MOCK JUROR EFFECTS OF BLAME AND CONVICTION IN RAPE CASES: DO

ATTITUDES, BELIEFS, AND CONTACT WITH

HOMOSEXUALS MATTER?

Dawn Hurst-McCaleb, B.A., M.A.

Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

May 2016

APPROVED:

Linda Marshall, Major Professor
Adriel Boals, Committee Member
Vicki Campbell, Committee Member and Chair of
  the Department of Psychology
Costas Tsatsoulis, Dean of the Toulouse Graduate
  School

Hurst-McCaleb, Dawn. *Mock juror effects of blame and conviction in rape cases: Do attitudes, beliefs, and contact with homosexuals matter?* Doctor of Philosophy (Experimental Psychology), May 2016, 72 pp., 9 tables, references, 173 titles.

The current case involves a female rape victim. Research has shown the level of victim blaming can be elevated if the victim is a lesbian woman compared to a heterosexual woman. Mock jurors' responses to personality trait questionnaires (e.g., *Belief in a Just World*, *Attitudes toward Women*, *and Attitudes toward Lesbians*) and amount of contact they have with homosexual people were employed as predictors of how they would decide victim blaming and perpetrator guilt. Personality trait findings were not good predictors; however, greater contact with homosexuals did decrease negative attitudes toward lesbian victims. Limitations and implications for future research are addressed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Linda Marshall for signing on to be my major professor and for all of her time and assistance thereafter. Her expertise and patience were both valuable assets that made me a better scholar and person as a whole. I would also like to give thanks to Drs. Adriel Boals and Vicki Campbell for signing on as committee members and for their time and assistance as well. They both offered constructive feedback that was critical to my success. It has been a long journey; however, the realization of finally reaching my academic goals has made all of the trials and tribulations worth it.

I would absolutely be remiss to not send the greatest gratitude to my loving husband. Without your unwavering support, obtaining my Ph.D. would absolutely not have been possible. Along the journey, I shed a lot of tears and you were there to catch every one. May the future be filled with far less stress, many more smiles, and time to simply celebrate and enjoy life!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Women have been victimized throughout history. Victimization can occur in many

forms, including the way individuals and the criminal justice system treat a woman who has been

raped. Police officers and prosecutors sometimes engage in "secondary victimization" or "victim

blaming," thus deterring a rape victim from pursuing a case against her alleged offender.

Oftentimes, there is little or no physical evidence or eyewitness testimony (other than the

victim's; Estrich, 1987; LaFree, 1989; Lonsway & Archambault, 2012) in rape cases.

Consequently the case becomes a "he said/she said" argument; or "consent/defense." The

necessary prosecuting steps can create barriers in processing rape charges (Research to Practice

Brief, 2011), especially related to jurors' gender and individual beliefs (Sable, Danis, Mauzy &

Gallagher, 2006).

If an alleged rapist is arrested, and the case actually is processed in the court of law,

jurors' often decide criminal cases based on factors other than the information presented during

the trial (e.g., Ahola, Christianson., & Hellström, 2009; Mitchell & Byrne, 1973). Legally, it is a

juror's responsibility to decide a defendant's guilt or innocence based on whether or not a law

was violated; however, empirical evidence suggests that jurors enter the courtroom with

preconceived ideas (i.e., those based on biases and/or experience) concerning the decision they

are going to make before the case is even presented to them (De La Fuente, De La Fuente &

García, 2003; Diamond, 1990; Diamond & Zeisel, 1974). Prosecutors often find it necessary to

establish the credibility of a rape victim in order to win a conviction. That is, during the trial

process, jurors' biases and perceptions of the victim's credibility are often more important than

the evidence presented (Kassin, Williams, & Saunders, 1990). This establishment of credibility is

not essential for victims of other types of violent crimes. For example, there are no "robbery myths" or robbery victim blaming that impedes justice for victims of robbery (Mallios & Meisner, 2010; Page, 2008).

All of the jurors see and hear the same presentation of the facts of the case, yet there are often verdict disparities among jurors; particularly a difference in judgments about the case or the parties involved (Ahola, Christianson, & Hellström, 2009; Mitchell & Byrne, 1973). Pre-existing attitudes and beliefs, the ability to objectively evaluate the evidence (e.g., eyewitness testimony, weapon used, etc.), as well as personality and demographic characteristics have all demonstrated influence on jurors' views of evidence and testimony, and their beliefs about the crime, thereby affecting the verdict (Ellsworth, 1993; Roberts & Zuckerman, 2004). The influences may be particularly important in cases that are socially (Lauman, 1994; Marino, 2004; Weiss, 2010), and at times politically charged, for example a rape case where the victim is a lesbian (Epstein, 1992; Mallios & Meisner, 2010).

Research shows that sexual assaults against lesbians occur significantly more frequently than against heterosexual females (Duncan, 1990; Martin, Fisher, Warner, Krebs, & Lindquist, 2011). Rothman, Exner, and Baughman (2011) reviewed 75 studies that looked at sexual assault victimization rates of lesbian women. The literature revealed that 11.3% to 15.6% of lesbians reported being an adult sexual assault victim; and 53.2% to 85.0% of lesbians reported being a victim of sexual assault sometime during their life. There are no current data directly comparing the number of sexual assaults against heterosexual females to assaults on lesbians; however, the data suggest lesbians are at a greater risk of victimization in general (Rothman, Exner, & Baughman, 2011).

Homosexuals have historically been the target of violence and victimization (Berrill, 1992), and it has been speculated they are victimized more because they are often the targets of greater discrimination than heterosexual persons (Rothman, Exner, & Baughman, 2011). One explanation for why rape rates for lesbians are higher than for heterosexual females is the concept of "corrective rape" (Martin, Kelly, Turquet, & Ross, 2009). According to this phenomenon, "corrective rapes" are committed against lesbians to "cure" them (Bartle, 2000), thus enforcing the victims to conform to traditional gender roles and societal stereotypes (Martin, Kelly, Turquet, & Ross, 2009). The lack of comprehensive recent research makes including lesbian victims of rape in the current study important.

Jury selection, one of the first steps in a trial, demonstrates the impact of jurors' attitudes and the barriers faced by victims of sexual assault. Further research indicates that potential jurors may have intrinsic negative views of people who have been sexually assaulted (Anderson, Cooper, & Okamura, 1997; Judson, Johnson, Perez, 2013). It has been documented that rape victims have been treated more unfairly during the jury process than victims of other crimes (Mallios & Meisner, 2010); therefore, it is important to empirically study the biases jurors have that contribute to victim blaming and result in an unjust trial (Olsen-Fulero & Fulero, 1997). While victim blaming occurs for all female rape victims at some level, lesbian women in particular may be at a greater disadvantage within the legal system (Ronner, 2005). Therefore, negative attitudes based on the sexual orientation of the victim are a particular concern (Smith & Bull, 2012; White & Robinson Kurpius, 2002). Past research that has examined stereotypes of homosexual individuals has focused predominantly on gay men (e.g., see Clausell & Fiske, 2005; Fingerhut & Paplau, 2006; Kite & Whitley, 1998). This study's focus is on stereotypes, and possible consequences, of only lesbian women.

Evidence supporting the impact of jurors' attitudes on decisions has contributed to research psychologists' increased interest in jurors and juries over the past 50 years, with most employing mock jurors as their sample (Lieberman & Sales, 2007; Penrod, Kovera, & Groscup, 2011; Seltzer, 2006; Strier, 1999). When the two disciplines of psychology and law began to merge in their research efforts, the findings became more relevant to the legal community (e.g., Thompson, Cowan, Ellsworth, & Harrington, 1984). One of the most common methods used in conducting mock juror studies are questionnaire packets, often including scenarios of the alleged crime that was committed for jurors to review prior to making decisions about a case. Mock juror research can serve as important tools that assists attorneys in real life jury trials, including the jury selection process (Shofner-Meyer, 2011).

Blaming the Victim and Participant's Gender

Victim blaming (Ryan, 1970) is well documented in decision-making in rape cases. It is not uncommon for people to view the victim negatively and blame her for the rape. For example, they might attribute the rape to the way she was dressed, to her drinking alcoholic beverages, or to her sexual orientation (e.g., see Best & Demmin, 1982; Davies, Roger, & Whitelegg, 2009; Fagan, 1993). Ryan suggests Americans blame people for being in the situations they are in, often unknowingly. The existence of victim blaming, particularly in rape cases, is generally accepted amongst scholars, social scientists, people in the legal community, the media, and even at times by the victims themselves (e.g., Christie, 1986; Grubb & Turner, 2012; Lamb, 1996; Mallios & Meisner, 2010; Sleath, & Bull, 2012). It is assumed that someone who is harmed was responsible for, or contributed to, the victimization in some way.

Victim blaming creates a significant hurdle to holding an alleged perpetrator accountable for rape (Mallios & Meisner, 2010). Victim blaming, or derogation of the victim, is found more often in rapes than in any other type of crimes (e.g., Calhoun, Selby & Warring, 1976; Grubb & Harrower, 2009; Grubb & Turner, 2012; Janoff-Bulman, Timko & Carli, 1985; Sinclair & Bourne, 1998; Sperry & Siegel, 2013; Whatley, 1996). Over the last three decades victim blaming in rape cases has become a major topic of research interest, perhaps because rape elicits stronger feelings for some people than other crimes (Mallios & Meisner, 2010).

According to Seymour, Gaboury, and Edmunds (2002) the prosecutor's main goal is not to protect the victim or be on her side. Rather, the ultimate objective is to convict the perpetrator. Secondary victimization due to lack of procedural justice (i.e., fairness of justice procedures) confounds the already complicated process of jurors' decisions in rape cases. Secondary victimization is often a result of a person's condemnatory negative attitudes toward a victim (Williams, 1984), including blaming the victim for the crime occurring (Maguire, 1991). Secondary victimization is often greater for lesbian victims because they are not only objectified for being raped but are also chastised for being a lesbian (Berrill & Herek, 1992).

Research on gender differences over the years in victim blaming consistently indicates that women are less likely to blame a female victim than men (Brekke & Borgida, 1988; Gilmartin-Zena, 1983; Johnson, Jackson, & Smith, 1989; Kleinke & Meyer, 1990). This outcome is due to female jurors being more likely to identify with and be empathetic towards a female victim (e.g., Ben-David & Schneider, 2005; Calhoun, Selby, & Warring, 1976; Kanekar, Pinto, & Mazumdar, 1985; Krulewitz, 1981; Pozzulo, Dempsey, Maeder, & Allen, 2010; Wenger & Bornstein, 2006; Winer & Rinehart, 1986). It is possible that male jurors are equally as likely to identify with the male defendant by believing the woman was to blame for her own victimization

(Bell, Kuriloff, & Lottes, 1994). For men, endorsing victim blaming serves as validation for continued sexual coercion of women and assists in their ability to diminish blame against a defendant (Talbot, Neill, & Ranking, 2010). Therefore, males are more empathetic and less punitive toward an alleged perpetrator of rape (e.g., Grubb & Harrower, 2008; Grubb & Harrower, 2009; Whatley, 2005). Although the correlations between a person's gender and their likelihood to blame the victim in the studies discussed were relatively small, they were still statistically significant.

Research indicates gender differences also influence the likelihood a person would convict an alleged perpetrator of sexual assault. In general, females are more likely to find the perpetrator guilty in rape cases compared to men (e.g., Davis, Holt, Spitzer, & Stasser, 1981; Fischer, 1991; Freetly & Kane, 1995; Pugh, 1983; Quas, Bottoms, Haegerich, & Nysse-Carris, 2002; Schutte & Hosch, 1997; Selby, Calhoun, & Brock, 1977). Accordingly, males have a greater tendency to find the perpetrator of rape not guilty than females do. Employing a sample from the Baltimore jury pool, Mills and Bohannon (1980) found females reported giving more guilty verdicts than males, in cases that involved rape compared to other types of crimes (i.e., robbery and homicide). Females found the defendant guilty in 78% of the rape cases; whereas, males only found the defendant guilty in 53% of the cases.

Belief in a Just World and Attitudes Toward Lesbians

One theory employed to explain victim blaming in rape cases is Lerner's (1965, 1970, 1971) theory of Belief in a Just World (BJW). According to this theory, individuals who believe that the world is a fair and just place think that adverse events (e.g., being raped) result from a person's actions, moral character, or lack thereof. That is, people get the positive or negative

consequences they deserve based on their own behaviors and lifestyle. Individuals with strong just world beliefs are more likely to derogate a rape victim and place more blame on her (Furnham, 2003; Furnham & Proctor, 1989; Lambert & Raichie, 2000; Sleath & Bull, 2012), view her in a more negative way (Murray, Spadafore, & McIntosh, 2005), and find the perpetrator less guilty than people with weak just world beliefs (Whatley & Riggio, 1993; Yamawaki, 2009).

Research has revealed male mock jurors who held high BJW evaluated the rape victim more negatively than female mock jurors (Kleinke & Meyer, 1990). Accordingly, male mock jurors assigned a significantly greater amount of blame to the rape victim than female mock jurors (Feldman-Summers & Lindner, 1976; Kanekar & Vaz, 1983). Similarly, female jurors with high BJW derogated the victim less than those who had low BJW beliefs. Perhaps women are more hesitant to blame the victim because they want to have support and be believed if they ever were victims of sexual assault. It makes sense that women view victimization of other women as more personally threatening, than victimization of men. Likely, this attitude is more prominent in rape cases because women are more fearful of being raped than men (Bohner, Weisbrod, Raymond, & Barzvi, 1993; Frieze, 1987).

This research has an important implication for the criminal justice system. Ironically, if people with high levels of BJW blame the victim, the outcome may work against obtaining a just outcome to a trial. That is, if a juror's decision in a criminal case is chosen because of BJW, without a preponderance of evidence against the defendant, the outcome could actually make the world a more unfair place.

People who have high levels of belief in a just world have more negative attitudes toward lesbians than toward heterosexuals (Cheng, 2004). Little research has focused on negative

attitudes toward lesbian victims of rape (e.g., see Ford, Liwag-McLamb, & Foley, 1998; Waterman, Dawson, & Bologna, 1989; White & Robinson Kurpius, 2002). If lesbians are viewed as bad and immoral and as violating traditional gender roles, people might attribute a greater amount of blame to a lesbian victim because they think she is more deserving of harm.

Attitudes Toward Women and Attitudes Toward Lesbians

Many studies have been conducted on people's attitudes towards women. Rather than examine general attitudes toward women, the focus here is specifically on attitudes toward women's roles in American society (see Spence & Helmreich, 1978). That is, to assess people's individual attitudes towards traditional positions and responsibilities as females (e.g., homemaker, child-bearer, etc.). For almost forty years, the most frequently employed measurement (e.g., Angelone, Mitchell, & Grossi, 2015; Aosved & Long, 2006; McHugh & Frieze, 1977; Spence & Hahn, 1997; Swim & Cohen, 1997) to assess these views in the literature has been the Attitudes Toward Women scale (ATW; Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Whatley (2008) examined the dimensionality of the ATW scale and found it measures integral attitudes toward women for both males and females.

In this study, the goal was to identify what people view as acceptable behaviors of and societal roles for women; and how those views effect their decisions in rape cases. There have been noted changes in gender-role attitudes since the mid-1960s (Helmreich, Spence & Gibson, 1982; Spence & Hahn, 1997; Whatley, 2008); however, the public continues to have sexist attitudes and negative gender stereotypes towards women (Chapleau, Oswald, & Russell, 2007; Talbot, Neill, & Ranking, 2010). It is important to understand these stances, particularly when examining the effect they have on fostering negative attitudes toward rape victims resulting in

victim blame during criminal processes. In a 2015 study (employing the ATW short scale; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1978), Angelone, Mitchell, and Grossi found people who endorsed more traditional female roles found female rape victims to be much more culpable and less credible than those who expressed more egalitarian beliefs.

A women's traditional role in society is most often viewed as being a homemaker, a nurturing child bearer, a spouse to a husband (Biernat & Wortman, 1991). People who adhere to more traditional roles for women are more likely to blame her when a rape occurs than people who are more liberal or egalitarian (Hink & Thomas, 1999; Muehlenhard & Hollabaugh, 1988; White & Kurpius, 2002). Talbot, Neill, and Ranking (2010) found males who scored lower on the ATW (i.e., held more traditional role attitudes) were more accepting of rape; whereas, female participants were not. Accordingly, male participants were also more likely to place blame on the victim than the perpetrator in a criminal case (White & Kurpius, 2002).

Relationships between the ATW scale and other personality assessments have been reviewed, including the Attitudes Toward Lesbian scale (ATL; Herek, 1988; e.g., Parrott & Gallagher, 2008; White & Kurpius, 2002). Characteristics that violate people's views of traditional gender roles, such as a women being a lesbian, can contribute to greater prejudice (Esses, Haddock, & Zanna, 1993; Wilkinson, 2006). People who endorse more conservative roles towards women (i.e., score low on the ATW) express greater levels of prejudice against lesbian women (Parrott & Gallagher, 2008), and enhance the belief lesbians are immoral (Wilkinson, 2006). That is, there are certain societal opinions about what gender roles and rights are appropriate for females compared to males (Herek, 1984, 1988).

Traditional gender roles can sometimes be perceived as having been violated. That is, they deviate from the way women are "naturally" intended to be (Kite & Deaux, 1987;

9

Wilkinson, 2006). For example, lesbian women may not be viewed as traditionally possessing feminine characters and are often perceived as more masculine (i.e., more like men; Herek, 2002; Kite & Whitley, 1998; Terry, 1999). This is confounded by the fact that many people believe that lesbians have made a conscious choice to deviate from cultural norms and standards (Wood & Bartkowski, 2004). Homosexuality has been considered by many people to be unnatural (Bamforth, 1997). Negative attitudes towards lesbians are likely to be a result of opinions about their violation of traditional gender roles in society as well as attitudes about homosexuality (Herek, 2002).

Attitudes About Homosexuals and Contact with Homosexuals

In general, most research on sexual orientation and rape focuses on victims who are gay men (Davies & Hudson, 2011; Davies, Rogers, & Bates, 2008; Gold, Marx, & Lexington, 2007; Mitchell, Hirschman, & Hall, 1999; Sleath & Bull 2010). Little research investigates the rape of lesbians and the research that does exists focuses on psychological issues of the victim after the crime had occurred (i.e., behavioral health issues and recovery; e.g., Gold, Dickstein, Marx, & Lexington, 2009; Roberts, 2001) rather than victim blaming. Kite and Whitley's (1996) meta-analysis of over 100 research articles about "homosexuals" revealed only 10% focused solely on lesbian women. The victim's sexual orientation (i.e., lesbian or heterosexual) will be one of the main areas of interest in the current study.

Both gender of the participant (or mock juror) and the sexual orientation of the victim (heterosexual or lesbian) can affect amount of victim blaming. Hostility toward homosexuals is predominantly a male trend (Lim, 2002). In a meta-analysis, Kite and Whitely (1996) revealed heterosexual males have more negative attitudes toward homosexuals than heterosexual females

10

do. More recent research continues to confirm the findings (e.g., see Davies, Rogers, & Whitelegg, 2009; Hinrichs & Rosenberg, 2002; Kite & Whitley, 1998; Marino, 2004; Whitely Jr., 2002). While heterosexual males have more negative views of homosexuals in general, their stance is weaker when applied to lesbian women than gay men (Hinrichs & Rosenberg, 2002; Keiller, 2010; Kite & Whitley, 1996). Herek (2002) asserts males express less negative attitudes about lesbians than gay men because lesbians do not challenge their traditional masculine roles in society as much.

Research over a twenty year span continues to reveal heterosexual women generally hold less negative attitudes towards gay men and lesbian women than heterosexual males (e.g., Hansen, 1982; Hinrichs & Rosenberg, 2002; Herek, 2002). However, interestingly, female heterosexuals express slightly more negativity towards lesbian women than gay men (Herek, 1988; Kyes & Tumbelaka, 1994; Louderback & Whitley, 1997).

Based on the previous findings, it makes sense when it comes to victim blaming in rape cases, males blame homosexuals (both gay men and lesbian women) more than females and assign more blame to homosexual victims compared to heterosexual victims (Davies, Roger, & Whitelegg, 2009). Men and women have more negative viewpoints toward homosexuals of their same sex. Perhaps same sex biases are a result of the participant identifying with (or the inability to identify with) the stimulus person involved in the case who is most like the participant.

Until 1973, the American Psychological Association categorized homosexuality in its *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* as a type of mental illness. Since the APA no longer labels same-sex sexual orientation as a form of psychopathology (Minton, 2002), negative attitudes towards homosexuals has decreased over the past 30 years, particularly beginning in the 2000s (Saad, 2007). Twenge, Carter and Campbell (2015) reported people's

tolerance toward homosexual people has also increased during the past three decades, particularly for individuals who have rejected traditional gender roles. However, a large amount of the U.S. population still view homosexuality as unnatural, immoral, and an unacceptable lifestyle (Gallup, 2014; Sherrill & Yung, 2000; Yang, 1997), including negative stigmatization of lesbians (Herek & McLemore, 2013), particularly those individuals who have had little or no personal contact or exposure to homosexual people (Herek, 1996). Research shows individuals who have personal interactions with homosexuals have more tolerant attitudes and display less prejudice (Herek & Capitanio, 1996; Lewis, Derlega, Clarke, & Kuang, 2006; Stephan & Stephan, 1985). They also have generally less negative attitudes towards lesbian women and gay men than those who do not have interactions (Cheng, 2004; Wills & Crawford, 2000).

Herek (1988, 1994) and Herek and Capitanio (1996) have found the Attitudes Toward Lesbian Scale (ATL) is consistently correlated with other characteristics of people, specifically whether an individual knows a gay or lesbian person. Knowing or being acquainted with someone who is homosexual, sometimes referred to as "contact exposure hypothesis," is the strongest predictor of an individual having less negative attitudes towards lesbians than any other demographic, including participant gender (Klamen, Grossman, & Kopacz, 1999; Smith, Axelton, & Saucier, 2009). Negative biases appear to diminish even with brief exposure to a homosexual person (Blair, 2002); however, the decrease is even greater when a person has experience with a larger number of gay people. Researchers have found participants with more contact with lesbians had more positive attitudes than those with a lesser amount of contact (Dasgupta & Rivera, 2008; Herek, 2009).

Not surprisingly, actually knowing someone who is gay or lesbian (a friend, sibling, co-worker, etc.) is a strong predictor of more tolerance and more accepting attitudes toward

homosexuals, especially if the experiences with that person (people) is positive (Hinrichs & Rosenberg, 2002). According to a Wall Street Journal Poll (2012), 65% of people stated they either know or work with someone who is a gay man or lesbian woman. Similarly, Gallup (2009) reported 58% of people stated they had co-workers, friends or relatives who are gay or lesbian. The more interaction and/or positive experiences people have with out-group members the more tolerant they become. People who know few homosexuals report more prejudice (Dasgupta & Rivera, 2009). According to a meta-analysis, having personal contact to homosexual individuals alleviate negative stigmatizations (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000) and contributes to lower rates of victim blaming based on attitudes about a victim's sexual orientation (Cotton-Huston & Waite, 2000).

Summary

Despite slight declines in rates of rapes during the past few decades, rape remains a serious problem for women (Lonsway & Archambault, 2012). Lesbians are particularly at risk (Duncan, 1990; Martin, Fisher, Warner, Krebs, & Lindquist, 2011; Rothman, Exner, & Baughman, 2011). Negative attitudes toward lesbians have decreased from 1997 through 2007 (Saad, 2007); however, stigmatization is still prevalent within U. S. culture (Herek, 2000; Herek & McLemore, 2013). Results from several studies indicate gender has a large impact on an individual's attitudes toward rape (e.g., Burt, 1980; Cowan, 2000; Grubb & Harrower, 2008; Reilly, Lott, Caldwell, & DeLuca, 1992). Males typically view the victim as more responsible and blame her more for the rape than females (e.g., Grubb & Harrower, 2008; Grubb & Harrower, 2009; Whatley, 2005). Conversely, several studies have shown females are more empathetic toward a victim of rape and blame the perpetrator more than males (e.g., Calhoun,

Selby, & Warring, 1976; Pozzulo, Dempsey, Maeder, & Allen, 2010; Wenger & Bornstein, 2006; Winer & Rinehart, 1986). Women also assign less blame to the victim than men (Brekke & Borgida, 1988; Gilmartin-Zena, 1983; Johnson, Jackson & Smith, 1989; Kleinke & Meyer, 1990).

Victim blaming is an important aspect of rape cases. One explanation for victim blaming in rape cases is an effort to make the perceiver feel safe (e.g., see Lerner, 1965; Mallios & Meisner, 2010). It has been argued that women realize they can be raped which increases their identifying with the victim, perhaps being more empathetic to the victim, which lessens amount of victim blaming (Ben-David & Schneider, 2005; Pozzulo, Dempsey, Maeder, & Allen, 2010).

Throughout the past four decades and beyond, research has indicated that personality traits can be reliable predictors of jurors' decisions in court cases (Clark, 2014; Couch & Sundre, 2001; Foley & Chamberlin, 1982; Herde, 2009; Herek, 1994; Mitchell & Byrne, 1973). Responses to questionnaires packets provide basic demographic information (e.g., gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, etc.), specific personality traits (e.g., levels of belief in a just world, attitudes toward lesbians, etc.), and other answers that attempt to evaluate attitudes about people and types of crimes. Online administration of these packets has become increasingly popular due to the explosion and availability of internet access for individuals, and because internet data collection is fast and cost efficient (Cook, Heath, & Thompson, 2000; Gosling, Vazine, Srivastava, & John, 2004). According to Internet Live Stats (2014), 86.75% of people in the U.S. have access to and use the internet. Traditional mock trials serve as valuable tools; however, online methods provide lawyers with fast and inexpensive ways to conduct powerful research that can help them win cases during real trials (Shofner-Meyer, 2011). The advances in technology have made it simpler for researchers to reach a larger variety of sample of people

that include those that represent jury eligible persons (Wiener, Krauss, & Lieberman, 2011).
The online questionnaire method was employed in this study.

Purpose of This Study

The purpose of this study was to assess the relationships between participants' attitudes,
beliefs, and experiences (ATW, BJW, ATL, CWH) and their individual assignments of blame of
a lesbian or heterosexual female rape victim or the alleged perpetrator; and whether or not they
found the alleged perpetrator guilty or not guilty for the rape in a mock juror scenario.

Hypotheses

Based on prior research, the following hypotheses were made:

$H1_a$: Female participants would be more likely to find the defendant guilty of rape than male
participants.

$H2_a$: Participants would blame the lesbian victim more often than the heterosexual victim and
more people would be likely to find the perpetrator not guilty if the victim was lesbian rather
than a heterosexual.

$H3_a$: Participants with high BJW would assign blame to the victim more often than to the
perpetrator.

$H4_a$: Participant's with high ATL would be positively correlated with low ATW scores.

$H5_a$: Participants who have had exposure/contact with homosexuals would have more positive
attitudes toward lesbians.

$H6_a$: Participants who have had limited or no exposure/contact with homosexuals would blame
the lesbian victim more often than the heterosexual victim.

CHAPTER 2

METHODS

This between-subjects study examined how three factors: gender of participant, sexual orientation of a female rape victim, and the amount of previous contact participants have had with homosexual people affected the outcome of the dependent variables: blaming the victim or the perpetrator more for the rape occurring and whether or not the defendant is guilty or not guilty of rape. Additional predictor variables were participant's responses to BJW, ATL, ATW measures.

Participants

Two hundred ten participants were recruited from a database sample gathered by a U.S. based online data collection firm (ODCF) that has a vast history of assisting with academic research. The panel firm database consisted of a random-stratified sample of community representative participants who met the general criterion to be selected as jurors in most states in the U.S. That is, they had to be between the ages of 18 and 75 (however the current researcher capped the age at 65), a U.S. Citizen, and have no felony convictions. Participants were blocked on gender and age and then were randomly assigned to one of two conditions (i.e., a scenario where rape victim is a heterosexual woman or a lesbian woman). The overall online response rate reported by the ODFC was about 9%. Several participants did not participate or complete the study because they refused to agree to the informed consent ($n=39$), or failed the qualifying criterion including were under the age of 18 ($n=18$), were not U.S. citizens ($n=15$), and/or had been convicted of a felony ($n=34$). Additionally, a total of 164 participants were ejected due to providing the incorrect "attention/fail" responses (e.g., Please respond "Mildly disagree to this statement.") embedded in two of the Likert questionnaires for quality control.

Based on the sample available in the database, participants ranged in age from 18 to 65. The mean age for participants was 40 years of age (with a range of 18 to 65). There were an equal number of male (*n*=105) and female (*n*=105) participants. Participant's ethnicity was reported as predominantly Caucasian (83.3%), with the remaining sample being self-identified as African American (8.6%), Hispanic/Latino (3.8%), Asian American (1.4%), or other (2.9%). The majority of participants were college graduates or had completed some college (62.4%); however, 25.2% had completed high school or less and 4.3% were currently enrolled in college or university. See Table 1 for complete demographics. The community sample database was more diverse (e.g., certainly in age and education level) than a convenience sample of college students (see Hosch, Culhane, Tubb, & Granillo, 2011), therefore generalizability was possibly increased (external validity).

Materials

Belief in Just World Scale

The Belief in Just World Scale (BJW; Rubin & Peplau, 1975) was designed to measure people's level of just world beliefs. The BJW consists of 20 items, measured on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (*Strongly disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly agree*). An example item from the BJW is "Crime doesn't pay." A higher score indicates greater belief in a just world. The scale has been shown to be reliable and valid with a high internal consistency, coefficient alpha = .81 (Rubin & Peplau, 1975). Chronbach's alpha for the current study = .67.

Attitudes Toward Women Scale - Short Version

The Attitudes Toward Women Scale - Short Version (AWS-SV; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1978) is a measure designed to assess people's attitudes toward women, including women's roles in society and individual rights. The AWS-SV has 15 items, measured on a 4-

17

point Likert scale ranging from 0 (*agree strongly*) to 3 (*disagree strongly*). Responses to items are summed to get a total score ranging from 0 to 45. An example item from the AWS-SV is "There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted." Higher score on the AWS-SV indicates more liberal, egalitarian beliefs rather than endorsement of traditional female roles (i.e., lower score; e.g., less liberal, egalitarian beliefs, more negative attitudes toward women if they violate societal standards). The AWS-SV is reliable with reported Chronbach alpha .79 (Angelone, Mitchell, & Grossi, 2015) to .89 (Agbayani-Siewart, 2004; Foss & Slaney, 1986) and a six week span test-retest reliability of .86 (Davis & Liddell, 2002). The validity of the scale has also been maintained. Spence and Hahn (1997) and Loo and Logan (1977) found that the 15-item AWS-SV is almost completely correlated with the original 55-item version (Spence & Helmreich, 1972; Spence & Hahn, 1997). The psychometric information shows support for continued use the ATW-SV scale in future studies (Whatley, 2008). Chronbach's alpha for the current study was acceptable = 0.84.

Attitudes Toward Lesbians Subscale – Short

The Attitudes toward Lesbians Subscale – Short (ATL-S; Herek, 1994, 1998) is a shortened measure of the longer ATL version, both of which were designed to measure the attitudes of heterosexual males and females towards lesbian women. The short form consists of *5* items, answered on a 5-point Likert scale with responses from 1 (*Strongly disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly agree*). An example item from the ATL-S is "Lesbians just can't fit into our society." A higher score indicates more negative or unfavorable attitudes toward lesbians. The short, subscale and the original longer subscale are highly correlated (ATL-S with ATL, *r* = .95; 1998). When completing the short form of the ATL scale, Herek reports reliability coefficient of *alpha* is typically greater than .85 (1994, 2002). Several research studies have supported the

psychometric properties of the ATL (Herek, 1994). Chronbach's alpha for the current study was acceptable = 0.86.

Contact with Homosexuals Measure

After participants have read one of the two scenarios, completed all other questionnaires, and made judgments about the case, they were asked about their personal contact with homosexuals (CWH; i.e., knowing someone who is homosexual; e.g., co-worker, family member, friend, etc.), if so how many (a short survey developed by the current author). The questions are roughly based on similar inquiries conducted in studies by Comstock (1989) and Herek (1994). Herek and Capitanio (1996) revealed that only when a person reported knowing two or more homosexuals had "consistently different [positive attitudes] from those with no contacts" at all (p. 6). The current study will examine participant's responses and will be measured as a discrete categorical variable from zero to x. See Appendix C for measure.

Rape Scenarios

The scenario employed describes a woman who was a victim of forced rape by a man. See Appendix D for scenario(s). Two short vignettes were developed for this study. They were both identical, with the exception of the victim's sexual orientation (i.e., heterosexual female or a lesbian female). The participants were given the following instructions prior to reading the vignettes: "Now please read this short vignette that describes, without any detailed graphics, a woman being forced raped by a man. Please read carefully and try to access the information provided to you as if you are a real juror in a jury trial. You will be asked a few questions after reading the scenario." In both versions of the scenario the victim is described as having a long term partner. The scenario was not written with the intent to maximize gender effects. It was composed by the investigator (not adopted from any particular other scenario, but by employing

19

the same general format used in mock juror research) in the most generic perceived way possible to avoid leading participants to develop bias based on the vignettes.

Procedure

The ODCF sent an invitation to potential participants from their database via email. If participants chose to participate in this study (based on a very brief description of the project provided by the ODCF), they were instructed to click on a link that led them directly to the online study. The ODCF employed three quotas during the data collection process: equal distribution of gender of participants, distribution of participants' age, and an equal number of randomly assigned scenario version (i.e., heterosexual or lesbian victim). In the online study, participants were asked qualifying questions: if they were 18 years of age older, if they were citizens of the U.S., and if they had ever been convicted of a felony. Those who did not meet the initial criterion were exited out of the survey. Those who did qualify read and digitally signed an informed consent form before proceeding (see Appendix A for full narrative), then filled out a demographics questionnaire. See Appendix B.

Consistent testing methods were employed for all participants (i.e., online) and measures throughout the entire study in an attempt to maximize internal validity. Participant compensation was delivered in a variety of forms based on what the individuals selected from a selection of options (i.e., participants in this sample set received "points" from the ODCF that may be accumulated and redeemed through the firm's website for products and services; e.g., airline miles. restaurant gift cards, etc.).

Participants were then instructed to respond to the BJW, ATW, ATL, and CWH measures. Participants were next asked to read a description of a criminal case in which a woman

was force to have sex with a man she just met at a co-worker's housewarming party. Each participant read one of two randomly assigned hypothetical rape case descriptions.

After reading a scenario, participants completed the dependent measures of blame of either the perpetrator or victim for the rape occurring (forced choice) and decided if the perpetrator was guilty or not guilty of committing rape (forced choice). The participants were next asked additional questions about being a victim of a violent crime and/or sexual assault and to respond to a manipulation check question for the rape scenario they were randomly assigned to. Lastly, participants were asked to respond to a manipulation check question about the scenario they were randomly assigned to. See Appendix E.

At the end of the study, the participants were informed about the purpose of the study, provided with contact information for rape advocacy groups (see Appendix F), and provided with contact information for the investigator in the event they have any additional questions or comments.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

All statistical analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS (V23.0). An alpha level of .05 was set to determine statistical significance. Assumptions for analyses were all conducted independently and met. Each variable was screened for missing data. Three of the eight predictor variables yielded 15% or less of missing values. See Table 2. No missing values were found for the two response variables (i.e., blame of victim of perpetrator and finding the defendant guilty or not guilty). See Table 3.

Examination of the distributions for the variables yielded three of the quantitative variables (ATL, Number of Gay Men Known, and Number of Lesbian Women Known) were positively skewed, and three of the quantitative variables (ATW, BJW, and How Well Participants Knew Homosexuals) were negatively skewed. No transformations were applied. Further examination found no outliers in the data that exceeded 1.5 box-lengths, except between two variables (Number of Gay Men Known, and Number of Lesbian Women Known), where seven data points exceeded 3 box-lengths. These seven data points were deleted. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic showed a significant departure from normality for all of the variables, except for the BJW scale; however, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic has a reputation for having weak power and is not a good test to use for normality. The Q-Q plots have been found to be superior. Examination of Q-Q plots for all variables did not indicate serious departures from normality, except for two variables: Number of Gay Men Known, and Number of Lesbian Women Known.

To meet the assumptions for the logistic regression analysis, five criteria had to be met prior to conducting the analyses: 1) Independence of cases/errors; 2) A linear relationship

22

between the continuous independent variables and the logit transformation of the dependent variable; 3) No multicollinearity; 4) No significant outliers or influential points and 5) Categories are mutually exclusive and exhaustive. No cases exceeded this threshold, and multicollinarity was not violated. No data were eliminated.

To meet the assumptions for the multiple regression analysis, six criteria had to be met prior to conducting the analyses: 1) Independence of errors (residuals); 2) A linear relationship between the predictor variables and the dependent variable; 3) Homoscedasticity of residuals; 4) No multicollinearity; 5) No significant outliers or influential points; and 6) Residuals are normally distributed. There was independence of residuals as assessed by a Durbin-Watson statistic of 1.974. Residuals plot display slightly non-linearity, which can possibly results in issues of normality and homoscedasticity. No issues of multicollinearity was found. One data point exhibit high leverage and was deleted. Based on Cook's Distance, no cases were influential. A P-P plot showed that the residuals were normally distributed.

To meet the assumptions for the Pearson product-moment correlation, four criteria had to be met prior to conducting the analyses: 1) Two variables should be measured at the interval or ratio level; 2) There needs to be a linear relationship between the two variables; 3) There should be no significant outliers; and 4) There needs to be bivariate normality. A scatter plot yielded that there was a linear relationship between the two variables (i.e., ATW and ATL). As previously noted, both variables were not normally distributed as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test (p < .05). However, Pearson's correlation has been shown to be robust to deviations from normality.

Analyses

For hypothesis one, a logistic regression was run to determine if female participants were more likely to find the defendant guilty of committing rape than male participants. The model indicated that gender did not predict whether the defendant was guilty of rape or not [χ^2 (1) = 0.309, p = .578]. The model explained 0.2% (Nagelkerke R^2) of the variance in guilty verdict and correctly classified 83.3% of cases. Wald statistics indicated that none of the predictor variables contributed to the overall model. See Table 3.

For hypothesis two, a logistic regression was run to assess if participants would blame the lesbian victim more frequently than the heterosexual victim. The model indicated that sexual orientation did not predict whether participants blamed the lesbian victim more often than the heterosexual victim [χ^2 (1) = 0.000, p = 1.000]. The model explained 00.0% (Nagelkerke R^2) of the variance in blame and correctly classified 86.7% of cases. Wald statistics indicated that none of the predictor variables contributed to the overall model. Additionally, a logistic regression was conducted to predict if the victim being a lesbian decreased the likelihood of the perpetrator being found guilty. The model indicated that sexual orientation did not predict whether the defendant was guilty of rape [$\chi2$ (1) = 0.309, p = 0.578]. The model explained 0.2% (Nagelkerke R^2) of the variance in guilt and correctly classified 83.3% of cases. Wald statistics indicated that none of the predictor variables contributed to the overall model. See Table 4.

A logistic regression was run on hypothesis three to examine whether participants with high BJW scores assigned more blame to the victim more often than to the perpetrator. That model indicated that scores on BJW did not predict whether participants blamed the lesbian victim more often than the heterosexual victim [$\chi2$ (1) = 0.023, p = 0.879]. The model explained 00.0% (Nagelkerke R^2) of the variance in blame and correctly classified 86.7% of cases. Wald

statistics indicated that none of the predictor variables contributed to the overall model. See Table 5.

For hypothesis four, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to determine if ATL scores were negatively correlated with ATW scores. ATL scores were moderately ATW scores, r (208) = -0.553, $p < .001$. The ATL explained 30% of the variability in variable in the ATW (R^2 = .306). The assumption of bivariate normality was violated for Pearson's r; however, this type of violation is not uncommon and is often given little weight. To emphasize this assertion, a Spearman Rank-Order correlation that does not include assumption of normality and the pattern of results did not differ greatly, ρ = -0.543. See Table 6.

A multiple regression was run for hypothesis five to predict if participants who had contact with homosexuals would have more positive attitudes toward lesbians. The model predicted less negative attitudes toward lesbians when participants had contact with more homosexuals than those participants with less or no contact, F (2, 180) = 5.875, p = .004, adjusted R^2 = .066. See Table 7.

For the final hypothesis, number six, a logistic regression model was run to determine if participants who had limited or no contact with homosexuals would blame the lesbian victim more often than the heterosexual victim. The model did not predict whether participants blamed the lesbian victim more often than the heterosexual victim [χ^2 (2) = 5.839, p = 0.054]. The model explained 8.3% (Nagelkerke R^2) of the variance in blame and correctly classified 89.3% of cases. Wald statistics indicated that one of the predictor variables contributed to the overall model. See Table 8.

Participants blamed the perpetrator more for the rape occurring (n = 182; 86.7%) than the victim, and found the found perpetrator guilty of committing rape (n = 176; 83.3%) than a not

guilty. There was an evident lack of variance in the two dependant variable responses. See Table

3. The responses for the manipulation check question (i.e., whether or not participants were able

to correctly identify the victim's sexual orientation in the scenario they were randomly assigned

to) were examined. One hundred sixty participants correctly identified the sexual orientation of

the victim in the scenario they were assigned; 50 (23.8%) participants failed to correctly identify

the victim's sexual orientation.

Data Analysis Plan

For the first hypothesis, a logistic regression was used to determine if the gender of

participant (nominal scale; 1 = male, 2 = female) predicted guilt of rape (categorical scale; 0 =

guilty, 1 = not guilty). For the second hypothesis, a logistic regression was used to determine if

the participants blaming the victim or the defendant (categorical scale; 0 = blame victim, 1 =

blame perpetrator) predicted the sexual orientation of the victim (categorical scale; 0 =

heterosexual victim, 1 = lesbian victim). Additionally, a logistic regression was used to

determine if the victim's sexual orientation (categorical scale; 0 = heterosexual victim, 1 =

lesbian victim) predicted conviction (categorical scale; 0 = guilty, 1 = not guilty). For the third

hypothesis, a logistic regression was used to determine if blame of victim or perpetrator

(categorical scale; 0 = blame victim, 1 = blame perpetrator) predicted participants BJW (ordinal

scale; 0 to 5, strongly disagree to strongly agree). For the fourth hypothesis, a Pearson product-

moment correlation was conducted to examine if negatives attitudes towards lesbians based on

responses to the ATL scale (interval; with higher score indicating more negative attitudes toward

lesbians) and based on scores on ATW (interval scale; with higher scores indicating more liberal,

egalitarian beliefs) are correlated. For the fifth hypothesis, a multiple regression was conducted

to examine if the number of experiences with homosexuals (continuous; 0 to x) predicted the responses on the ATL scale (ordinal scale; 0 to 5, strongly disagree to strongly agree). For the sixth hypothesis, a logistic regression was conducted to examine if no experience with homosexuals (continuous; 0 to x) predicted blaming of the victim for the rape occurring more than the perpetrator (categorical scale; 0 = blame victim, 1 = blame perpetrator).

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

This case involved a scenario with a woman who was raped by a male assailant. The objective was to determine whether the gender of jurors and the victim's sexual orientation would influence blame being attributed to the victim or the perpetrator and whether the participants (mock jurors) will find the defendant guilty or not guilty of rape. Making judgments and attributing blame to rape victims are multifaceted. Therefore, the investigation evaluated whether the jurors' gender and/or responses to any of the theories: beliefs in a just world, attitudes towards lesbians, attitudes toward women, and contact with homosexuals predicted blame attributed to the victim or defendant, and the perceived guilt or innocence of the alleged perpetrator of rape. This assessment may serve as a tool to discovering factors that should, or should not, be addressed during the voir dire process of a rape trial.

Contrary to previous research, and as hypothesized in this paper, gender of participant did not statistically predict that female participants would find the defendant guilty of rape more than male participants. Since the sample consisted of equal numbers of female and male participants, it is likely the language and description used in the scenario employed in this study was strongly biased against the perpetrator. In addition, no significant prediction was made between the sexual orientation of the victim and blaming the lesbian victim more than the heterosexual victim for a rape occurring. Sexual orientation of the victim also had no significant impact on mock jurors' finding the defendant guilty or not guilty of committing rape. This finding could have been affected by the fact that 23.8% ($n = 50$) of participants failed to properly identify the victim's sexual orientation in the random scenario they were assigned to

28

(i.e., heterosexual victim or lesbian victim; as calculated by responses from the "memory check" question that was asked at the end of the survey).

It has been reported that people with high BJW scores have more negative attitudes toward lesbian women than heterosexual women, and they are more likely to assign blame to a lesbian woman for a rape occurring than if a heterosexual woman is raped. Based on the previous findings, it was hypothesized that participants with high BJW scores would assign blame to the victim more often than to the perpetrator. There were no significant findings to support this hypothesis. This could be the result of people's attitudes toward lesbians steadily changing in recent years. Specifically, overall negative attitudes towards homosexual people as a whole have declined. (Newman, 2007; Twenge, Carter and Campbell, 2015).

As predicted, a relationship was found between ATL scores and ATW scores. Participants with higher ATL scores indicated more negative attitudes toward lesbians. Those with lower scores on ATW endorsed more traditional roles for women in society, less liberal beliefs, and more negative attitudes toward women, implying a violation of societal standards such as being a lesbian woman. People who endorse more conservative roles convey greater levels of prejudice against lesbian women (Parrott & Gallagher, 2008), and think that lesbian lifestyles are immoral (Wilkinson, 2006). Conversely, Twenge, Carter and Campbell (2015) reported an increase in tolerance toward homosexual people has increased particularly for individuals who have dismissed traditional, societal gender roles.

Also as predicted, and consistent with previous research, the more contact participants had with homosexuals the less negative attitudes they had toward lesbians (Dasgupta & Rivera, 2008; Herek, 2009). This is particularly supported when an individual knows or is acquaintances with more than only one homosexual person (Herek & Capitanio, 21996). Out-group contact

diminishes intrinsic counterstereotypic attitudes about individuals who others previously had no exposure to (Gawronski & Bodenhausen, 2006).

Lastly, the hypothesis that participants who had limited or no contact with homosexuals would blame the lesbian victim more often than the heterosexual victim was not statistically significant; however, there was a possible trend toward significance ($p = .059$). It is likely the results for this hypothesis would have been significant if a larger data sample had been collected. Consistent with previous findings, people who report knowing fewer homosexual people display more prejudice (Dasgupta & Rivera, 2009).

A series of additional analyses were conducted on participants' responses to the manipulation check question. Responses were examined to determine if participants correctly or incorrectly identified the sexual orientation of the victim made an impact on results for all other measures (independent and dependant variables). Correct or incorrect responses had no impact. The majority of participants identified the victim as heterosexual. It is probable that people who correctly identified the victim as heterosexual was not actually a result of the manipulation check. Despite the fact that there is increased acceptance of homosexuality in the population, homosexuals are still viewed by many as an out-group (i.e., minority). Some of the participants might have simply assumed the victim was heterosexual.

Limitations and Future Directions

There are several limitations of this study that need to be addressed. First, in this study, a manipulation check for ambiguousness of the lesbian victim or heterosexual victim scenarios should have been conducted prior to collecting data. It is likely the scenarios used in this study

were skewed toward the perpetrator being responsible for more blame and guilt than the victim, leading to limited variance in the analysis.

Second, although online data collection has become increasingly popular thanks to increased access to the World Wide Web, and the speed and cost at which data can be collected (Shofner-Meyer, 2011), there are still several areas of concern with this methodology. The ODCF reported an approximate response rate of 9%, which is relatively low, and could have a negative impact of the validity of data analyses (Greenlaw & Brown-Welty, 2009). Almost 20 years ago, Kittleson (1997) stated the expected response rate of between 25 and 30%, and many advances in technology and the availability to most persons has grown exponentially since then. Such a low response rate is surprising because it was distributed by a reputable ODCF and the participants received incentives (although it is possible the incentive was not considered very valuable to some participants), and was short in length of time to complete (approximately 15 minutes). One suggested way to increase online response rates is to complete a follow-up email after initial contact with potential participants (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2009; Kittleson, 1997). That was not performed in this study. Mixed views remain concerning online survey data collection, but some are optimistic. Early researchers examining online data collection revealed response representativeness is more important than response rate alone (Cook, Heath, & Thompson, 2000), and others state the response rate is actually higher than paper and pencil methods (O'Neill, 2004).

In addition to low response rates, online data collection creates an issue of lack of the control of the participant's environment when completing the online survey (e.g., distraction such as children or work, time of day completed, etc.). This could impact internal validity. One effort to attempt to add some form of control to this study was making it mandatory for all

participants to complete the study in one setting (i.e., they could not start and return later to complete).

In self-report survey data there is always the issue of response bias. That is, there is a chance the participant will lie or be dishonest in his/her responses to provide a response they deem as more socially acceptable (i.e., specifically social desirability bias), particularly if the subject matter can be considered "sensitive" such as the crime of rape. Conversely, online data collection might be viewed as non-threatening (Schmidt, 1997) since participants never experience any human contact and are almost completely anonymous, they might feel more comfortable answering questions more honestly (Locke & Gilbert, 1995). There is no way to assess the amount of response bias that occurred in this paper; however, isolation from a researcher might be a way to decrease response bias in future studies (Nederhof, 1985).

Using binary responses for both dependent variables in this study could have had a significant impact on the amount of variance that was not found. Especially on a topic that is sensitive, such as rape, it is probable participants found it impossible to definitively assign blame to either the perpetrator or the victim for the rape occurring. It might be more plausible to ask participants to assign a certain amount of blame, or contribution for the rape occurring, in future research (e.g., using a Likert type scale or percentages).

Although not realistic to conduct via online research, jury deliberation would add ecological validity to the study. That is, investigate a mock jury, not only mock jurors. It can be difficult for individual jurors to make informative decisions without the presence of other people's input and understanding the facts of the case (Levett, Danielsen, Kovera, & Cutler, 2005).

In an attempt to create a more representative sample, instead of retrieving responses by university convenience sampling of students, online data collection was collected from persons in every state in the country. The participants in this study were older than traditional college students ($M = 40.10$ years of age) and most had already completed some or graduated from college ($n = 148$; 70.5%). Only 9 participants (4.3%) were currently enrolled in college. The sample set was more diverse than a university convenience sample; however, it is not possible to state whether the difference in type of participant had an impact on the overall results of this study or not.

Conclusion

People's attitudes toward rape and responses to questions about rape victims in mock juror research are complex and can evoke strong emotions. Making decisions about such a sensitive subject can be very difficult and biases that emerge can affect the outcome of mock criminal case. Possible personality traits or implicit biases described in this paper (BJW, ATW, ATL) surprisingly did not seem to influence participants' decisions about the victim or perpetrator. Conversely, consistent with previous research, it appears that contact with homosexuals is a much stronger predictor of negative attitudes toward lesbian women and victim blaming than mock juror's attitudes or their gender (Klamen, Grossman, & Kopacz, 1999; Smith, Axelton, & Saucier, 2009).

Future investigations of prejudice toward homosexual people should include conjectures stated in the contact hypothesis (Allport, 1954; 1979). First introduced in by Allport in 1954, the contact hypothesis has been shown as an effective means to reduce negative stereotypes about and alleviating prejudice toward members of out-groups more than any other demographic

variable (Herek & Capitanio, 1996). The quality of contact with homosexuals (i.e., whether it was a good or bad experience) also has an impact on people's positive or negative attitudes toward homosexual individuals (Hinrichs & Rosenberg, 2002; Vonofakou, Hewstone, & Voci, 2007). Additionally, closer relationships have a larger effect on increased favorable beliefs. Researchers have reported that people who have "friends" that are gay or lesbian resulted in overall increased acceptance and more favorable attitudes of homosexuals in general (Herek, 1988; Herek & Capitanio, 1996).

It appears contact exposure expands beyond personal contact. Negative biases towards out-group people (such as lesbians) appear to decline when a person has experiences with counter stereotypes either through personal encounters or via representative forms such as mass media (Gawronski & Bodenhausen, 2006), including viewing and/or having knowledge of lesbian actresses, athletes, and so forth (Dasgupta & Asgari, 2004; Sinclair, Lowery, & Hardin, 2005).

Popular media has been ground-breaking in making people more aware of homosexuals by providing more "contact" with lesbian women and gay men through sitcoms, talk shows, musicians, etc. The media show gays as "normal." That is, homosexuals' behaviors and lifestyles are shown to be like or similar to heterosexuals (Newman, 2007). Homosexual sitcom characters (e.g., Pretty Little Liars' Emily, Empire's Jamal, Modern Family's Cam), actors and comedians (e.g., Portia De Rossi, Wanda Sykes, Jane Lynch, Matt Bomer), talk show hosts (e.g., Ellen DeGeneres), news reporters (e.g., Robin Roberts, Anderson Cooper), athletes (e.g., Ireen Wiist, Jason Collins), and musicians (e.g., Melissa Etheridge, Adam Lambert) have brought homosexuals into the minds and homes of many Americans. Media exposure allows accessibility to people who might not otherwise be likely to encounter homosexual men or women.

This form of exposure subsequently reduces negative and biased attitudes (Gawronski & Bodenhausen, 2006). Some people feel admiration for gay and lesbian celebrities. People's positive views of celebrities who are homosexual or those who play homosexual characters can generalize to real life experiences with homosexuals (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005). This "contact" and acceptance of homosexuals has contributed to more tolerant views of homosexuals and support for equality of civil rights (Brewer, 2003; Dasgupta & Rivera, 2008).

Further exploration is needed focusing on victim blaming in rape cases, specifically against lesbian women. All homosexuals can be victims of discrimination; however, more research is needed that focuses on lesbian women individually and not gay people as a whole in order to gain accurate attitudes about lesbians and their expected roles in society (Wilkinson, 2006) and how these attitudes could affect outcomes in rape cases involving a lesbian victim There are several factors that influence attitudes toward homosexuals; however, a person's gender does not seem to be as significant of a predictor as it previously was.

It is been shown that contact has statistical as well as practical significance. Future findings from mock juror research could have real life implications during jury trials. Despite the recent ruling legalizing same-sex marriage by the Supreme Court in all 50 States (Obergefell v. Hodges, 192 L. Ed. 2d 609 U.S. 2015), many people consider homosexuality as immoral (i.e., 42% in a recent poll found same sex relations as unacceptable; Gallup, 2014); therefore, people might view homosexual orientation as justification for bad things happening to lesbians. Retrieving information about potentials jurors' previous and current contact with homosexuals could serve as a better predictor of exposing implicit biases in lieu of asking other "attitude" (e.g., BJW) questions during the voir dire process. Thus, an attempt to provide a truer fair and just trial for a lesbian victim.

Table 1
Demographic Statistics

Variable	*n*	%	Mean	*SD*
Gender				0.50
Male	105	50		
Female	105	50		
Age			40.1	13.74
Ethnicity				0.85
Caucasian	175	83.3		
African American	18	8.6		
Hispanic/Latino	8	3.8		
Asian American	3	1.4		
Other	6	2.9		
Education				1.37
High School or Less	53	25.2		
Completed Some College	60	28.6		
Currently Enrolled in College	9	4.3		
Graduated College	71	33.8		
Graduate School/Post Graduate	17	8.1		

Table 2
Statistic Distribution

		Number of Lesbian	Number of Gay Men	Scenario Version	Gender	Level Of Exposure	ATL Score	ATW Score	BJW Score
N	Valid	182	182	210	210	184	210	210	210
	Missing	28	28	0	0	26	0	0	0
Mean		3.57	4.48	1.5	0.5	2.25	12.33	33.88	51.63
Median		2	2	1.5	0.5	2	11	35	51
SD		4.84	8.10	0.501	0.501	0.671	3.84	6.50	9.01

Table 3
Outcome Results

		Participants	Victim	Perpetrator
N	Valid	210	---	---
	Missing	0	---	---
	Blame		28	182
	Guilty		---	175
	Not Guilty		---	35

Table 4
Logistic Regression Results for H1$_a$

	B	SE	Wald	df	p	Odds ratio	95% CI for Odds Ratio	
							Lower	Upper
Female Participant	-.206	.371	.308	1	.579	.814	.393	1.685
Constant	-1.510	.253	35.478	1	.000	.221		

Table 5
Logistic Regressions Results for H2$_a$

	B	SE	Wald	df	p	Odds ratio	95% CI for Odds Ratio	
							Lower	Upper
Lesbian Victim	.206	.371	.308	1	.579	1.229	.593	2.545
Constant	-1.716	.272	39.937	1	.000	.180		

	B	SE	Wald	df	p	Odds ratio	95% CI for Odds Ratio	
							Lower	Upper
Lesbian Victim	.000	.406	.000	1	1.000	1.000	.451	2.216
Constant	1.872	.287	42.511	1	.000	6.500		

Table 6
Logistic Regressions Results for H3$_a$

	B	SE	Wald	df	p	Odds ratio	95% CI for Odds Ratio	
							Lower	Upper
High BJW Scores	.003	.023	.023	1	.879	1.003	.960	1.049
Constant	1.695	1.177	2.076	1	.000	7.196		

Table 7
Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Results for H4$_a$

	ATW Scale	ATL Scale
ATL Scale	-.553**	
ATW Scale		-.553**

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 8

Multiple Regression Results for H5$_a$

Variable	B	SEB	β	t	p	95% CI for Odds Ratio	
						Lower	Upper
Contact with Lesbians	-.306	.101	-.255	-3.032	.003	-.506	-.107
Contact with Gay Men	-.055	.063	-.074	-.880	.380	-.179	.069
Constant	13.028	.378		34.503	.000	12.283	13.774

Table 9

Logistic Regression Results for H6$_a$

	B	SE	Wald	df	p	Odds ratio	95% CI for Odds Ratio	
							Lower	Upper
No Contact Homosexuals	-1.81	0.086	4.443	1	0.035	0.835	0.706	.987
Lesbian Victim Blame	0.184	0.115	2.554	1	0.11	1.202	0.959	1.506
Constant	1.974	0.365	29.231	1	.000	7.196		

APPENDIX A
INFORMED CONSENT

University of North Texas Institutional Review Board

Informed Consent Notice

Before agreeing to participate in this research study, it is important that you read and understand

the following explanation of the purpose, benefits and risks of the study and how it will be

conducted.

Title of Study: Mock Jury Effects of Blame and Conviction in Criminal Rape Cases: Do
Attitudes, Beliefs, and Contact with Homosexuals Matter?
Student Investigator: Dawn Hurst-McCaleb, University of North Texas (UNT) Department of
Psychology
Supervising Investigator: Dr. Linda Marshall

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this study is to examine how jurors make individual
decisions in criminal cases. In this study you will be asked to serve as a "mock juror" in a "mock
trial." In other words, this is not a real trial and you are not a real juror; however, you should
perceive the events depicted as if you are a real juror in a real criminal case.
Study Procedures: First, you will be asked to fill out a few questionnaires. Then, you will read a
scenario about a sexual assault crime against an adult female. When you have finished reading
the case, you will be asked to answer some questions concerning the victim and alleged
defendant described in the scenario. The entire process should take approximately 15-20
minutes.
Foreseeable Risks: The potential risks involved in this study are possible discomfort responding
to attitudes toward homosexual people and reading a brief mock scenario that describes a man
forcibly raping a woman. The description of the assault is not graphic or explicit in details. If you
experience any discomfort at any time, you may exit the survey.
Benefits to the Subjects or Others: This study is not expected to be of any direct benefit to you,
but we hope to learn more about how mock juror trials are conducted.
Compensation for Participants: You will receive varying types of incentives from Qualtrics (as
you are accustomed to; i.e., random selection from the Qualtrics panel) as compensation for your
participation after you have completed the study. If a study is not completed, partial incentive
will not be given.
Procedures for Maintaining Confidentiality of Research Records: Your confidentiality and
anonymity will be protected by Qualtrics. The investigators will not have knowledge of your
name, or any other personal information, other than responses to the current study.   The
confidentiality of your individual information will be maintained in any publications or
presentations regarding this study. This is an online study recruited directly to you from
Qualtrics and Confidentiality will be maintained to the degree possible given the technology and
practices used by the online survey company. Your participation in this online survey involves
risks to confidentiality similar to a person's everyday use of the internet.
Questions about the Study: If you have any questions about the study, you may contact *Dawn
Hurst McCaleb* at DawnHurst@my.unt.edu or *Dr, Linda Marshall* at *Linda.Marshall@unt.edu.*

Review for the Protection of Participants: This research study has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB). The UNT IRB can be contacted at (940) 565-4643 with any questions regarding the rights of research subjects.

Research Participants' Rights:

Your participation in the survey confirms that you have read all of the above and that you agree to all of the following:

- *Dawn Hurst-McCaleb* has explained the study to you and you have had an opportunity to contact him/her with any questions about the study. You have been informed of the possible benefits and the potential risks of the study.
- You understand that you do not have to take part in this study, and your refusal to participate or your decision to withdraw will involve no penalty or loss of rights or benefits. The study personnel may choose to stop your participation at any time.
- You understand why the study is being conducted and how it will be performed.
- You understand your rights as a research participant and you voluntarily consent to participate in this study.
- You understand you may print a copy of this form for your records.

By checking the one of the two boxes below you agree or disagree to the following statement: I

have read and I understand the procedures described above. I am over 18 years of age and I agree

to participate in the procedure.

APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Age_____

2. Gender

    1) Male

    2) Female

3. Are you 18 years of age or older?

    1) Yes

    2) No

4. Are you a U.S. citizen?

    1) Yes

    2) No

5. Have you ever been convicted of a felony?

    1) Yes

    2) No

6. Ethnic background?

    1) Caucasian

    2) African American

    3) Hispanic/ Latino

    4) Asian American

    5) Other: _____

7. What is your highest level of education?

    1) High school or less

    2) Completed some college

    3) OR Currently enrolled in college

    4) Graduated college

    5) Graduate school/Post-graduate

APPENDIX C
CONTACT WITH HOMOSEXUALS MEASURE

1) Based on the best of your knowledge, please answer the following question: How many people do you know who are gay men or lesbian women (including acquaintances, co-workers, friends, family members, or other)?

       1) Yes

       2) No

       3) I don't know

2) If yes, how well would you say that you know any/or all of them?

__Not well at all   __Somewhat well   __Very well

3) If yes to question 1, how many of the people you know are…

       1) Lesbian women _____ (Please indicate a number here)

       2) Gay men   _____ (Please indicate a number here)

APPENDIX D
RAPE SCENARIO

Victim's Statement:

On July 10, 2015, I, Rachel, was attending a house warming party at a new co-worker's house, Pat. During the evening, I met Tom and we began chatting. We were mutual acquaintances with Pat, the party's host. I found that Tom and I had a lot in common. We both received bachelor degrees from Rochester Institute of Technology in New York, albeit years apart, and we both lived in Pennsylvania during our childhoods. We also both enjoy camping and hiking. During our conversation, I told Tom how happy I was in my four year long relationship with my girlfriend Laura/ boyfriend Adam and suggested that we should have dinner sometime with Tom and his girlfriend. Tom told me he wasn't currently dating anyone, but said he'd love to have dinner with us anyway if we didn't mind a "third wheel." The conversation flowed between us and as the evening progressed it seemed like we had formed a new friendship.

Toward the end of the party, Tom asked me if I would go outside with him to help carry in a surprise house warming gift for Pat. He explained it wasn't heavy -- it was just an awkward size for one person to pick up. I told Tom I would be happy to help. We had to walk some distance because Tom's vehicle was parked about 2 blocks away from the house. He said "I couldn't find a closer parking space because there were so many guests at the party." Tom pointed to a grey SUV. "That's my car."

When we got to the vehicle, Tom opened the back door of the SUV. He grabbed me and aggressively kissed me. I tried to push him away. I told Tom that I was, "flattered, but I wasn't interested in him in that way." I reminded Tom I am involved with my girlfriend Laura/ boyfriend Adam." Despite my protest, Tom persisted. I said "no" again and tried to get him to release his grip, but I was unable to. Tom pushed me into the backseat of the vehicle

and got on top of me. He continued to kiss me. He unzipped his pants, lifted up my skirt and forcibly raped me.

When Tom "finished" he just stood up, pulled his pants up, grabbed the gift box, and told me, "Thanks, that was great. I'll see you in a bit." He walked back towards the house. I didn't say anything. I couldn't believe what just happened to me. After Tom was out of sight, I slowly sat up and got out of the SUV, stumbled to my car, and drove home without telling anyone. I called in sick to work for the next five days and did not answer my phone for anybody.

Prosecution Statement: Rachel did not come forward or tell anyone about the rape because she works with Pat, and some of the other people that were there, and did not want to feel embarrassed or awkward at work. After much contemplation, Rachel felt like she should report the rape to the police. She made a formal complaint 10 days after she was raped.

Defendant's Testimony:

Rachel was flirting with me, Tom, since we first met at Pat's party. She agreed to leave the house with me, so she obviously felt comfortable. Rachel was totally into everything that happened between us and didn't refuse my advances and never said "no." I expected her to come back into the party and wondered where she had gone. I even asked Pat and some other guests about Rachel and was told nobody had seen her in a while. It was a mutual sexual encounter between two people looking to have some fun. That's it.

APPENDIX E

ADDITIONAL DEMOGRAPHICS AND MANIPULATION CHECK QUESTION

1) Have you ever been a victim of a violent crime?
    4) Yes
    5) No
    6) Not sure
    7) Do not wish to respond
2) Have you ever been a victim of any form of sexual assault or rape?
    3) Yes
    4) No
    5) Not sure
    6) Do not wish to respond

Based on the study you just participated in, please answer the following questions to the best of your memory:

3) The sexual orientation of the rape victim in this case identified herself as:
    1) Heterosexual
    2) Lesbian
    3) Bisexual
    4) I cannot remember

APPENDIX F

DEBRIEFING

National Rape, Abuse, and Incest National Network Information

If you or someone you know has ever been a victim of rape, abuse, or incest, or simply want to more know about the topics, please contact RAINN (National Rape, Abuse, and Incest National Network) 24 hours a day, 7 days a week for support. They can be reached via an Online Hotline at https://ohl.rainn.org/online/ or by phone at (800) 656-HOPE (4673). Their service is free, confidential, and secure.

If you have additional questions about the study you just participated in, please contact the principal investigator, Dawn Hurst-McCaleb at DawnHurst@my.unt.edu or (940)565-2671.

Thank you for your time and participation.

REFERENCES

Agbayani-Siewert, P. (2004). Assumptions of Asian American similarity: The case of Filipino
and Chinese American students. *Social Work,* 49(1): 39-55.

Ahola, A. S., Christianson, S. Å., & Hellström, Å. Å. (2009). Justice needs a blindfold: Effects of
gender and attractiveness on prison sentences and attributions of personal characteristics
in a judicial process. *Psychiatry,Psychology and Law*, 16(Suppl 1), S90-S100.
doi:10.1080/13218710802242011

Angelone, D. J., Mitchell, D. M., & Grossi, L. (2015). Men's perception of an acquaintance rape:
The role of relationship length, victim resistance, and gender role attitudes. *Journal of
Interpersonal Violence, 30*(13), 2278-2303.

Aosved, A. C., & Long, P. J. (2006). Co-occurrence of rape myth acceptance, sexism, racism,
homophobia, ageism, classism, and religious intolerance. *Sex Roles, 55,* 481-492. doi:
10.1007/s11199-006-9101-4

Bamforth, N. (1997). *Sexuality, morals, and justice: A theory of lesbian and gay rights.* New
York: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Bartle, E. E. (2000). Lesbians and hate crimes. *Journal of Poverty*, 4(4), 23–44.
doi:10.1300/J134v04n04_02

Bell, S. T., Kuriloff, P. J., & Lottes, I. (1994). Understanding attributions of blame in stranger
rape and date rape situations: An examination of gender, race, identification, and
students' social perception of rape victims. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24*(19),
1719-1734.

Ben-David, S., & Schneider, O. (2005). Rape perceptions, gender roles, and victim-perpetrator
acquaintance. *Sex Roles, 5,* 385-399.

Berrill, K. T. (1992). Anti-gay violence and victimization in the United States: An overview. In

    G. M. Herek, & K. T. Berrill (Eds.), *Hate Crimes: Confronting violence against lesbians*

    and gay men (pp. 19-45). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Berrill, K. T., & Herek, G. M. (1992). Primary and secondary victimization in anti-gay hate

    crimes: Official response and public policy. In G. M. Herek, & K. T. Berrill (Eds.), *Hate*

    Crimes: Confronting violence against lesbians and gay men (pp. 19-45). Newbury Park,

    CA: Sage Publications.

Best, J., & Demmin, H. (1982). Victim's provocativeness and victim's attractiveness as

    determinants of blame in rape. *Psychological Reports*, *51*(1), 255-258.

Blair, I. V. (2002). The malleability of autonomic stereotypes and prejudice. *Personality and*

    Social Psychology Review, 6, 242-261.

Bohner, G. Weisbrod, C. Raymond, P., & Barzvi, A. (1993). Salience of rape effects on self-

    esteem: The moderating role of gender and rape myth acceptance. *European Journal of*

    Social Psychology, 23, 561-579

Brekke, N. & Borgida, E. (1988). Expert psychological testimony in rape trials: A social

    cognitive analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55, 372_386.

Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social*

    Psychology, 38, 217-230.

Calhoun, L., Selby, J., & Warring, L. (1976). Social perception of the victim's causal role in

    rape: An exploratory examination of four factors. *Human Relations*, *29*(6), 517-526.

Cheng, Z. (2004). Correlates of homophobia in rehabilitation graduate students. *Dissertation*

    abstracts international: Section B: The science and engineering, 65(1-B), 424.

Clark, J. W. (2014). Is it possible to predict juror behavior? *Tennessee Journal of Law and Policy, 5*(2), Article 6.

Clausell, E., & Fiske, S. T. (2005). When do subgroup parts add up to the stereotypic whole? Mixed stereotype content for gay male subgroups explains overall ratings. Social Cognition, 23,161–181.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd Ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cook, C., Heath, F., & Thompson, R. L. (2000). A meta-analysis of response rates in web- or internet –based surveys. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 60,* (6), 821-836.

Christie, N. (1986). The ideal victim. In E. A. Fattah (Ed.), *From crime policy to victim policy: Reorienting the justice system,* (pp. 17-30). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Cotton, A., Farley, M., & Baron, R. (2002). Attitudes towards prostitution and acceptance of rape myths. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32,* 1790-1796.

Cotton-Huston, A., & Waite, B. (2000). Anti-homosexual attitudes in college students: Predictors and classroom interventions. *Journal of Homosexuality, 38*(3), 117-133.

Couch, J. V. & Sundre, D. L. (*2001*). Legal Attitudes Scale: A factor analytic study. *North American Journal of Psychology, 3*(2), 309-320

Cowan, G. (2000). Beliefs about the four causes of rape. *Sex Roles,* 42(9/10), 807-823.

Dasgupta, N., & Asgari, S. (2004). Seeing is believing: Exposure to counterstereotypic women leaders and its effect on automatic gender stereotyping. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 40,* 642-658.

Dasgupta, N., & Rivera, L. M. (2008). When social context matters: The influence of long-term

    contact and short-term exposure to admired outgroup members on implicit attitudes and

    behavioral intentions. *Social Cognition, 26*(1), 112-123.

Davies, M., & Hudson, J. (2011). Judgments toward male and transgendered victims in a

    depicted stranger rape. *Journal Of Homosexuality*, *58*(2), 237-247.

    doi:10.1080/00918369.2011.540179

Davies, M., Rogers, P., & Bates, J. (2008). Blame toward male rape victims in a hypothetical

    sexual assault as a function of victim sexuality and degree of resistance. *Journal of*

    Homosexuality, *55*(3), 533-544. doi:10.1080/00918360802345339

Davies, M., Rogers, P., & Whitelegg, L. (2009). Effects of victim gender, victim sexual

    orientation victim response and respondent gender on judgments of blame in hypothetical

    adolescent rape. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 14,* 331-338. doi:

    10.1348/978185408X386030

Davis, J. H., Holt, R. W., Spitzer, C. E., & Stasser, G. (1981). The effects of consensus

    requirements and multiple decision on mock juror verdict preferences. *Journal of*

    Experimental Social Psychology, 17, 1-15.

Davis, T. L., & Liddell, D. L. (2002). Getting inside the house: The effectiveness of a rape

    prevention program for college fraternity men. *Journal of College Student Development,*

    43(1), 35-50.

De La Fuente, L. De La Fuente, E. I., & García, J. (2003). Effects of pretrial juror bias, strength

    of evidence and deliberation process on juror decisions: New validity evidence of the

    Juror Bias Scale scores. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, *9*(2), 197-209.

    doi:10.1080/1068316031000116283

Diamond, S. S. (1990). Scientific jury selection: What social scientists know and do not know. *Judicature, 73,* 178-183.

Diamond, S., & Zeisel, H. (1974). A courtroom experiment on juror selection and decision-making. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *1*(1), 276-277. doi: 10.1177/014616727400100193

Dillman, D.A., Smyth, J, & Christian, L. (2009). Internet, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method. 3ʳᵈ Edition. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Duncan, D. F. (1990). Prevalence of sexual assault victimization among heterosexual and gay/lesbian university students. *Psychological Reports, 66,* 65-66.

Ellsworth, P. (1993). Some steps between attitudes and verdicts. In R. Hastie (Ed.), *Inside the juror: The psychology of jury decision making* (pp. 42-64). Cambridge: Cambridge University   Press.

Esses, V. M., Haddock, G., & Zanna, M. P. (1993). Values, stereotypes, and emotions as determinants of intergroup attitudes. In D. M. Mackie & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, cognition, and stereotyping: Interactive processes in intergroup perception communication* (pp. 137-166). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Estrich, S. (1987). *Real rape.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Fagan, J. (1993). Interactions among drugs, alcohol, and violence. *Health Affairs,* Winter, 65-79.

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.-G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*, *41*, 1149-1160.

Feldman-Summers, S., & Lindner, K. (1976). Perceptions of victims and defendants in criminal assault cases. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 3*(2), 135-150.

Felson, R. B., & Krohn, M. (1990). Motives for rape. Journal of research in Crime and

    Delinquency, 27(3), 222-242.

Fingerhut, A. W., & Peplau, L. A. (2006). The impact of social roles on stereotypes of gay men.

    Sex Roles, 55, 273–278.

Fischer, G. J. (1991). Cognitive predictors of not-guilty verdicts in a simulated acquaintance rape

    trial. *Psychological Reports*, *68*(3), 1199-1206.

Foley, L. A., Chamblin, M. H. (1982). The effect of race and personality in mock jurors'

    decision. *Journal of Psychology, 112*(1), 47-51.

Ford, T. M., Liwag-McLamb, M. G., & Foley, L. A. (1998). Perceptions of rape based on sex

    and sexual orientation of victim. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality*, *13*(2), 253-

    263.

Foss, C.J.*, & Slaney, R.B. (1986). Increasing nontraditional career choices in women: Relation

    of attitudes toward women and responses to a career intervention. *Journal of Vocational*

    Behavior, 28, 191-202.*

Freetly, A.J. & Kane, E.W. (1995). Men's and women's perceptions of non-consensual sexual

    intercourse. *Sex Roles*, *33*, 785-802.

Furnham, A. (2003). Belief in a just world: Research progress over the past decade. Personality

    and Individual Differences, 34, 795-817.

Furnham, A. & Procter, E. (1989). Belief in a just world: Review and critique of the individual

    difference research. British Journal of Social Psychology, 28, 365-384.

Gallup. (2009, May 29). Knowing someone gay/lesbian affects views of gay issues. Retrieved

    from http://www.gallup.com/poll/118931/knowing-someone-gay-lesbian-affects-views-

    gay-issues.aspx

Gallup. (2014, May 30). New record highs in moral acceptability. Retrieved from

    http://www.gallup.com/poll/170789/new-record-highs-moral-acceptability.aspx

Gawronski, B., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2006). Associative and propositional processes in

    evaluation: An integrative review of implicit and explicit attitude change. *Psychological*

    Bulletin, *132*(5), 692-731. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.132.5.692

Gilmartin-Zena, P. (1983). Attribution theory and rape victim responsibility. *Deviant Behaviour,*

    4, 357-374.

Gold, S. D., Dickstein, B. D., Marx, B. P., & Lexington, J. M. (2009). Psychological outcomes

    among lesbian sexual assault survivors: An examination of the roles of internalized

    homophobia and experiential avoidance. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *33*(1), 54-66.

    doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2008.01474.x

Gold, S. D., Marx, B. P., & Lexington, J. M. (2007). Gay male sexual assault survivors: The

    relations among internalized homophobia, experiential avoidance, and psychological

    symptom severity. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *45*(3), 549-562.

    doi:10.1016/j.brat.2006.05.006

Gosling, S. D., Vazire, S., Srivastava, S., & John, O. P. (2004). Should we trust web-based

    surveys? A comparative analysis of six preconceptions. *American Psychologist, 59*(2),

    93-104.

Greenlaw, C., & Brown-Welty, S. (2009). A comparison of web-based and paper-based survey

    methods. *Evaluation Review, 33*(5), 464-480.

Grubb, A., & Harrower, J. (2008). Attribution of blame in cases of rape: An analysis of

    participant gender, type of rape and perceived similarity to the victim. *Aggression and*

    Violent Behavior, *13*(5), 396-405.

Grubb, A., & Harrower, J. (2009). Understanding attribution of blame in cases of rape: An

    analysis of participant gender, type of rape and perceived similarity to the victim. *Journal*

    of Sexual Aggression, *15*(1), 63-81.

Grubb, A., & Turner, E. (2012). Attribution of blame in rape cases: A review of the impact of

    rape myth acceptance, gender role conformity and substance use on victim blaming.

    Aggression and Violent Behavior, *17*(5), 443-452. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2012.06.002

Hansen, G. L. (1982). Measuring prejudice against homosexuality (homosexism) among college

    students: A new scale. *Journal of Social Psychology, 117,* 233-236.

Herde, G. W. (2009, January 1). Take me to your leader: An examination of authoritarianism as

    an indicator of jury bias. *The Jury Expert: Bias, Voir Dire, & Jury Selection.* Retrieved

    from http://www.thejuryexpert.com/2009/01/take-me-to-your-leader-an-examination-of-

    authoritarianism-as-an-indicator-of-juror-bias/

Herek, G. M. (1984). Beyond homophobia: A social psychological perspective on attitudes

    toward lesbians and gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality, 10*(1/2), 1-15.

Herek, G. M. (1988). Heterosexuals' attitudes towards lesbians and gay men: Correlates and

    gender differences. *Journal of Sex Research, 25,* 451-477.

Herek, G. M. (1994). Assessing heterosexuals' attitudes towards lesbians and gay men: A review

    of empirical research with the ATLG scale. In B. Greene & G. M. Herek (Eds.), *Lesbians*

    and gay psychology: Theory, research, and clinical applications (pp. 206-228). Thousand

    Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Herek, G. M. (1998). The attitudes towards lesbians and gay men scale. In C. M. Davis & S. L.

    Davis (Eds.), *Handbook of sexuality-related measures* (pp. 392-394). Thousand Oaks,

    CA: Sage.

Herek, G. M. (2000). The psychology of sexual prejudice. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 9,* 19-22.

Herek, G. M. (2002). Gaps in public opinion about lesbians and gay men. *The Public Opinion Quarterly, 66*(1), 40-66.

Herek, G. M. (2009). Sexual stigma and sexual prejudice in the United States: A conceptualframework. In D. A. Hope (Ed.), *Contemporary perspectives on lesbian, gay, and bisexual identities: The 54th Nebraska symposium on motivation* (pp. 65-111). New York: Springer.

Herek, G. M., & Capitanio, J. P. (1996). "Some of my best friends": Intergroup contact, concealable stigma, and heterosexuals attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22,* 412-424.

Herek, G. M., & McLemore, K. A. (2013). Sexual prejudice. *Annual Review of Psychology, 64,* 309-333.

Hinrichs, D. W., & Rosenberg, P. J. (2002). Attitudes toward gay, lesbian, and bisexual persons among heterosexual liberal arts college students. *Journal of Homosexuality, 43*(1), 61-84.

Hosch, H. M., Culhane, S. E., Tubb, V. A., & Granillo, E. A. (2011). Town vs. gown: A direct comparison of community residents and student mock jurors. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 29,* 452-466. doi: 10.1002?bsl.970

Internet Live Stats. (2014). Internet users by country: 2014. Retrieved from http://www.internetlivestats.com/internet-users-by-country/

Janoff-Bulman, R., Timko, C. & Carli, L. L. (1985). Cognitive biases in blaming the victim. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 21,* 161-177.

Johnson, J. D., Jackson, L. A. & Smith, G. J. (1989). The role of ambiguity and gender in

    mediating the effects of salient conditions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,*

    15, 52-60.

Judson, S. S., Johnson, D. M., & Perez, A. U. (2013). Perceptions of adult sexual coercion as a

    function of victim gender. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 14*(4), 335-344. doi:

    10.1037/a0030448

Kanekar, S., Pinto, N. J., & Mazumdar, D. (1985). Causal and moral responsibility of victims or

    rape and robbery. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 15*(4), 622-637.

Kanekar, S., & Vaz, L. (1983). Determinants of perceived likelihood of rape and victim's fault.

    Journal of Social Psychology, 120, 147-148.

Kassin, S. M., Williams, L. N., & Saunders, C. L. (1990). Dirty tricks of cross-examination: The

    influence of conjectural evidence on the jury. *Lawn and Human Behavior, 14*(4), 373-

    384.

Keiller, S. W. (2010). Masculine norms as correlates of heterosexual men's attitudes toward gay

    men and lesbian women. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 11*(1), 38-52.

Kite, M. E., & Deaux, K. (1987). Gender belief systems: Homosexuality and the implicit

    inversion theory. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11,* 88-96.

Kite, M. E., & Whitley, B. E., Jr. (1996). Sex differences in attitudes toward homosexual

    persons, behavior, and civil rights: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology*

    22, 336-353.

Kite, M. E., & Whitley, B. E., Jr. (1998). Do heterosexual men and women differ in their

    attitudes toward homosexuality?: A conceptual and methodological analysis. *Sex Roles,*

    30, 144-170.

Kittleson, M. (1997). Determining effective follow-up of email surveys. *American Journal of Health Behavior, 21*(3), 193-196.

Kleinke, C. L., & Meyer, C. (1990). Evaluation of rape victim by men and women with high and low belief in a just world. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 14,* 343-353.

Krulewitz, J. E. (1981). Sex differences in evaluations of female and male victims' responses to assault. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 11,* 460-474.

LaFree, G. D. (1989. *Rape and criminal justice: The social construction of sexual assault.* Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Lamb, S. (1996). *The trouble with blame: Victims, perpetrators, and responsibility.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lambert, A. J., & Raichle, K. (2000). The role of political ideology in mediating judgments of blame in rape victims and their assailants: A test of the just world, personal responsibility, and legitimization hypotheses. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26(7), 853-863.

Lerner, M. J. (1965). Evaluation of performance as a function of performer's reward and attractiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1*(4), 355-360.

Lerner, M. J. (1970). The desire for justice and reactions to victims. In J. Macaulay, & L. Berkowitz (Eds.), *Altruism and helping behavior* (pp. 205 – 229). New York: Academic Press.

Lerner, M. J. (1971). Justice, guilt, and veridical perception. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 20,* 127-135.

Lerner, M. J., & Miller, D. T. (1978). Just world research and the attribution process: Looking back and ahead. Psychological Bulletin, 85(5), 1030-1051.

Levett, L. M., Danielsen, E. M., Kovera, M. B., & Cutler, B. L. (2005). The psychology of jury and juror decision making. In N. Brewer & K. D. Williams (Eds.), *Psychology and law: An empirical perspective* (pp. 365-406). New York: Guilford Press.

Lewis, R. J., Derlega, V. J., Clarke, E. G., & Kuang, J. C. (2006). Stigma consciousness, socialconstraints, and lesbian well-being. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53,* 48-56.

Lieberman, J. D., & Sales, B. D. (2007). *Scientific Jury Selection.* American Psychological Association: Washington, D.C.

Locke, S. D., & Gilbert, B. O. (1995). Method of psychological assessment, self-disclosure, and experiential differences: A study of computer, questionnaire, and interview assessment formats. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 10,* 255-263.

Lonsway, K. A., & Archambault, J. (2012). The "justice gap" for sexual assault cases: Future directions for research and reform. *Violence Against Women, 18,* 145-168. doi: 10.1177/1077801212440017

Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1994). Rape myths: In review. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 18,* 133-164.

Louderback, L. A. , & Whitley, B. E. (1997). Perceived erotic value of homosexuality and sex-role attitudes as mediators of sex differences in heterosexual college students' attitudes toward lesbian and gay men. *Journal of Sex Research, 34*(2), 175-182.

Mallios, C., & Meisner, T. (2010). Educating juries in sexual assault cases. *Strategies: The Prosecutors' Newsletter on Violence Against Women, 2,* 1-7.

Marino, R. L. (2004). Manifestations of homophobia: Attitudes toward social and cultural aspects of homosexuality among male and female college students. *Epistimi, 1,* 34-38.

Martin, S. L., Fisher, B. S., Warner, T. D., Krebs, C. P., & Lindquist, C. H. (2011). Women's

    sexual orientations and their experiences of sexual assault before and during university.

    Women's Health Issues, 21(3), 199-205. doi: 10.1016/j.whi.2010.12.002

Martin, A., Kelly, A., Turquet, L., Ross, S. (2009). Hate crimes: The rise of 'corrective' rape in

    South Africa. *ActionAid. Retrieved from* http://www.actionaid.org.uk/news-and-

    views/hate-crimes-the-rise-of-corrective-rape-in-south-africa

Mills, C. J., & Bohannon, W. E. (1980). Juror characteristics: To what extent are they related to

    jury verdicts? *Judicature, 64,* 23-31.

Minton, H. L. (2002). *Departing from deviance: A history of homosexual rights and emancipator*

    sciences in America. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mitchell, H., & Byrne, D. (1973). The defendant's dilemma: Effects of jurors' attitudes and

    authoritarianism on judicial decisions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,

    25(1), 123-129.

Mitchell, D., Hirschman, R., & Hall, G. (1999). Attributions of victim responsibility, pleasure,

    and trauma in male rape. *Journal Of Sex Research*, *36*(4), 369-373.

    doi:10.1080/00224499909552009

Muehlenhard, C. L., & Hollabaugh, L. C. (1988). Do women sometimes say no when they mean

    yes? The prevalence and correlates of women's token resistance to sex. *Journal of*

    Personality and Social Psychology, 54, 5, 872-879.

Murray, J. D., Spadafore, J., & McIntosh, W. D. (2005). Belief in a just world and social

    perception: Evidence for automatic activation. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 145*(1),

    35-47.

Newman, B. S. (2007). College students' attitudes about lesbians. *Journal of Homosexuality, 52*(3-4), 249-265.

Obergefell v. Hodges, 192 L. Ed. 2d 609 (U.S. 2015),

Olsen-Fulero, L., & Fulero, S. M. (1997). Commonsense rape judgments: An empathy-complexity theory of rape juror story making. *Psychology, Public Policy, and FA Law, 3*(2/3), 402-427.

O'Neill, B. (2004). Collection research data online: Implications for extension professionals. *Journal of Extensions, 42*(3), 1.

Parrott, D. J., & Gallagher, K. E. (2008). What accounts for heterosexual women's negative emotional responses to lesbians? Examination of traditional gender role beliefs and sexual prejudice. *Sex Roles, 59*(3/4)*,* 229-239.

Penrod, S. D., Kovera, M. B., & Groscup, J. (2011). Jury research methods. In Rosenfeld, B. & Penrod, S. D. (Eds.), *Research methods in forensic psychology.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2000). Does intergroup contact reduce prejudice: Recent met-analytic findings. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing Prejudice and Discrimination* (pp. 93-114). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pozzulo, J. D., Dempsey, J., Maeder, E., & Allen, L. (2010). The effects of victim gender, defendant gender, and defendant age on juror decision making. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *37*(1), 47-63.

Pugh, M. D. (1983). Contributory fault and rape convictions: Loglinear models for blaming the victim. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 46,* 233-242.

Quas, J. A., Bottoms, B. L., Haegerich, T. M., & Nysse-Carris, K. L. (1993). Effects of victim, defendant, and juror gender on decisions in child sexual assault cases. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32*(10), 1993-2021.

Reilly, M. E., Lott, B., Caldwell, D., & DeLuca, L. (1992). Tolerance for sexual harassment related to self-reported sexual victimization. *Gender & Society, 6,* 122-138.

Roberts, S. (2001). Lesbian health research: A review and recommendations for future research. *Health Care for Women International*, *22*(6), 537-552. doi:10.1080/07399330127194

Roberts, P., & Zuckerman, A. (2004). *Criminal evidence.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ronner, A. D. (2005). Homophobia and the law. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Rothman, E. F., Exner, D., & Baughman, A. L. (2011). The prevalence of sexual assault against people who identify as gay, lesbian, or bisexual in the States: A systematic review. *Trauma Violence Abuse, 12*, 55-66. doi: 10.1177/1524838010390707

Rubin, Z., & Peplau, L. A. (1975). Who believes in a just world? *Journal of Social Issues, 31*(3), 65-89.

Ryan, W. (1970). *Blaming the Victim.* New York: Vintage Books.

Saad, L. (2007). *Tolerance for gay rights at high ebb*. Gallup Poll News Service: Retrieved March 2, 2013 from http://www.theinterface.org/media/pdf/Gallup052907.pdf

Selby, J. W., Calhoun, L. G., & Brock, T. A. (1977). Sex differences in the social perception of rape victims. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 3,* 412-415.

Schmidt, W. (1997). World-Wide Web survey research: Benefits, potential problems and solutions. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers, 29,* 274-279.

Schutte, J. W., & Hosch, H. M. (1997). Gender differences in sexual assault verdicts: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Behavior and Personality, 12*(3), 759-772.

Selby, J. W., Calhoun, L. G., & Brock, T. A. (1977). Sex differences in the social perception of rape victims. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 3,* 412-415.

Seltzer, R. (2006). Does scientific jury selection work? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36, 10, 2417-2435.*

Seymour, A., Gaboury, M., & Edmunds, C. (2002). Dynamics of the criminal justice system. In National Victim Assistance Academy Textbook. Washington,

DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office for Victims of Crime. Retrieved October 19, 2013, from https://www.ncjrs.gov/App/Publications/abstract.aspx?ID=197108

Shofner-Meyer, S. (2011). Is the time right for online jury research? *The Jury Expert, 23*(2), 32 34. Retrieved from

http://www.thejuryexpert.com/wpcontent/uploads/TJEVol23Num2_Mar2011.pdf

Sinclair, H. C. & Bourne, L. E. (1998). Cycle of blame or just world: Effects of legal verdict on gender patterns in rape myth acceptance and victim empathy. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22,* 575-588.

Sinclair, S., Lowery, B. S., Hardin, C. D., & Colangelo, A. (2005). Social Tuning of Automatic Racial Attitudes: The Role of Affiliative Motivation. *Journal of Personality And Social Psychology*, *89*(4), 583-592. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.89.4.583

Sleath, E., & Bull, R. (2010). Male rape victim and perpetrator blaming. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *25*(6), 969-988. doi:10.1177/0886260509340534

Sleath, E., & Bull, R. (2012). Comparing rape victim and perpetrator blaming in a police officer sample: Differences between police officers with and without special training. *CriminalJustice and Behavior*, *39*(5), 646-665. doi:10.1177/0093854811434696

Smith, S. J.; Axelton, A. M.; Saucier, D. A. (2009). "The effects of contact on sexual prejudice: A meta-analysis". *Sex Roles, 61*(3-4): 178–191. doi:10.1007/s11199-009-9627-3.

Smith, L. L., & Bull, R. (2012). Identifying and measuring juror pre-trial bias for forensic evidence: Development and validation of the Forensic Evidence Evaluation Bias Scale. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, *18*(9), 797-815.

Spence, J. T., & Hahn, E. D. (1997). The attitudes toward women scale and attitude change in college students. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21,* 17.34.

Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1972). Who likes competent women? Competence, sex-role congruence of interest, and subjects' attitudes toward women as determinants of interpersonal attraction. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 2-3,* 197-213.

Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). *Mascauliinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and anecdotes.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Sperry, K., & Siegel, J. T. (2013). Victim responsibility, credibility, and verdict in a simulated rape case: Application of Weiner's attribution model. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, *18*(1), 16-29.

Strier, F. (1999). Whither trial consulting? Issues and projections *Law and Human Behavior, 23,* 93-115.

Swim, J. K., & Cohen, L. L. (1997). Overt, covert, and subtle sexism: A comparison of attitudes toward women and modern sexism scales. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*(1), 103-118. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00103.x

Terry, J. (1999). *An American obsession: Science, medicine, and homosexuality in modern society.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Thompson, W. C., Cowan, C. L. , Ellsworth, P. C., & Harrington, J. C. (1984). Death penalty

      attitudes and conviction proneness: The translation of attitudes into verdicts. *Lawn and*

      Human Behavior, 8, 95-113. doi: 10.1007:BF01044353

Tropp, L. R., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2005). Differential relationships between intergroup contact

      and affective and cognitive dimensions of prejudie. *Personality and Social Psychology*

      Bulletin, 31, 1145-1158.

Twenge, J. M., Carter, N. T., & Campbell, K. (2015). Time period, generational, and age

      differences in tolerance for controversial beliefs and lifestyles in the United States, 1972-

      2012. *Social Forces, 94*(1), 379-399. doi: 10.1093/sf/sov050

Vonofakou, C., Hewstone, M., & Voci, A. (2007). Contact with outgroup friends as a predictor

      of meta-attitudinal strength and accessibility of attitudes towards gay men. *Journal of*

      Personality and Social Psychology, 92, 804–820.

Wall Street Journal/NBC. (2012, Dec 6-9). Journal Survey. Retrieved from

      http://online.wsj.com/public/resources/documents/DECEMBERNBCWSJ12122012.pdf

Waterman, C. K., Dawson, L. J., & Bologna, M. J. (1989). Sexual coercion in gay male and

      lesbian relationships: Predictors and implications for support services. *Journal of Sex*

      Research, *26*(1), 118-124.

Weiss, K. G. (2010). Too ashamed to report: Deconstructing the shame of sexual victimization.

      Feminist Criminology, 5(3), 286-310.

Wenger, A. A., & Bornstein, B. H. (2006). The effects of victim's substance use and relationship

      closeness on mock jurors' judgments in and acquaintance rape case. *Sex Roles, 7,* 547-

      555.

Whatley, M. A. (1996). Victim characteristics influencing attributions of responsibility to rape victims: A metaanalysis. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour, 1*, 81-95.

Whatley, M. A. (2008). The dimensionality of the 15 item attitudes toward women scale. *Race, Gender, and Class, 15*(1-2), 265-273.

Whatley, M. A. (2005). The effect of participant sex, victim dress, and traditional attitudes on causal judgments for marital rape victims. *Journal of Family Violence, 20,* (3), 191-200.

Whatley, M. A., & Riggio, R. E. (1993). Gender differences in attributions of blame for male rape victims. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 8,* 202-511. *doi:10.1177/088626093008004005*

White, B. H., & Robinson Kurpius, S. E. (2002). Effects of victim sex and sexual orientation on perceptions of rape. *Sex Roles*, *46*(5/6), 191-200.

Whitely Jr., B. (2002). Gender role variable and attitudes toward homosexuality. *Sex Roles, 45,* 691-715.

Wiener, R. L., Krauss, D. A., & Lieberman, J. D. (2011). Mock jury research: Where do we go from here? *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 29,* 467-479.

Wilkinson, W. W. (2006). Exploring heterosexual women's anti-lesbian attitudes. *Journal of Homosexuality, 51*(2), 139-155.

Williams, L. S., (1984). The classic rape: When do victims report? *Social Problems, 31*(4), 459-467.

Winer, R. L., & Rinehart, N. (1986). Psychological causality in attribution of responsibility for rape. *Sex Roles, 14,* 369-382.

Wood, P., & Bartkowski, J. (2004). Attribution style and public policy attitudes toward gay rights. *Social Science Quarterly, 85,* 19-37.

Yamawaki, N. (2009). The role of rape myth acceptance and belief in just world on victim blame

    attribution: A Study in Japan. *Psychologia, 52*(3), 163-174.

Yang, A. (1997). Trends: Attitudes toward homosexuality. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 61,* 477-

    507.