor and then penetrate her.

1. What is your understanding of what's happening in this scenario?
2. Do you think the female has invited the male with the intend of having sexual relations
3. Do you think both people have consented to have sex?
4. Do you think both people want to have sex in this scenario?
5. Do you think either person should have done something differently in this scenario? If yes, what would that be?
6. What do you think the female's resistance means in this scenario?
7. How old do you think the woman is in the scenario?
8. Is there anything that seems unclear to you in this scenario?

Situation 5

Please read the text carefully and again imagine yourself in the situation presented.

You helped a young woman recently when her car broke down. She invites you to supper in her flat as a way of saying thank you. It's a very pleasant evening, and you have the impression she likes you. When your hostess indicates she is beginning to feel rather tired, you are not at all ready to leave. You would rather you finished the evening in bed together,

and you try to kiss her. At that the woman gets mad and tells you to clear out. Instead, you grab her arms and drag her into the bedroom. You throw the woman on to the bed and force her to have sex with you.

1. What is your understanding of what's happening in this scenario?

2. Do you think both people have consented to have sex?

3. Do you think both people want to have sex in this scenario?

4. Do you think either person should have done something differently in this scenario? If yes, what would that be?

5. How old do you think the woman is in the scenario?

6. Is there anything that seems unclear to you in this scenario?

Appendix E

Study 1 Debrief Form

Firstly, thank you for participating in this study—it is greatly appreciated!

In this study, you answered a series of questionnaires on a series of sexual experiences and demographic information. The purpose of this research is to understand university students' understanding of a currently used measure. The results of this study will guide the development of strategies for the prevention of sexual violence. All responses you gave over the course of this study will remain confidential in agreement with the confidentiality agreements the research team has signed. In order to ensure you can withdraw your data at any time during data collection, please make a note of your memorable code word on your copy of the debrief form, or somewhere else where you can easily access it. It is important to note you will need to remember your memorable code word in order to withdraw your data. If at any point in time you would like to withdraw your data before September 1, 2019, you can contact Laleh Dadgardoust (laleh.dadgardoust@uoit.ca) and provide your memorable code word. After doing so, your data will be removed from the study.

It would be greatly appreciated if you would keep the details of this study confidential until the end of the academic year in order to help us maintain the study's integrity. We do recognize, however, that due to the sensitive nature of the topics discussed in this study, you may feel upset or distressed. If you do feel upset as a result of this study and feel the need to discuss the study content with a counsellor, please feel free to do so. Your personal health is of the utmost importance! As a research team, we want to ensure you feel supported following study completion. If you should feel distressed, upset, or simply

would like to speak to a counsellor about this study, please feel free to use either of the contacts below:

Distress Centre Durham (24-hour, confidential):1-800-452-0688

UOIT Student LifeLine (Mon-Fri., 8:30am-4:30pm): 905-721-3392

Durham Rape Crisis Center (24-hour, crisis, and support Line): 905-444-9672

Once again, thank you for your participation in this study!

This study has been approved by the UOIT Research Ethics Board REB # 14734.

If you have any further questions, concerns, or complaints about this study, you may contact Dr. Laleh Dadgardoust (Laleh.dadgardoust@uoit.ca). If you have any questions about your rights as a participant, complaints, or adverse events that occurred during the study, please contact the Research Ethics Board through the Compliance Office (905-721-8668 ext. 3693).

Appendix F

Study 2 Consent Form-Time 1

Consent Form to Participate in a Research Study-Time 1

Name of Principal Investigator (PI): Dr. Leigh Harkins

PI's contact number/email: leigh.harkins@ontariotechu.ca; 905-721-8668 ext. 5991

Student lead: Laleh Dadgardoust

Student lead's contact email: Laleh.dadgardoust@ontariotechu.ca

Departmental and institutional affiliation(s): Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Ontario Tech University

Introduction

You are invited to participate in Time 1 of a two-part research study regarding sexual interests, attitudes regarding sex, and sexual behaviour. Please read information about the study presented in this form. The form includes details on the study's procedures, risks and benefits that you should know before you decide if you would like to take part. You should take as much time as you need to make your decision. The form includes details on the study's procedures, risks and benefits that you should know before you decide if you would like to take part. You should take as much time as you need to make your decision. You should ask the Principal Investigator (PI) or study team to explain anything that you do not understand and make sure that all of your questions have been answered before consenting to participate. Before you make your decision, feel free to talk about this study with anyone you wish, including your friends and family. Participation in this study is voluntary.

Any questions regarding your rights as a participant, complaints, or adverse events may be addressed to the Research Ethics Board through the Research Ethics Coordinator – researchethics@ontariotechu.ca, or 905.721.8668 x. 3693. This study has been reviewed and approved by the University of Ontario Institute of Technology (Ontario Tech University) Research Ethics Board REB # 14741.

Purpose and Procedure:

This study is part one of a two-part study. Participation in Time 2 is voluntary and it will take place 4-6 weeks after your participation in Time 1. This study aims to investigate male students' (18 years and older) views on sexual situations and to measure their tendencies, and experiences. Some of the questions will be quite personal and will ask you about your own sexual experiences and interests, and some of the questions/ situations that might be upsetting to some people as they are of a sexual nature. If you decide to take part in this study, you will be asked to complete an anonymous online survey, you will be asked to fill out 8 questionnaires – a general information questionnaire, questionnaires about your sexual interests, views on sexual situations, attitudes towards sex and aggression, sexual experiences, and other personal characteristics. Following this, you will be debriefed. The entire experiment will take approximately 90 minutes.

Potential Benefits:

The findings may have beneficial implications for the research community and the general public. You will not directly benefit from participating in this study.

Potential Risk or Discomforts:

Questionnaires in this study will ask about your sexual interests, past sexual experiences, your sexual attitudes and ask for your views on sexual situations. As you complete the materials involved in this study, you may feel uncomfortable revealing your past experiences/ interests or find it upsetting to answer such questions if you have been a victim of sexual crime. If so, please know you can stop the study at any time, or contact the support service provided on the debriefing form.

Please be assured that all of your responses will be anonymous, and your responses will not be connected to you in any way. Furthermore, we are aware that many people have engaged in different types of antisocial and illegal activities in the past. There will be no repercussions for answering the questionnaires honestly. Any information you will provide will be used anonymously and aggregated with the data of the complete pool of participants. If, at any point in time during the study, you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to inform the experimenter. At any point in time during the study, you also have the right to discontinue the study without any penalty.

If you should feel distressed, upset, or simply would like to speak to a counsellor about this study, please feel free to contact any of the following resources:

- **Distress Centre Durham (24-hour, confidential): 1-800-452-0688**
- **Ontario Tech University Student LifeLine (Mon-Fri., 8:30am-4:30pm): 905-721-3392**
- **Durham Rape Crisis Center (24-hour, crisis, and support Line): 905-444-9672**
- **Crisis Text Line operates in both the US and Canada:**

<https://www.crisistextline.org/>

Storage of Data:

The information you provide will be stored indefinitely on password-protected computers, on Qualtrics (i.e., the survey platform facilitating data collection), and the University's secure cloud storage (i.e., Google Drive, G Suite).

This information will only be accessible to the research team, their assistants, and other researchers/practitioners, as required by the ethics and publication guidelines of psychology. Please note, this means that raw and aggregate data may be shared with other researchers as is standard practice in psychology. If data is shared, the research team cannot ensure that data will not be published or disseminated in its raw or aggregate form, as once shared what researchers do with this data is outside of the research team's control.

All information collected during this study, including your personal information, will be kept confidential and not shared with anyone outside the study unless required by law.

You will not be named in any reports, publications, or presentations that may come from this study. You will be asked to provide general demographic information about yourself (e.g., age, gender, sexual orientation), but none of this will be identifying in nature.

Furthermore, no identifying information, such as your name, will be kept in the database or shared with anyone. Only group results will be reported to protect the confidentiality of your responses further.

There is also the potential that this data will be used for secondary research purposes. If the data was used for secondary research purposes the PI will submit a separate application form to the REB for the secondary use of this data.

Confidentiality:

It is entirely up to you if you want to take part. You will be asked to provide a memorable word (middle name initial, mother's maiden name, last 3 digits of phone number) at the beginning of the study, which will be linked with your responses to protect the anonymity of your data. This will mean your responses will remain anonymous but will allow us to withdraw your data if you decide you no longer want it to be included. Please also rest assured that the principal investigator and research team will all be required to sign confidentiality agreements to further protect you. In addition, all data will be kept on a password protected lab computer, and will only be accessible to designated members of the research team.

Once you complete the survey, you will be redirected to a new URL page to enter your email address. This will ensure that your responses are not linked to any identifying information such as your email address. The email address you provide will be used to invite you to participate in Time 2. Even if you agree for us to contact you, you are not obliged to take part and can still choose not to be involved with the study at that time. If you consent to take part in this study at Time 2 when we contact you, we will email you a link to the questionnaires that need to be completed. The memorable word you use in the beginning of the study will also be used to link your responses from Time 1 to Time 2 while ensuring your anonymity.

Confidentiality will be provided to the fullest extent possible by law, professional practice and ethical codes of conduct. Your privacy shall be respected. No information about your identity will be shared or published without your permission unless required by law. There are some situations in which confidentiality may need to be breached - if

you report the intention to harm yourself or someone else, or if you report committing a specific previous crime with a victim that can be identified. We also may have a duty to report any abuse to children under the age of 16 to the Children's Aid Society (i.e., if you provide unsolicited information about an identifiable victim). Please note that we have designed the questionnaires in a way that should not result in the situations described above, so please feel free to answer the yes or no questions honestly. We do ask, however, that you not provide any extra detail regarding past offences so your confidentiality can be maintained.

Right to Withdraw:

Your participation is voluntary, and you can choose to answer only those questions that you are comfortable with. The information that is shared will be held in strict confidence and discussed only with the research team. You may withdraw from the study at any time without affecting entitlement to research credit. If you withdraw from the research project at any time, any data that you have contributed will be removed from the study, up until August 2021, at which point the data will be analysed and it will no longer be possible to identify your individual responses. As a participant, you are not waiving any rights to legal recourse in the event of research-related harm. To withdraw during the course of the study, verbally indicate to the experimenter you would like to stop and withdraw, and all of your data will be discarded without having been viewed.

The process for withdrawing from the study after completion is as follows:

1. At the beginning of the study, you will be prompted to provide a code word (your middle initial, mother's maiden name, and the last 3 digits of your phone number).
2. We recommend that you make note of your code word somewhere you can easily access (ex. Cell phone)
3. If you wish to withdraw your data, you can contact Laleh Dadgardoust, or Leigh Harkins using the email provided above.
4. When contacting Laleh Dadgardoust, please clearly state your intent to withdraw your data, and provide your code word.
5. Providing your code word will allow for all data collected from you to be identified and destroyed. You do not have to provide a reason for withdrawal. Once you have stated your intent for your data to be withdrawn, it will not be viewed again, even in the process of withdrawal.
6. You will be contacted to confirm your data has been withdrawn from the study

Participant Concerns and Reporting:

If you have any questions concerning the research study or experience any discomfort related to the study, please contact the researcher Laleh Dadgardoust at Laleh.Dadgardoust@ontariotechu.ca, or Leigh Harkins at leigh.harkins@ontariotechu.ca. Any questions regarding your rights as a participant, complaints, or adverse events may be addressed to Research Ethics Board through the Research Ethics Coordinator

– researchethics@ontariotechu.ca or 905.721.8668 x. 3693. This study has been approved by the Ontario Tech University Research Ethics Board REB # 14741.

Debriefing and Dissemination of Results:

As a participant, you are entitled to be informed of the results of this study if interested. The results may be published in an academic journal and/or presented at an academic conference. Even in this form, all data will be aggregated and remain anonymous. If participants are interested in the results of this study, please contact the researcher at Laleh.dadgardoust@ontariotechu.ca, or her academic supervisor at leigh.harkins@ontariotechu.ca.

Consent to Participate:

1. I have read the consent form and understand the study being described
2. I have had an opportunity to ask questions about the study before I participate and in the future.
3. I freely consent to participate in the research study, understanding that I may discontinue participation at any time without penalty.
4. I understand that the anonymous data I provide in this study may be subject to additional analyses not outlined in this study.
5. I understand that by consenting to participate, I do not waive any legal rights or recourse.

Appendix G

Likelihood to Rape Questionnaire

How likely is it that you would commit rape if you would not get caught and/or punished?

1 = Not at all likely

2

3

4

5 = Very likely

Appendix H

Sexual Experiences Survey-TFR (SES-TFR)

Sexual Experiences Survey-TFR (SES-TFR) Attitudes

Sexual Experiences Survey-TFR (SES-TFR) Proclivity

Instructions:

We are now going to ask you some questions about:

- (a) your **past** experiences with different types of sexual behaviour,
- (b) how **likely** you would be do these different sexual behaviours in the future, and (c) how you **evaluate** these different types of sexual behaviour.

Please answer the following questions by choosing an answer from the drop down menus for each item.

By “woman” we mean any female close to your age or older at the time of the sexual experience.

SES-TFR Response Scale

How many times SINCE YOU WERE 16 years old... 0 = *Never* to 9 = *9 times or more*

SES-TFR Attitudes Response Scale

How POSITIVE or NEGATIVE do you think the behaviour below is? 1 = *Very*

Negative to 7 = *Very Positive*

SES-TFR-Proclivity Response Scale

How LIKELY would you be to do the behaviour below? 1 = *Not at all likely* to 7 =

Very likely

SES-TFR Behaviours and Tactics

[How many times SINCE YOU WERE 16 years old.../How LIKEY would you be to do the behaviour below?/ How POSITIVE or NEGATIVE do you think the behaviour below is?]

Have you ever overwhelmed a woman with arguments and pressure, although she indicated she didn't want to, in order to . . .

1. fondle, kiss, or sexually touch her without her permission?
2. attempt to make her have sexual intercourse with you, but for some reason intercourse didn't happen?
3. make her have oral sex with you?
4. make her have sexual intercourse with you?
5. make her have anal sex with you?
6. insert an object into her?

[How many times SINCE YOU WERE 16 years old.../How LIKEY would you be to do the behaviour below?/ How POSITIVE or NEGATIVE do you think the behaviour below is?]

Have you ever told a woman lies or made promises that you knew were untrue (after she indicated she didn't want to, in order to . . .

1. fondle, kiss, or sexually touch her without her permission?
2. attempt to make her have sexual intercourse with you, but for some reason intercourse didn't happen?
3. make her have oral sex with you?
4. make her have sexual intercourse with you?
5. make her have anal sex with you?

6. insert an object into her?

[How many times SINCE YOU WERE 16 years old.../How LIKEY would you be to do the behaviour below?/ How POSITIVE or NEGATIVE do you think the behaviour below is?]

Have you ever shown you were not happy by making a woman feel guilty, swearing, sulking, or getting angry (after she indicated she didn't want to), in order to . . .

1. fondle, kiss, or sexually touch her without her permission?
2. attempt to make her have sexual intercourse with you, but for some reason intercourse didn't happen?
3. make her have oral sex with you?
4. make her have sexual intercourse with you? 5. make her have anal sex with you?
6. insert an object into her?

[How many times SINCE YOU WERE 16 years old.../How LIKEY would you be to do the behaviour below?/ How POSITIVE or NEGATIVE do you think the behaviour below is?]

Have you ever given a woman drugs or alcohol without her permission in order to . . .

1. fondle, kiss, or sexually touch her without her permission?
2. attempt to make her have sexual intercourse with you, but for some reason intercourse didn't happen?
3. make her have oral sex with you?
4. make her have sexual intercourse with you?
5. make her have anal sex with you?
6. insert an object into her?

[How many times SINCE YOU WERE 16 years old.../How LIKEY would you be to do the behaviour below?/ How POSITIVE or NEGATIVE do you think the behaviour below is?]

When a woman was passed out or too drunk to give permission or stop what was happening, have you ever...

1. fondled, kissed, or sexually touched her without her permission?
2. attempted to make her have sexual intercourse with you, but for some reason intercourse didn't happen?
3. made her have oral sex with you?
4. made her have sexual intercourse with you?
5. make her have anal sex with you?
6. insert an object into her?

[How many times SINCE YOU WERE 16 years old.../How LIKEY would you be to do the behaviour below?/ How POSITIVE or NEGATIVE do you think the behaviour below is?]

Have you ever used some degree of physical force (twisting her arm, holding her down) or in any other way held down or physically hurt a woman in order to . . .

1. fondle, kiss, or sexually touch her without her permission?
2. attempt to make her have sexual intercourse with you, but for some reason intercourse didn't happen?
3. make her have oral sex with you?
4. make her have sexual intercourse with you?
5. make her have anal sex with you?

6. insert an object into her?

Appendix I

The Sexual Interest Cardsort Questionnaire

Rate interest on each of 75 statements on a seven point Likert scale, from -3 to +3, with -3 representing extreme sexual repulsion, 0 representing neutrality, and +3 representing extreme interest.

1. A 25-year-old man and I are lying side by side, naked, touching each other all over.
2. I'm peering through a girl's window. She's an attractive brunette with a great figure; she's taking a shower.
3. I have an erection. My penis is between an eight-year-old girl's legs.
4. I'm looking through the partially drawn window shades. I'm watching a woman sleeping. The covers have fallen off of her nude body.
5. A beautiful woman is stroking my dick and balls as she lies beside me. We are both getting excited.
6. I'm standing next to a woman I've just beaten up. She's bruised and bleeding. She can't move any more.
7. I'm lying on top of my son. I feel his hot body beneath mine as I kiss his back and feel his skin.
8. A 10-year-old girl and I are lying on the couch. I'm rubbing her soft skin, all over her body. I'm feeling her body. I'm feeling her breasts.
9. The subway train is extremely packed. I've got a really stiff hard-on. I'm face to face with a young woman, pushing my dick right up against her. She's trying to move away but she can't.

10. I'm pleading with a tall woman to stop hitting me with her belt. The pain is tremendous.
11. I'm lying back naked on the bed with my daughter sitting on top of me. I'm stroking her naked body with my hands and pushing my fingers into her cunt.
12. I'm pinching a 25-year-old woman's breasts with pliers. She's beginning to bleed. She's crying.
13. I see two good-looking 22-year-old girls walking down the street. I drive slowly by with no clothes on, rubbing my penis. I get excited as they look at me with disbelief.
14. I followed a 20-year-old blonde girl into the parking lot at the public library. I take out my dick and begin to beat it as she sees me and looks tense.
15. I'm holding a burning cigarette butt against the big tits of a 30-year-old brunette. She's screaming for me to stop.
16. It's packed in the train and I've pinned a woman up against the people in front of her. I'm rubbing her ass with my hands. She tells me to stop. She can't get away from me. I just keep rubbing her.
17. It's very crowded in the subway train. I'm facing a beautiful girl. I'm rubbing her tits and crotch. She has a blank expression on her face.
18. I'm unbuttoning my daughter's blouse. I'm feeling her small tits. She likes it.
19. I've pulled an attractive woman to the ground. I've pulled her panties off. I'm forcing my penis in her. She is screaming.
20. I'm kneeling beside my son, holding him close to me. I'm kissing his forehead and getting an erection.

21. I'm pulling down my little daughter's shorts and underwear. I'm going to finger-fuck her.
22. I've forced my way into an apartment. I've forced a brunette to take off her clothes. I'm raping her.
23. I'm lying on a deserted beach with a real handsome guy. He has wrapped his arms and legs around me. He really enjoys making love with me.
24. I have a hard on. My dick is between the legs of a young boy.
25. I would like to be a wife.
26. We're in the 69 position with me on top. I'm sucking a young guy's dick as he sucks mine. I'm starting to come.
27. A 12-year-old girl is sucking my cock. I'm starting to come.
28. I'm thinking about putting on some sheet nylon tights with no crotch. I'm feeling them in my hands.
29. I would like to have a good physique.
30. I have a woman spread eagled on the floor. I'm torturing her, burning her fingertips.
31. An attractive woman looks surprised as I tell her I'm going to rape her. I make her undress and put my dick between her legs as I hold her down.
32. I would like to be a mother.
33. I can feel myself getting turned on as my daughter hugs me. I want to screw her.
34. I would like to be a husband.
35. I've broken into a house. No one is home. I've found some woman's underclothes and I'm pulling on some cotton panties.
36. I would like to wear beautiful, feminine clothes.

37. I go by the girl's locker room at a college and look through the dressing room. I can see several girls there, all partly undressed.
38. I have a hard-on. My dick is between my daughter's legs as I'm ejaculating.
39. I feel my partner on top of me, with her knees holding my hips. She is moving up and down on my dick.
40. My son is curled up beside me in bed. I'm gently rubbing his small penis; he is getting an erection.
41. I've fucked a 25-year-old woman. She has come again and again. She thinks that I'm really great in bed.
42. I've gotten my son to rub my cock. I'm getting hard.
43. A beautiful woman is pinching my skin with pliers. I'm afraid she's going to pinch my balls with it, too.
44. I'm in my sister's bedroom alone. I'm pulling on a pair of beige, nylon panties.
45. I'm forcing a well-stacked girl to hold still as I push my dick into her. She cries out as I rape her.
46. My hands and legs are tied up. The ropes are biting into my skin. A woman in high heeled, black boots is coming towards me, snapping a whip in her hands.
47. I would like to be a woman.
48. I would like to have male genitals.
49. A 12-year-old boy is sucking my cock. I'm about to come.

50. I'm following a woman off the subway train. I move in right behind her as she waits for the next train. The crowd moves forward onto the next train. I start to rub her ass from behind.

51. I'm chained to a wall. A woman in tall, black boots is holding a burning cigarette butt close to my nipples. She smiles as she brings the cigarette closer.

52. I'm lying face down on the ground. An attractive woman is sitting on my ass, slashing my back with a razor blade. I'm pleading with her to stop. The blood is gushing out.

53. A good-looking man is pressing against me as we kiss very tenderly. We hold each other close.

54. I am following a nicely built blonde, 18-year-old girl down the stairs at school. I take my dick out, holding my books in front of it and begin to beat it. As I follow her, I feel it get hard.

55. A handsome man is lying on top of me in bed. He has his tongue in my ear and his hand on my dick. I'm really excited.

56. I'm wearing a matching bra, panties and slip, all lacy. I'm touching and feeling the underclothes against my body.

57. I'm standing naked beside the car. A 20-year-old girl in a bikini is coming from the swimming pool. I feel my hard penis in my hand as she sees me and looks shocked.

58. I've gotten a young boy to rub my cock. I feel it getting hard.

59. I'm sucking my young son's small dick. He seems to like it.

60. A lovely little boy is curled up beside me in bed. I'm gently rubbing his small penis.

61. I've lured a nine-year-old girl into the house. She is really good looking. I'm pulling down her shorts and underwear.
62. I'm lying on top of my partner. She is digging her hands into my back, lifting her ass up. She is really excited.
63. I would like to have female genitals.
64. I would like to wear masculine clothes.
65. A 10-year-old girl with long blond hair is holding my dick. She seems to be fascinated by it.
66. I've got a young woman tied down in the woods. I'm sticking needles into her vagina. She is screaming with terror.
67. A girl in the women's bathroom has taken her clothes off. I've pinned her down. I'm starting to rape her.
68. I'm lying on a couch, wearing only my feminine underclothes, bright red panties, large-cupped bra, sheer hose, and a see-through slip.
69. At an apartment complex, a 25-year-old girl is dressed in her panties. I'm looking at her through the window.
70. I'm looking from my upstairs window down into the apartment across the way. I can see a woman with big tits reading with a see-through negligee on.
71. I've walked out of the field house shower so a young girl can see me. The 13-year-old is surprised as she looks at my penis.
72. My partner and I are in the bathtub. She is sitting between my legs, leaning her back against me. I'm playing with her tits.
73. I would like to be a man.

74. There are very few people on the subway train. I sit down next to an attractive woman and let my hand fall down into her crotch. I start to rub her.

75. A 10-year-old boy with soft dark hair is holding my dick. He seems to be fascinated by it

Appendix J

The Rape Scale

Response Scale:

1= *Strongly Disagree* 2

3

4= *Strongly Agree*

1. Men who commit rape are probably responding to a lot of stress in their lives, and raping helps to reduce that stress.
2. Women who get raped probably deserved it.
3. Women generally want sex no matter how they can get it.
4. Since prostitutes sell their bodies for sexual purposes anyway, it is not as bad if someone forces them into sex.
5. If a woman does not resist strongly to sexual advances, she is probably willing to have sex.
6. Women often falsely accuse men of rape
7. A lot of women who get raped had “bad reputations” in the first place.
8. If women did not sleep around so much, they would be less likely to get raped.
9. If a woman gets drunk at a party, it is really her own fault if someone takes advantage of her sexually.
10. When women wear tight clothes, short skirts, and no bra or underwear, they are asking for sex.
11. A lot of women claim they were raped just because they want attention.
12. Victims of rape are usually a little bit to blame for what happens.

13. If a man has sex with a woman before, then he should be able to have sex with her any time he wants.
14. Just fantasizing about forcing someone to have sex isn't all that bad since no one is really being hurt.
15. Women who go to bars a lot are mainly looking to have sex.
16. A lot of times when women say "no" they are just playing hard to get, and really mean "yes".
17. Part of a wife's duty is to satisfy her husband sexually whenever he wants it, whether or not she is in the mood.
18. Often a woman reports rape long after the fact because she gets mad at the man she had sex with and is just trying to get back at him.
19. As long as a man does not slap or punch or punch a woman in the process, forcing her to have sex is not as bad.
20. When a woman gets raped more than once, she is probably doing something to cause it.
21. Women who get raped will eventually forget about it and get on with their lives.
22. On a date, when a man spends a lot of money on a woman, the woman ought to at least give the man something in return sexually.
23. I believe that if a woman lets a man kiss her and touch her sexually, she should be willing to go all the way.
24. When women act like they are too good for men, most men probably think about raping the women to put them in their place.
25. I believe that society and the courts are too tough on rapists.

26. Most women are sluts and get what they deserve.
27. Before the police investigate a woman's claim of rape, it is a good idea to find out what she was wearing, if she had been drinking, and what kind of person she is.
28. Generally, rape is not planned- a lot of times it just happens.
29. If a person tells himself that he will never rape again, then he probably won't.
30. A lot of men who rape do so because they are deprived of sex.
31. The reason a lot of women say "no" to sex is because they don't want to seem loose
32. If a woman goes to the home of a man on the first date, she probably wants to have sex with him.
33. Many women have a secret desire to be forced into having sex.
34. Most of the men who rape have stronger sexual urges than other men.
35. I believe that any woman can prevent herself from being raped if she really wants to.
36. Most of the time, the only reason a man commits rape is because he was sexually assaulted as a child.

Appendix K

Rape Myth Acceptance Scale

Response Scale:

1= *Strongly Agree*

2= *Agree*

3= *Somewhat Agree*

4= *Neutral*

5= *Somewhat Disagree*

6= *Disagree*

7= *Strongly Disagree*

1. A woman who goes to the home or apartment of a man on their first date implies that she is willing to have sex.
2. Any female can get raped.
3. One reason that women falsely report a rape is that they frequently have a need to call attention to themselves.
4. Any healthy woman can successfully resist a rapist if she really wants to.
5. When women go around braless or wearing short skirts and tight tops, they are just asking for trouble.
6. In the majority of rapes, the victim is promiscuous or has a bad reputation.
7. If a girl engages in necking or petting and she lets things get out of hand, it is her own fault if her partner forces sex on her.
8. Women who get raped while hitchhiking get what they deserve.

9. A woman who is stuck-up and thinks she is too good to talk to guys on the street deserves to be taught a lesson.
10. Many women have an unconscious wish to be raped, and may then unconsciously set up a situation in which they are likely to be attacked.
11. If a woman gets drunk at a party and has intercourse with a man she's just met there, she should be considered "fair game" to other males at the party who want to have sex with her too, whether she wants to or not.
12. What percentage of women who report a rape would you say are lying because they are angry and want to get back at the man they accuse?
1. Almost All
 2. About 3/4
 3. About Half
 4. About 1/4
 5. Almost None
13. What percentage of reported rapes would you guess were merely invented by women who discovered they were pregnant and wanted to protect their own reputation?
1. Almost All
 2. About 3/4
 3. About Half
 4. About 1/4

5. Almost None

A person comes to you and claims they were raped. How likely would you be to believe their statement if the person were:

14. your best friend?

1. Always
2. Frequently
3. Sometimes
4. Rarely
5. Never

15. an Indian woman?

1. Always
2. Frequently
3. Sometimes
4. Rarely
5. Never

16. a neighborhood woman?

1. Always
2. Frequently
3. Sometimes
4. Rarely
5. Never

17. a young boy?

1. Always
2. Frequently
3. Sometimes
4. Rarely
5. Never

18. a black woman?

1. Always
2. Frequently
3. Sometimes
4. Rarely
5. Never

19. a white woman?

1. Always
2. Frequently
3. Sometimes
4. Rarely
5. Never

Appendix L

Costin's R scale

* To be reverse-scored.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

1. In order to protect the male it should be difficult to prove that a rape has occurred.

*2. Women are conditioned by sexist attitudes in our society to be rape victims.

3. Most charges of rape are unfounded.

4. In general, rape victims exhibit more provocative behavior than victims of other kinds of violent crime.

5. Most rapists are oversexed.

6. Many women really want to be raped.

*7. A basic motive of a rapist is not so much sexual as it is to humiliate the victim.

8. No healthy adult female who resists vigorously can be raped by an unarmed man.

9. Women often provoke rape through their appearance or behavior.

10. A charge of rape two days after the act has occurred is probably not rape.

11. Any woman who is a "tease" or leads a man on is just asking to be raped.

12. A woman should be responsible for preventing her own rape.

13. Most women who claim they were raped by a man they knew probably consented at the time and then changed their mind afterward.

*14. A raped woman is an innocent victim, not a responsible one.

*15. The defense in a rape trial should *not* be able to submit as evidence the sexual history of the alleged victim.

16. Within a marriage there can be no such crime as rape by a husband, since a wife's "consent" to the husband is a permanent part of the marriage vows and cannot be withdrawn.

17. If a woman is going to be raped, she might as well relax and enjoy it.

*18. Economic threats (for example, an employee threatened with the loss of her job if she doesn't have sex with her boss) should be treated legally on an equal basis with threats of force in cases of rape.

*19. A woman can be raped against her will.

*20. In forcible rape the victim never causes the crime.

Appendix M

Acceptance of Modern Myths about Sexual Aggression Scale

Please read each statement carefully and then circle that number from 1 to 7 that you feel best represents your opinion. The points on the scale have the following meaning:

1 = completely disagree

2 = disagree

3 = disagree somewhat

4 = neutral

5 = agree somewhat

6 = agree

7 = completely agree

For example:

It snows in winter.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 ⑥ 7 completely agree

In this example the answer of 5 would indicate that you agree somewhat with the statement but not entirely (for example, because it does not snow everywhere and all the time in winter).

Please use the complete range of the scale to express your exact opinion.

1. When it comes to sexual contacts, women expect men to take the lead.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

2. Once a man and a woman have started "making out", a woman's misgivings against sex will automatically disappear.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

3. A lot of women strongly complain about sexual infringements for no real reason, just to appear emancipated.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

4. To get custody for their children, women often falsely accuse their ex-husband of a tendency towards sexual violence.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

5. Interpreting harmless gestures as "sexual harassment" is a popular weapon in the battle of the sexes.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

6. It is a biological necessity for men to release sexual pressure from time to time.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

7. After a rape, women nowadays receive ample support.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

8. Nowadays, a large proportion of rapes is partly caused by the depiction of sexuality in the media as this raises the sex drive of potential perpetrators.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

9. If a woman invites a man to her home for a cup of coffee after a night out this means that she wants to have sex.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

10. As long as they don't go too far, suggestive remarks and allusions simply tell a woman that she is attractive.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

11. Any woman who is careless enough to walk through "dark alleys" at night is partly to be blamed if she is raped.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

12. When a woman starts a relationship with a man, she must be aware that the man will assert his right to have sex.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

13. Most women prefer to be praised for their looks rather than their intelligence.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

14. Because the fascination caused by sex is disproportionately large, our society's sensitivity to crimes in this area is disproportionate as well.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

15. Women like to play coy. This does not mean that they do not want sex.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

16. Many women tend to exaggerate the problem of male violence.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

17. When a man urges his female partner to have sex, this cannot be called rape.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

18. When a single woman invites a single man to her flat she signals that she is not averse to having sex.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

19. When politicians deal with the topic of rape, they do so mainly because this topic is likely to attract the attention of the media.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

20. When defining "marital rape", there is no clear-cut distinction between normal conjugal intercourse and rape.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

21. A man's sexuality functions like a steam boiler – when the pressure gets too high, he has to "let off steam".

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

22. Women often accuse their husbands of marital rape just to retaliate for a failed relationship.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

23. The discussion about sexual harassment on the job has mainly resulted in many a harmless behavior being misinterpreted as harassment.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

24. In dating situations the general expectation is that the woman "hits the brakes" and the man "pushes ahead".

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

25. Although the victims of armed robbery have to fear for their lives, they receive far less psychological support than do rape victims.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

26. Alcohol is often the culprit when a man rapes a woman.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

27. Many women tend to misinterpret a well-meant gesture as a "sexual assault".

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

28. Nowadays, the victims of sexual violence receive sufficient help in the form of women's shelters, therapy offers, and support groups.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

29. Instead of worrying about alleged victims of sexual violence society should rather attend to more urgent problems, such as environmental destruction.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

30. Nowadays, men who really sexually assault women are punished justly.

completely disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 completely agree

Appendix N

Measure of Criminal Attitude and Associates

Measure of Criminal Attitudes and Associates (DV4)

Attitudes Towards Violence:

2. It's understandable to hit someone who insults you. (R5)
33. Its not wrong to hit someone who puts you down. (J6)
5. It's none of my business, if I saw a store being robbed. (R)
37. Ignoring a store being robbed is not wrong. (J)
9. Sometimes a person may have to carry a weapon to protect themselves.
(R)
40. There is nothing wrong with carrying a weapon to protect yourself. (J)
12. It is understandable for a person to fight when they are threatened. (R)
A person is completely right to fight back if they have been threatened.
(J)
3. Child molesters get what they have coming. (R)
5. There is nothing wrong with beating up a child molester. (J)
7. Sometimes you have to fight to keep your self-respect. (R)
8. It's not wrong to fight to save face. (J)
9. If you make someone really angry, you shouldn't complain if you get hit.
(R)
10. Someone who makes you very angry deserves to be hit. (J)
11. People who get beat up usually had it coming. (R)
12. There is nothing wrong with beating up someone who asks for it. (J)

13. It is reasonable to expect a fight from someone you cheated. (R)

60. Its all right to fight someone if they stole from you. (J)

Attitudes Towards Entitlement:

45. If someone found a wallet, its O.K. to keep the money as a reward before turning it in. (R)

3. Any money I find in a wallet rightfully belongs to me. (J)

48. Sometimes you have to break the law to survive. (R)

6. If you can't get a job, then you have to do crime to get by.(J)

5 Rationalization Item

* Justification Item

52. Stealing to survive is understandable. (R)

10. A hungry man has the right to steal. (J)

54. Anyone with self-respect would rather steal than have to live off of charity. (R)

13. Its not wrong to steal, if it lets you keep your self-respect. (J)

58. Taking what is owed you is not really stealing. (R)

17. A person is right to take what is owed them, even if they have to steal it. (J)

61. People should be allowed to decide what is right and wrong. (R)

20. Only I can decide what is right and wrong. (J)

64. A person should decide what they deserve out of life. (R)

24. Only I should decide what I deserve. (J)

- 65. I should be given what I need. (R)
- 27. It would be wrong if I didn't get what I needed. (J)
- 67. You should not judge what other people do. (R)
- 31. No one has the right to pass judgment on me. (J)
- 68. I should be treated like anyone else no matter what I do. (R)
- 34. No matter what I've done, its only right to treat me like everyone else.
(J)
- 71. A lack of money should not stop you from getting what you want. (R)
- 38. Its wrong for a lack of money to stop you from getting things. (J)
- 72. Most people break the law in some way. (R)
- 41. Sometimes you have to break the law. (J)

Anti-Social Intent:

- 4. I am not likely to commit a crime in the future. (-7)
- 7. I can see myself becoming law-abiding. (-)
- 11. I would keep any amount of money I found. (+8)
- 14. I could not see myself buying stolen goods. (-)
- 18. I could see myself lying to the police. (+)
- 21. In certain situations I would try to outrun the police. (+)
- 25. I would not cheat on an exam. (-)

7 Negatively Keyed Item

* Positively Keyed Item

- 28. I would be open to cheating certain people. (+)
- 32. I am likely to get away with any future crime I may commit. (+)

- 35. If I were a salesman, I would never lie to a customer. (-)
- 39. I could easily tell a convincing lie. (+)
- 42. I could not see myself as a professional thief. (-)
- 46. Rules will not stop me from doing what I want. (+)
- 49. I would not enjoy getting away with something wrong. (-)
- 55. I would run a scam if I could get away with it. (+)
- 59. For a good reason, I would commit a crime. (+)
- 62. If it put money in my pocket, I would take advantage of someone. (+)
- 66. I will not break the law again. (-)
- 70. I would be happy to fool the police. (+)

Attitudes Towards Assoc.

- 1. I have a lot in common with people who break the law. (+)
- 8. None of my friends have committed crimes. (-)
- 15. I know several people who have committed crimes. (+)
- 22. I would not steal, and I would hold it against anyone who does. (-)
- 29. I am most comfortable around people who obey the law.(-)
- 36. I always feel welcomed around criminal friends. (+)
- 43. Most of my friends don't have criminal records. (-)
- 50. I have friends who have been to jail. (+)
- 56. None of my friends has ever wanted to commit a crime. (-)
- 63. I have committed a crime with friends. (+)
- 69. I have friends who are well known to the police. (+)

Appendix O

Coercive Sexuality Scale

Please indicate on the 4-point scale how frequently you have engaged in the following behaviours.

1	2	3	4
Never	Once/ Twice a Week	Several Times	Always

1. Held a woman's hand against her will.
2. Kissed a woman against her will.
3. Placed your hand on a woman's knee against her will.
4. Placed your hand on a woman's breast against her will.
5. Placed your hand on a woman's thigh or crotch against her will.
6. Unfastened a woman's outer clothing against her will.
7. Removed or disarranged a woman's outer clothing against her will.
8. Removed or disarranged a woman's under clothing against her will.
9. Removed your own underclothing against a woman's will.
10. Touched a woman's genital area against her will.
11. Had intercourse with a woman against her will.
12. Attempted to verbally convince a woman to have sex with you.
13. Ignored a woman's protests to have sex with you.
14. Used verbal threats to get a woman to have sex with you.
15. Used physical restraint with a woman to get her to have sex with you.
16. Used threats of physical aggression with a woman to get her to have sex.
17. Used physical aggression with a woman to get her to have sex with you.

18. Threatened to use a weapon on a woman to get her to have sex with you.

19. Used a weapon on a woman to get her to have sex with you.

Appendix P

Quality Control Questions

1) Please choose option 2:

1-Strongly disagree 2-Somewhat disagree 3-Somewhat agree 4-Strongly agree

2) Please select the “Agree” response:

1-Agree 2-Disagree

Appendix Q

Study 2 Debrief Form

Firstly, thank you for participating in this study—it is greatly appreciated!

In this study, you answered a series of questionnaires on your sexual interests, attitudes about sex, past sexual experiences, and demographic information. The purpose of this research is to understand sexual tendencies, interests, attitudes and past experiences. The results of this study will guide the development of strategies for preventing sexual violence. All responses you gave over the course of this study will remain confidential in agreement with the confidentiality agreements the research team has signed. In order to ensure you can withdraw your data at any time during data collection, please make a note of your memorable words somewhere where you can easily access it. It is important to note you will need to remember your memorable word in order to withdraw your data. If at any point in time you would like to withdraw your data before June 01, 2020, you can contact Laleh Dadgardoust (laleh.dadgardoust@ontariotechu.ca), or Dr. Leigh Harkins Leigh.harkins@ontariotechu.ca and provide your memorable word. After doing so, your data will be removed from the study. We do recognize that due to the sensitive nature of the topics discussed in this study, you may feel upset or distressed. If you do feel upset as a result of this study and feel the need to discuss the study content with a counsellor, please feel free to do so. Your personal health is of the utmost importance.

If you feel distressed, upset, or simply would like to speak to a counsellor about this study, please feel free to contact any of the following resources:

- **Distress Centre Durham (24-hour, confidential): 1-800-452-0688**

- **Ontario Tech University Student LifeLine (Mon-Fri., 8:30am-4:30pm): 905-721-3392**
- **Durham Rape Crisis Center (24-hour, crisis, and support Line): 905-444-9672**
- **Crisis Text Line operates in both the US and Canada:
<https://www.crisistextline.org/>.**

Once again, thank you for your participation in this study!

This study has been approved by the OntarioTech University Research Ethics Board *REB* #14741.

If you have any further questions, concerns, or complaints about this study, you may contact Laleh Dadgardoust (Laleh.dadgardoust@Ontariotechu.ca). If you have any questions about your rights as a participant, complaints, or adverse events that occurred during the study, please contact the Research Ethics Board through the Compliance Office (905-721-8668 ext. 3693).

Appendix R

Consent Form Wave 1 (Community men)

You are invited to participate in Time 1 of a two-part research study. Please read this form carefully, and feel free to ask any questions you might have. If you have any questions concerning the research study or experience any discomfort related to the study, please contact the researcher Laleh Dadgardoust at Laleh.dadgardoust@uoit.ca, or academic supervisor, Leigh Harkins at Leigh.harkins@uoit.ca, or at 905.721.8668 ext. 5991. Any questions regarding your rights as a participant, complaints, or adverse events may be addressed to Research Ethics Board through the Research Ethics Coordinator – researchethics@uoit.ca or 905.721.8668 x. 3693. This study has been approved by the UOIT Research Ethics Board REB [Enter REB #15263].

Researcher(s):

This research is being carried out by Laleh Dadgardoust

Purpose and Procedure:

This study is part one of a two-part study. Time 2 will take place 4-6 weeks after your participation in time one. This study aims to investigate men's (18 years and older) views on sexual situations and to measure their sexual interests, attitudes, tendencies, and experiences. Some of the questions will be quite personal and will ask you about your own sexual experiences and interests, and some of the questions/ situations that might be upsetting to some people as they ask about aggressive, violent, and sexual behaviour. If you decide to take part in this study, you will be asked to fill out 6 questionnaires – a

general information questionnaire, questionnaires about your sexual interests, views on sexual situations, attitudes towards sex and aggression, sexual experiences, and other personal characteristics. We would like to see whether your responses at Time 1 have a relationship with responses at Time 2. Following this, you will be debriefed. The entire experiment will take approximately 60 minutes.

Compensation:

You will receive a \$10 Amazon gift card for taking part in Time 1, and a \$20 Amazon gift card after you participate in Time 2. We will be taking 200 participants, and the link will be deactivated once the quota is reached.

Potential Benefits:

You will not benefit directly by taking part in this study, however it may help you develop a better understanding of how research works.

Society will benefit from the study as it can provide valuable information about sexual attitude and behaviour to researchers, and law enforcement.

Potential Risk or Discomforts:

Questionnaires in this study will ask about your sexual interests, past sexual experiences, your sexual attitudes and asks for your views on sexual situations. As you complete the materials involved in this study, you may feel uncomfortable revealing your past activities/ interests or find it upsetting to answer such questions if you have been a victim of sexual crime. If so, please know you can stop the study at any time, leave questions

blank, or contact the support service provided on the debriefing form. Please be assured that your responses will not be connected to you in any way. Furthermore, we are aware that many people have engaged different types of antisocial and illegal activities in the past. There will be no repercussions for answering the questionnaires honestly. Any information you will provide will be anonymized and aggregated with the data of the complete pool of participants. At any point in time during the study, you also have the right to discontinue the study without any penalty. Crisis Text Line operates in both the US and Canada: <https://www.crisistextline.org/>

Storage of Data:

The information you provide will be entered into a computer database and stored on a password protected laptop accessible only by the research team. The print and electronic data will be kept indefinitely. No identifying information such as your email address will appear in the database. All the data will be aggregated to further protect the confidentiality of your responses. The data will be kept indefinitely and aggregated/grouped data may be shared with other researchers as required by the ethics and publication guidelines of psychology. If this is the case, none of your identifying information will be included.

Confidentiality:

It is entirely up to you if you want to take part. You will be asked to provide a memorable word (Last letter of your last name, last 3 digits of your phone number, birth month, mother's birth month). At the beginning of the study which will be linked with your

responses to protect the data. This will mean your responses will not be shared with anyone but will allow us to withdraw your data if you decide you no longer want it to be included. The principal investigator will not have access to any identifying information. Once you complete the survey, you will be redirected to a new URL page to enter your email address. This will ensure that your responses are not linked to any identifying information such as your email address. The email address you provide will be used to send your gift card, and also to invite you to participate in time 2. Please also rest assured that the principal investigator and research team will all be required to sign confidentiality agreements to further protect you. In addition, all data will be kept on a password-protected computer, and will only be accessible to designated members of the research team.

Confidentiality will be provided to the fullest extent possible by law, professional practice and ethical codes of conduct. Your privacy shall be respected. No information about your identity will be shared or published without your consent unless required by law. There are some situations in which confidentiality may need to be breached - if you report the intention to harm yourself or someone else, or if you report committing a specific previous crime with a victim that can be identified. We also may have a duty to report any abuse to children under the age of 16 to the Children's Aid Society (i.e. if you provide unsolicited information about an identifiable victim). Please note that we have designed the questionnaires in a way that minimizes the risk of identifying participants, so please feel free to answer the yes or no questions honestly. We do ask, however, that you not provide any extra detail regarding past offences so your confidentiality can be maintained.

Right to Withdraw:

Your participation is voluntary and you can choose to withdraw, or to answer only those questions that you are comfortable with. The information that is shared will be held in strict confidence and discussed only with the research team. You may withdraw from the study at any time without affecting entitlement to payment. If you withdraw from the research project at any time, any data that you have contributed will be removed from the study, up until May 30, 2020, at which point the data will be analysed and it will no longer be possible to identify your individual responses. As a participant, you are not waiving any rights to legal recourse in the event of research-related harm. To withdraw during the course of the study, close the browser prior to completing the study and all your data will be discarded without having been viewed.

The process for withdrawing from the study after completion is as follows:

1. At the beginning of the study, you will be prompted to choose a memorable word.
2. We recommend that you make note of your memorable word, on a location you can easily access (ex. Cell phone)
3. If you wish to withdraw your data, you can contact Laleh Dadgardoust using the email address provided above and on the debrief form. You can also call academic supervisor, Leigh Harkins at 905.721.8668 ext. 5991 from a blocked number to ensure anonymity.

4. When contacting Laleh Dadgardoust, or her academic supervisor, please clearly state your intent to withdraw your data, and provide your memorable word.
5. Providing your memorable word will allow for all data collected from you to be identified and destroyed. You do not have to provide a reason for withdrawal. Once you have stated your intent for your data to be withdrawn, it will not be viewed again, even in the process of withdrawal.
6. You will be contacted to confirm your data has been withdrawn from the study.

Participant Concerns and Reporting:

If you have any questions concerning the research study or experience any discomfort related to the study, please contact the researcher Laleh Dadgardoust at Laleh.dadgardoust@uoit.ca , or her academic supervisor, Leigh Harkins at Leigh.harkins@uoit.ca, or at 905.721.8668 ext. 5991. Any questions regarding your rights as a participant, complaints, or adverse events may be addressed to the Research Ethics Board through the Research Ethics Coordinator – researchethics@uoit.ca or 905.721.8668 x. 3693. This study has been approved by the UOIT Research Ethics Board REB [REB# 15263]

Debriefing and Dissemination of Results:

As a participant, you are entitled to be informed of the results of this study if interested. The results may be published in an academic journal and/or presented at an academic conference. Even in this form, all data will be aggregated and remain anonymous. If

participants are interested in the results of this study please contact the researcher at Laleh.dadgardoust@uoit.ca.

Consent to Participate:

1. I have read the consent form and understand the study being described
2. I am free to ask questions about the study in the future.
3. I freely consent to participate in the research study, understanding that I may discontinue participation at any time without penalty.
4. I understand that the anonymous data I provide in this study may be subject to additional analyses not outlined in this study.
5. I understand that by consenting to participate I do not waive any legal rights or recourse

Appendix S

Wave 1 Debrief Form (Community Men)

Firstly, thank you for participating in this study—it is greatly appreciated! In this study, you answered a series of questionnaires on your sexual experiences since time 1, and demographic information. The purpose of this research is to understand participants' tendency to act in a sexually violent manner, as well as their understanding of sexual interests, attitudes and past experiences. The results of this study will guide the development of strategies for preventing sexual violence. All responses you gave over the course of this study will remain confidential in agreement with the confidentiality agreements the research team has signed. In order to ensure you can withdraw your data at any time during data collection, please make a note of your memorable word somewhere where you can easily access it. It is important to note you will need to remember your memorable word in order to withdraw your data. If at any point in time you would like to withdraw your data before July 01, 2020, you can contact Laleh Dadgardoust (laleh.dadgardoust@uoit.ca) and provide your memorable code word. After doing so, your data will be removed from the study. It would be greatly appreciated if you would keep the details of this study confidential in order to help us maintain the study's integrity. We do recognize, however, that due to the sensitive nature of the topics discussed in this study, you may feel upset or distressed. If you do feel upset as a result of this study and feel the need to discuss the study content with a counsellor, please feel free to do so. Your personal health is of the utmost importance! As a research team, we want to feel free to contact the Crisis Text Line operates in both the US and Canada: <https://www.crisistextline.org/>. They provide free 24/7 services. It is also important to

note that engaging in any kind of sexual behaviour without getting consent first is not ok and can have serious legal consequences. Once again, thank you for your participation in this study! This study has been approved by the UOIT Research Ethics Board REB, REB#15236 If you have any further questions, concerns, or complaints about this study, you may contact Laleh Dadgardoust (Laleh.dadgardoust@uoit.ca). If you have any questions about your rights as a participant, complaints, or adverse events that occurred during the study, please contact the Research Ethics Board through the Compliance Office (905-721-8668 ext. 3693).

Appendix T

Wave 2 Consent Form (Student Sample)

You are invited to participate in this research study. Please read this form carefully, and feel free to ask any questions you might have. If you have any questions concerning the research study or experience any discomfort related to the study, please contact the researcher Laleh Dadgardoust at laleh.dadgardoust@uoit.ca. Any questions regarding your rights as a participant, complaints, or adverse events may be addressed to the Research Ethics Board through the Research Ethics Coordinator – researchethics@uoit.ca or 905.721.8668 x. 3693. This study has been approved by the UOIT Research Ethics Board REB # 14741

Researcher(s):

This research is being carried out by Laleh Dadgardoust

Purpose and Procedure:

This study aims to investigate male students' (18 years and older) past sexual experiences. Some of the questions will be quite personal and will ask you about your own sexual experiences and interests, and some of the questions/ situations that might be upsetting to some people as they are of a sexual nature. If you decide to take part in this study, you will be asked to fill out 2 questionnaires – a general information questionnaire, and a questionnaire about your past sexual experiences. Following this, you will be debriefed. The entire experiment will take approximately 30 minutes.

Potential Risk or Discomforts:

Questionnaires in this study will ask about your past sexual experiences. As you complete the materials involved in this study, you may feel uncomfortable revealing your past

activities/ interests or find it upsetting to answer such questions if you have been a victim of sexual crime. If so, please know you can stop the study at any time, leave questions blank, or contact the support service provided on the debriefing form. Please be assured that all of your responses will be anonymous, and your responses will not be connected to you in any way. Furthermore, we are aware that many people have engaged in different types of antisocial and illegal activities in the past. There will be no repercussions for answering the questionnaires honestly. Any information you will provide will be used anonymously and aggregated with the data of the complete pool of participants. If, at any point in time during the study, you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to inform the experimenter. At any point in time during the study, you also have the right to discontinue the study without any penalty.

If you should feel distressed, upset, or simply would like to speak to a counsellor about this study, please feel free to contact the Distress Centre. The Distress Centre is a 24-hour confidential support service, and can be contacted anonymously at the numbers below:

Distress Centre Durham (24-hour, confidential): 1-800-452-0688

UOIT Student LifeLine (Mon-Fri., 8:30am-4:30pm): 905-721-3392

Durham Rape Crisis Center (24-hour, crisis, and support Line): 905-444-9672

Storage of Data:

The information you provide will be entered into a computer database and stored in a locked office or lab on a password-protected laptop accessible only by the research team. No identifying information, such as your name or student ID, will appear in the database. All the data will be aggregated to further protect the confidentiality of your responses. The data will be kept indefinitely, and aggregated/grouped data may be shared with other

researchers as required by the ethics and publication guidelines of psychology. If this is the case, none of your identifying information will be included.

Confidentiality:

It is entirely up to you if you want to take part. You will be asked to provide a memorable word at the end of the study, which will be linked with your responses to protect the anonymity of your data. This will mean your responses will remain anonymous but will allow us to withdraw your data if you decide you no longer want it to be included. All data will remain anonymous by the investigator and research team. Please also rest assured that the principal investigator and research team will all be required to sign confidentiality agreements to protect you further. In addition, all data will be kept on a password protected lab computer, and will only be accessible to designated members of the research team.

Confidentiality will be provided to the fullest extent possible by law, professional practice and ethical codes of conduct. Your privacy shall be respected. No information about your identity will be shared or published without your permission unless required by law. There are some situations in which confidentiality may need to be breached - if you report the intention to harm yourself or someone else, or if you report committing a specific previous crime with a victim that can be identified. We also may have a duty to report any abuse to children under the age of 16 to the Children's Aid Society (i.e. if you provide unsolicited information about an identifiable victim). Please note that we have designed the questionnaires in a way that should not result in the situations described above, so please feel free to answer the yes or no questions honestly. We do ask,

however, that you not provide any extra detail regarding past offences so your confidentiality can be maintained.

Right to Withdraw:

Your participation is voluntary, and you can choose to answer only those questions that you are comfortable with. The information that is shared will be held in strict confidence and discussed only with the research team. You may withdraw from the study at any time without affecting entitlement to research credit. If you withdraw from the research project at any time, any data that you have contributed will be removed from the study, up until June 1, 2020, at which point the data will be analyzed, and it will no longer be possible to identify your individual responses. As a participant, you are not waiving any rights to legal recourse in the event of research-related harm. To withdraw during the course of the study, verbally indicate to the experimenter you would like to stop and withdraw, and all of your data will be discarded without having been viewed.

The process for withdrawing from the study after completion is as follows:

1. At the end of the study, you will be prompted to provide a code word (your middle initial, mother's maiden name, and last 3 digits of your phone number).
2. We recommend that you make a note of your code word on your debrief form or another location you can easily access (ex. Cell phone)
3. If you wish to withdraw your data, you can contact Laleh Dadgardoust using the email or phone number provided above and on your debrief form.
4. When contacting Laleh Dadgardoust, please clearly state your intent to withdraw your data, and provide your code word.

5. Providing your code word will allow for all data collected from you to be identified and destroyed. You do not have to provide a reason for withdrawal. Once you have stated your intent for your data to be withdrawn, it will not be viewed again, even in the process of withdrawal.

6. You will be contacted to confirm your data has been withdrawn from the study

Participant Concerns and Reporting:

If you have any questions concerning the research study or experience any discomfort related to the study, please contact the researcher Laleh Dadgardoust at

laleh.dadgaroudt@uoit.ca or her supervisor Leigh Harkins at Leigh.harkins@uoit.ca. Any questions regarding your rights as a participant, complaints, or adverse events may be addressed to the Research Ethics Board through the Research Ethics Coordinator – researchethics@uoit.ca or 905.721.8668 x. 3693. This study has been approved by the UOIT Research Ethics Board REB14741.

Debriefing and Dissemination of Results:

As a participant, you are entitled to be informed of the results of this study if interested. The results may be published in an academic journal and/or presented at an academic conference. Even in this form, all data will be aggregated and remain anonymous. If participants are interested in the results of this study, please contact the academic supervisor at leigh.harkins@uoit.ca.

1. I have read the consent form and understand the study being described.
2. I have had an opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered.

I am free to ask questions about the study in the future.

3. I freely consent to participate in the research study, understanding that I may discontinue participation at any time without penalty. A copy of this Consent Form has been given to me for my records.
4. I understand that the anonymous data I provide in this study may be subject to additional analyses not outlined in this study.
5. I understand that that by consenting to participate I do not waive any legal rights.
6. I UNDERSTAND THE ABOVE AND CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE.

Appendix U

Wave 2: Debrief Form (Student Sample)

Firstly, thank you for participating in this study—it is greatly appreciated!

In this study, you answered a series of questionnaires on your past sexual experiences since Time 1, and demographic information. The purpose of this research is to understand university students' tendency to act in a sexually violent manner, as well as their understanding of sexual interests, attitudes and past experiences. The results of this study will guide the development prevention strategies in All responses you gave over the course of this study will remain confidential in agreement with the confidentiality agreements the research team has signed. In order to ensure you can withdraw your data at any time during data collection, please make a note of your memorable code word on your copy of the debrief form, or somewhere else where you can easily access it. It is important to note you will need to remember your memorable code word in order to withdraw your data. If at any point in time you would like to withdraw your data before June 1, 2020, you can contact Dr. Harkins (leigh.harkins@uoit.ca; 905-721-8668 ext. 5991) or Laleh Dadgardoust (laleh.dadgardoust@uoit.ca) and provide your memorable code word. After doing so, your data will be removed from the study.

It would be greatly appreciated if you would keep the details of this study confidential until the end of the academic year in order to help us maintain the study's integrity. We do recognize, however, that due to the sensitive nature of the topics discussed in this study, you may feel upset or distressed. If you do feel upset as a result of this study and feel the need to discuss the study content with a counsellor, please feel free to do so. Your personal health is of the utmost importance! As a research team, we want to ensure you

feel supported following study completion. If you should feel distressed, upset, or simply would like to speak to a counsellor about this study, please feel free to use either of the contacts below:

Distress Centre Durham (24-hour, confidential): 1-800-452-0688

UOIT Student LifeLine (Mon-Fri., 8:30am-4:30pm): 905-721-3392

Durham Rape Crisis Center (24-hour, crisis, and support Line): 905-444-9672

Once again, thank you for your participation in this study!

This study has been approved by the UOIT Research Ethics Board REB [REB # 14741]

If you have any further questions, concerns, or complaints about this study, you may contact Dr. Harkins (leigh.harkins@uoit.ca; 905-721-8668 ext. 5991) or Laleh

Dadgardoust (Laleh.dadgardoust@uoit.ca). If you have any questions about your rights as a participant, complaints, or adverse events that occurred during the study, please contact the Research Ethics Board through the Compliance Office (905-721-8668 ext. 3693).

Appendix V

Wave 2: Consent form (Community Men)

You are invited to participate in Time 2 of a two-part of a research study. Please read this form carefully, and feel free to ask any questions you might have. If you have any questions concerning the research study or experience any discomfort related to the study, please contact the researcher Laleh Dadgardoust at Laleh.dadgardoust@uoit.ca, or academic supervisor, Leigh Harkins at Leigh.harkins@uoit.ca, or 905.721.8668 ext. 5991. Any questions regarding your rights as a participant, complaints, or adverse events may be addressed to the Research Ethics Board through the Research Ethics Coordinator – researchethics@uoit.ca or 905.721.8668 x. 3693. This study has been approved by the UOIT Research Ethics Board REB [REB #15263].

Researcher(s):

This research is being carried out by Laleh Dadgardoust

Purpose and Procedure:

This is Time 2 of a two-part study. This study aims to investigate men's (18 years and older) views on sexual situations and to measure their sexual interests, attitudes, tendencies, and experiences. Some of the questions will be quite personal and will ask you about your own sexual experiences and interests, and some of the questions/situations that might be upsetting to some people as they ask about aggressive, violent, and sexual behaviour. If you decide to take part in this study, you will be asked to fill out 2 questionnaires – a general information questionnaire, and a questionnaire about your

past sexual experiences since time 1. Following this, you will be debriefed. The entire experiment will take less than 30 minutes.

Compensation:

You will receive a \$20 Amazon gift card as compensation for participating in Time 2.

Potential Benefits:

You will not benefit directly by taking part in this study, however it may help you develop a better understanding of how research works.

The society will benefit the study as it can provide valuable information about sexual attitude and behaviour to researchers, and law enforcement.

Potential Risk or Discomforts:

Questionnaires in this study will ask about your past sexual experiences. As you complete the materials involved in this study, you may feel uncomfortable revealing your past activities/ interests or find it upsetting to answer such questions if you have been a victim of sexual crime. If so, please know you can stop the study at any time, leave questions blank, or contact the support service provided on the debriefing form. Please be assured that your responses will not be connected to you in any way. Furthermore, we are aware that many people have engaged in different types of antisocial and illegal activities in the past. There will be no repercussions for answering the questionnaires honestly. Any information you will provide will be used anonymously and aggregated with the data of the complete pool of participants. If at any point in time during the study you have any

questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to inform the experimenter. At any point in time during the study, you also have the right to discontinue the study. Your personal health is of the utmost importance! As a research team, we want to feel free to contact the Crisis Text Line operates in both the US and Canada: <https://www.crisistextline.org/>. They provide free 24/7 services.

Storage of Data:

The information you provide will be entered into a computer database and stored on a password protected laptop accessible only by the research team. No identifying information, such as your email address will appear in the database. All the data will be aggregated to further protect the confidentiality of your responses. The data will be kept indefinitely and aggregated / grouped data may be shared with other researchers as required by the ethics and publication guidelines of psychology. If this is the case, none of your identifying information will be included.

Confidentiality:

It is entirely up to you if you want to take part. You will be asked to provide a memorable word (Last letter of your last name, last 3 digits of your phone number, birth month, mother's birth month) at the beginning of the study which will be linked with your responses. This will mean your responses will not remain unidentifiable, but will allow us to withdraw your data if you decide you no longer want it to be included. Principal investigators will not have access to any identifying information. Once you complete the survey, you will be redirected to a new URL page to enter your email address. This will

ensure that your responses are not linked to any identifying information such as your email address. The email address you provide will be used to send your gift card. Please also rest assured that the principal investigator and research team will all be required to sign confidentiality agreements to further protect you. In addition, all data will be kept on a password protected lab computer, and will only be accessible to designated members of the research team.

Confidentiality will be provided to the fullest extent possible by law, professional practice and ethical codes of conduct. Your privacy shall be respected. No information about your identity will be shared or published without your consent, unless required by law. There are some situations in which confidentiality may need to be breached - if you report the intention to harm yourself or someone else, or if you report committing a specific previous crime with a victim that can be identified. We also may have a duty to report any abuse to children under the age of 16 to the Children's Aid Society (i.e. if you provide unsolicited information about an identifiable victim). Please note that we have designed the questionnaires in a way that minimizes the risk of identifying participants, so please feel free to answer the yes or no questions honestly. We do ask, however, that you not provide any extra detail regarding past offences so your confidentiality can be maintained.

Right to Withdraw:

Your participation is voluntary, and you can choose to answer only those questions that you are comfortable with. The information that is shared will be held in strict confidence and discussed only with the research team. You may withdraw from the study at any time

without affecting entitlement to payment. If you withdraw from the research project at any time, any data that you have contributed will be removed from the study, up until May 30, 2020, at which point the data will be analysed and it will no longer be possible to identify your individual responses. As a participant, you are not waiving any rights to legal recourse in the event of research-related harm. To withdraw during the course of the study, close the browser prior to completing the study and your data will be discarded without having been viewed.

The process for withdrawing from the study after completion is as follows:

1. At the beginning of the study, you will be prompted to choose a memorable word.
2. We recommend that you make note of your memorable word on a location you can easily access (ex. Cell phone)
3. If you wish to withdraw your data, you can contact Laleh Dadgardoust using the email address provided above and on your debrief form. You can also call academic supervisor, Leigh Harkins at 905.721.8668 ext. 5991 from a blocked number.
4. When contacting Laleh Dadgardoust, or her academic supervisor, please clearly state your intent to withdraw your data, and provide your code word.
5. Providing your code word will allow for all data collected from you to be identified and destroyed. You do not have to provide a reason for withdrawal. Once you have stated your intent for your data to be withdrawn, it will not be viewed again, even in the process of withdrawal.

6. You will be contacted to confirm your data has been withdrawn from the study

Participant Concerns and Reporting:

If you have any questions concerning the research study or experience any discomfort related to the study, please contact the researcher Laleh Dadgardoust at Laleh.dadgardoust@uoit.ca or academic supervisor, Leigh Harkins at Leigh.harkins@uoit.ca, at 905.721.8668 ext. 5991. Any questions regarding your rights as a participant, complaints, or adverse events may be addressed to Research Ethics Board through the Research Ethics Coordinator – researchethics@uoit.ca or 905.721.8668 x. 3693. This study has been approved by the UOIT Research Ethics Board REB [REB # 15263]

Debriefing and Dissemination of Results:

As a participant, you are entitled to be informed of the results of this study if interested. The results may be published in an academic journal and/or presented at an academic conference. Even in this form, all data will be aggregated and remain anonymous. If participants are interested in the results of this study please contact Laleh.dadgardoust@uoit.ca

Consent to Participate:

1. I have read the consent form and understand the study being described
2. I am free to ask questions about the study in the future.

3. I freely consent to participate in the research study, understanding that I may discontinue participation at any time without penalty.
4. I understand that the data I provide in this study may be subject to additional analyses not outlined in this study.
5. I understand that that by consenting to participate I do not waive any legal rights or recourse

Appendix W

Wave 2: Debrief form (Community Men)

Firstly, thank you for participating in this study—it is greatly appreciated!

In this study, you answered a series of questionnaires on your sexual experiences since time 1, and demographic information. The purpose of this research is to understand participants' tendency to act in a sexually violent manner, as well as their understanding of sexual interests, attitudes and past experiences. The results of this study will guide the development of strategies for preventing sexual violence. All responses you gave over the course of this study will remain confidential in agreement with the confidentiality agreements the research team has signed. In order to ensure you can withdraw your data at any time during data collection, please make a note of your memorable word somewhere where you can easily access it. It is important to note you will need to remember your memorable word in order to withdraw your data. If at any point in time you would like to withdraw your data before July 01, 2020, you can contact Laleh Dadgardoust (laleh.dadgardoust@uoit.ca) and provide your memorable code word. After doing so, your data will be removed from the study.

It would be greatly appreciated if you would keep the details of this study confidential in order to help us maintain the study's integrity. We do recognize, however, that due to the sensitive nature of the topics discussed in this study, you may feel upset or distressed. If you do feel upset as a result of this study and feel the need to discuss the study content with a counsellor, please feel free to do so. Your personal health is of the utmost importance! As a research team, we want to feel free to contact the Crisis Text Line operates in both the US and Canada: <https://www.crisistextline.org/>. They provide free

24/7 services. It is also important to note that engaging in any kind of sexual behaviour without getting consent first is not ok and can have serious legal consequences.

Once again, thank you for your participation in this study!

This study has been approved by the UOIT Research Ethics Board REB, REB#15236

If you have any further questions, concerns, or complaints about this study, you may contact Laleh Dadgardoust (Laleh.dadgardoust@uoit.ca). If you have any questions about your rights as a participant, complaints, or adverse events that occurred during the study, please contact the Research Ethics Board through the Compliance Office (905-721-8668 ext. 3693).