THE RAPE PARADOX:

THE EFFECT OF ANTI-SEXUAL ASSAULT POLICIES ON GENDER AND SEXUAL ASSAULT ATTITUDES, DONATIONS TO SEXUAL ASSAULT CAMPAIGNS, AND POLICY COMPLIANCE

A Dissertation

by

KIRSTIE MARIE BOYETT

Submitted to Graduate and Professional School of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Chair of Committee,	Jane Sell
Committee Members,	Holly Foster
	Mary Campbell
	Tasha Dubriwny
Head of Department,	Patrick Goldsmith

August 2021

Major Subject: Sociology

ABSTRACT

Guided by feminist criminology, gender, and social psychological theories of status, I tested whether policies aimed at reducing sexual violence paradoxically generate greater resistance to anti-sexual assault policies. Anti-sexual assault policy trainings are potentially undermined by the pervasiveness of traditional gender beliefs that grant males more sexual power than females and underlie sexually violent behavior. I predicted that the tendency for anti-sexual assault policies to utilize gendered language, including sexual assault language, reinforces traditional gender beliefs by making gender differences more salient. Because heterosexual men have higher status, I hypothesized their willingness to comply with anti-sexual assault policies that emphasize the disruption of traditional gender norms, i.e., threaten male privilege, would be low. I predicted that participants would be more likely to endorse and comply with gender-neutral policy language.

To test this, I conducted an online experiment where self-identified heterosexual male participants were randomly assigned to different experimental conditions that varied based on the policy framing. Participants read what they believed to be a university's student handbook policy and then engaged in a series of tasks that assessed the effect of anti-sexual assault policy language on gender and sexual assault attitudes. Immediately following the policy statement intervention, I tested a behavioral measure that requested donations to a campaign that supports sexual assault or consensual sex awareness and a behavioral intention measure that tested compliance to the policy statement. Following this, I measured explicit gender beliefs, ambivalent and hostile sexism, rape myth acceptance, and propensity to commit sexual assault.

Results show that, contradicting the hypotheses, gender-neutral language had no effect(s), whereas emphasizing sexual assault language had a significant effect on donations to

organizations and compliance to policies. The differences in policy compliance were spurred by policy language; compliance was higher when the policy used traditional sexual assault language. Larger donations to charitable organizations resulted from policies emphasizing the prevention of sexual assault.

DEDICATION

For my littles, Kaylen and Dylan.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to gratefully acknowledge those who have offered a tremendous amount of support over my Ph.D. experience. First, I would like to thank my advisor and dissertation chair, Dr. Jane Sell, aka “Jane of all Trades.” I thank Dr. Sell for her unwavering dedication, patience, and direction. I would have been lost without her. Special thanks to my committee members, Dr. Holly Foster, Dr. Mary Campbell, and Dr. Tasha Dubrwiny, for the guidance and encouragement they have provided me throughout this research and other endeavors. I would also like to thank the sociology faculty, Dr. Heili Pals, Dr. Sarah Gatson, and Dr. Harland Prechel, for continuously checking in on me and offering me valuable academic advice.

I would also like to acknowledge others who tirelessly helped me with my dissertation and research efforts. Thank you to my undergraduate research assistants, Morgan, Amanda, Alexis, and David. Thank you so very much for your dedication to this research. Special thanks to Katie, Cody, and Mario for being a sounding board and providing countless hours dedicated to helping me improve my experimental design. I also thank Katie, Melissa, and Kimber for helping me get through preliminary exams. Importantly, I thank the members of the KLAMS and Social Psychology working groups in the Department of Sociology for the many times you have made me feel comfortable enough to exchange ideas and for all the constructive feedback.

I express my utmost gratitude to my graduate student friends who made this journey possible. There are too many to name but know that I cherish you all for the positive thoughts, words of encouragement, and energy you always directed my way. Thanks for the memories! Special thanks to Nathan for always encouraging me to keep going and for just being an overall amazing support system. Thank you to my best friend, Kasey, for just being you. I had much support during my Ph.D. process, but you are the person who got me through life.

Most of all, I thank my children, Kaylen and Dylan, for their unconditional love. Thank you for always supporting your mother during this process. Thank you for all the times you were willing to go to class with me, told your friends I would be “Dr. Mommy,” and served as my mock audience for presentations. You allowed me to pursue my dreams, and I am looking forward to watching you both seek yours. I love you dearly, my littles.

CONTRIBUTORS AND FUNDING SOURCES

Contributors

This work was supervised by a dissertation committee consisting of Dr. Jane Sell [advisor], Dr. Holly Foster, and Dr. Mary Campbell of the Department of Sociology and Dr. Tasha Dubriwny of the Department of Communication. Work conducted for the dissertation was completed by the student independently.

Funding Sources

Graduate study was supported, in part, by the Howard B. Kaplan Memorial Assistantship and various assistantships through the Department of Sociology at Texas A&M University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Page

1. INTRODUCTION

There is little consensus on the best method for reducing sexual assault. Major institutions -- the government, criminal justice system, medical system, academia, etc. -- vary in their approaches to understanding and combating sexual assault and how to treat survivors and perpetrators of sexual assault. The variations in the definition of sexual assault and framing of "consent" produce a bias in reporting and prosecution and confuse how to treat sexual assault at the interactional level. Despite societal condemnation and criminalization of sexual assault, contradictory cultural narratives, such as rape myths, normalize and neutralize sexual assault on the interactional level. This process is what I refer to as the *rape paradox*, or the overarching societal intolerance of rape, coupled with the trivialization of rape, rape victims, and lack of prosecution of rapists within a male-dominant society.

This project focuses on a particular component of the rape paradox: resistance to anti-sexual assault policies. While a heterosexual male may disapprove of rape, not see himself as "someone who would rape," or not associate with someone he would believe to be a rapist (Edwards, Bradshaw, and Hinsz 2014; Tinkler, Becker, and Clayton 2018), he may also disapprove of anti-sexual assault policies that threaten sexual scripts that give him authority in sexual practices. Because heteronormative men and women adhere to different sexual scripts -- such as men being sexually aggressive and women being sexually passive -- policies that aim to eliminate sexually aggressive behavior target male behavior more than female (Tinkler, Li, and Mollborn 2007; Tinkler 2011; Tinkler 2012) and may generate a "boomerang effect" among males (Malamuth, Huppin, and Linz 2018; Spikes and Sternadori 2018). These policies may also

produce resistance from some females because the policies treat females as passive sexual objects (vs. agents) and potential victims (Tinkler 2012).

I propose that the gendered framing of sexual assault language utilized in anti-sexual assault policies may activate negative gender stereotypes and threaten the status position of males without offering an intervention for intimate interaction. Guided by the results Justine Tinkler and colleagues (2007; 2008; 2012) found regarding male resistance to sexual harassment policies, I predict that, despite the majority of males' disapproval of rape (Tinkler 2012), they may be resistant to formal policies that attempt to reduce rape by targeting traditional male gender beliefs and courting practices. Similar to sexual harassment policy training in the workplace, I predict that anti-sexual assault policies reinforce traditional gender beliefs, not reduce them (Tinkler, Gremillion, and Arthurs 2015). To test this, I use an experimental design to compare reactions to a university sexual misconduct policy that emphasizes gender and/or sexual assault language or does not.

I predict that reframing the language utilized in anti-sexual assault policies to be gender-neutral can yield a successful counterstrategy to resistance by decreasing explicit negative attitudes about gender and rape myths, increasing the likelihood to comply with the policy, and decreasing the likeliness to commit a sexual assault. Findings from the study are important for understanding the most effective way to present anti-sexual assault messages. Interrupting and changing underlying cultural beliefs regarding gender and gender violence has important implications for legal compliance and reducing sexual violence.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. Defining Sexual Assault

The word rape derives from the Latin word *rapere*, or "to steal, seize, or carry away." In early rape laws, the definition of rape referred to the violation of an unmarried virgin. The punishment was severe, sometimes resulting in the execution of both the assailant and the victim (Brownmiller 1975). Rape was treated as a property crime committed by a man against a man, with the woman assaulted viewed as the property stolen (Missirian and Kulow 2019). Women were seen as chattel, first owned by their fathers and then by their husbands. Because women were without rights, rape was not treated as a public order crime or crime against the State (Smith 2004).

One of the earliest compilations of written laws, the Babylonian Code of Hammurabi, 1990 BC, treated the rape of a virgin as property damage against her father (Harper 1904; Smith 2004). The theft of virginity reduced the “value” of the daughter and therefore ruined the father's chance to get a “fair price” for marrying his daughter off. If a married woman was raped, both the rapist and the victim were thrown into the river to drown (Brownmiller 1975). Under Mosaic Law, rape was punished by stoning the assailant to death. Additionally, if an unmarried (virgin) woman was raped within city walls, she was stoned to death along with her rapist; this was because it was believed if a woman was truly raped, she would have screamed loud enough to have been heard. If the assault happened outside city walls, the victim was forced to marry her assailant, and he was forced to pay the bride price to her father. If a married woman was raped, she was stoned with her rapist for adultery (Heirs 2004).

English Common Laws inspired some of the modern United States rape laws and rape myths. In 10th century Anglo-Saxon law, the punishment for rape was castration or death of the rapist (Reddington 2009). However, a victim had to be a high-class, propertied virgin to have legal recourse against her rapist. This constant distinction between those who could and could not be raped inspired the myth of an "ideal victim" rape myth. It was not until around the 12th century that rape was deemed a deliberate, violent, sexual crime against a (female) victim. In 12th century England, rapists could be held on trial for rape but only if immediately after the assault occurred the victim ran through town making a "hue and cry" and showed her injuries and torn clothing to "Men of Good Repute;" this inspired today's notion of outcry and/or corroboration.

In 13th century England, rape laws no longer distinguished punishments between the rape of a virgin and non-virgins and recognized acquaintance rape (Brownmiller 1975). The 13th century Statutes of Westminster also allowed the crown to prosecute rapists even if the woman who was assaulted or the woman's family choose not to. This was a central change in rape laws, allowing rape to be treated as a public order crime, rather than a property crime, and a crime against the State not the victim's father/husband (Missirian and Kulow 2019). However, interestingly enough, as the definition of rape expanded, the penalty for rape drastically decreased, reduced from the punishment of death to sometimes only two years imprisonment (Brownmiller 1975; Reddington 2009).

In the United States, early colonial law treated rape as the "carnal knowledge of a woman 10 years or older, forcibly and against her will." It was not until the late 1800s that suffrage activists successfully advocated for the raising of the legal age of consent from 10 to between 14 and 18 (depending on the state). Additionally, in the 1800s, most states excluded Black women from rape laws. Black women, both free and enslaved, could be raped and beaten by white men

with no recourse (Davis 1983; Pokorak 2006). It was not until 1861 that a Black woman in the United States could file rape charges against a white man. And, even then, she would be met with criticism, sometimes threatened by the white man or his white wife for attempting to file charges (Slatton 2020). The State of Missouri v. Celia 1855 decision declared a black slave woman to be the property of her owner with no right to defend herself against his rape of her (Brown 2017).

While first-wave feminism was largely organized by suffragettes and focused on women's right to vote, the second-wave feminist movement started with the Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s and focused on multiple forms of gender equality, including workplace equality, racial justice, reproductive justice, and ending violence against women. The National Organization for Women (NOW) claimed that "…we must also acknowledge that by the late 1960s, the feminist movement had not yet recognized or analyzed the impact of interpersonal violence on women's lives." The second wave marked the first time rape was treated as a weaponized version of male patriarchy that served to keep women in a perpetual state of fear and subordination (Gornick and Meyer 1998). As such, the feminist anti-rape movement emerged around the 1970s. From that movement to today, there has been significant progress in United States rape laws. An example of changes in United States rape laws includes marital rape, or the raping of one spouse by the other, becoming illegal. Before the 1970s, marital rape did not exist in United States rape laws (based on UCR definitions). In 1976 Nebraska became the first state to criminalize marital rape (however, it was not until 1993 that marital rape was recognized as a crime in all 50 states).

Eighty-five years after the creation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the FBI finally altered their definition of rape to widen the scope of what could be legally be considered rape. In

2012, the FBI definition of rape changed from, "the carnal knowledge of a female forcibly and against her will" to "the penetration, no matter how slight, of the vagina or anus with any body part or object, or oral penetration by a sex organ of another person, without the consent of the victim." The updated definition acknowledges that rape can be conducted under instances when the victim cannot give consent, such as when they are under the age of consent or incapacitated by mental or physical impairment, drugs, and/or alcohol. It also included men as potential victims of sexual assault. Before this, in the United States, rape was a crime committed by men against women and required penal penetration of a vagina (from FBI's Uniform Crime Report).

However, it is important to consider that the FBI does not dictate federal or state criminal codes or charges. The FBI's altered definition of rape may increase the reporting of rape in the Uniform Crime Report but not necessarily the arrest and prosecution of rapists. The reform of United States rape laws began in the 1970s and eventually spread throughout the country, including revisions to the state laws that recognized rape as a crime that can occur to men (Stemple and Meyer 2014). Rape state law reforms also broadened definitions to demarcate differences between "rape," "sexual assault," and other forms of sexual violence. The lack of a standard definition also means that varying state definitions have higher legal thresholds for what is considered rape.

The terms rape and sexual assault are often used interchangeably. In contrast to the legal definition of rape, the term sexual assault is broader. Sexual assault describes a spectrum of criminal acts that includes unwanted sexual touching, groping, molestation, and forcing a victim to engage in sexual touching against their will. According to the National Institute of Justice (NIJ; 2010), "sexual assault covers a wide range of unwanted behaviors—up to but not including penetration—that are attempted or completed against a victim's will or when a victim cannot

consent because of age, disability, or the influence of alcohol or drugs. Sexual assault may involve actual or threatened physical force, use of weapons, coercion, intimidation, or pressure and may include intentional touching of the victim's genitals, anus, groin, or breasts; voyeurism; exposure to exhibitionism; undesired exposure to pornography; public display of images that were taken in a private context or when the victim was unaware." Under NIJ's definition, sexual assault is not limited to penetration and qualifies as rape when penetration is included in the sexual violent act.

One of the primary reasons for the interchanging of rape and sexual assault is because legal terms, codes, and laws vary. Each state in the United States has different laws related to what constitutes a sex crime and how each crime is defined. For example, some states do not consider an act "rape" if the victim is not "physically forced" to have intercourse. In almost all U.S. states, rape is always a felony offense, whereas, sexual assault may be a misdemeanor, with penalties that range depending on the age and age difference of the perpetrator and the victim. Definitions and punishments for "sexual coercion" and "sexual harassment" also vary by state.

Additionally, the umbrella terms "sexual abuse," "sexual aggression," or "sexual violence" may also be used (Bouffard and Goodson 2017). While these terms are not codified in law, they are commonly used by college campuses to describe harmful sexual encounters. For the sake of this research, I will primarily focus on anti-sexual assault policies that comply with the current Title IX federal legislation (which I will explain in more detail below). As such, I will utilize the definition of "sexual assault" that colleges most commonly use. I focus on college campuses specifically because the rate of sexual assault is highest during college. It is estimated that 20% to 25% of women will experience a completed or attempted rape at some point during their collegiate experience (Fisher, Hartman, Cullen, and Turner 2000).

2.2. Defining and Measuring Campus Sexual Assault

The three major federal legislation that explicitly addresses campus sexual assault are Title IX, the Clery Act, and the Campus SaVE Act (which amended the Clery Act). Combined, these pieces of legislation dictate that college campuses have an obligation to prevent sexual violence and respond aptly when sexual violence occurs (on college campuses).

The Civil Rights Act of 1974 Title IX requires that universities ensure equal access to education; this includes prohibiting and sanctioning gender-based discrimination. In the following decades, feminists and civil rights advocates continued fighting for female equality in the workplace and college school systems. Sexual harassment became codified in United States law after successive Supreme Court sexual harassment cases (Reddington 2009). Further, the 1990s marked a decade of "women's rights." The rights second-wave feminists fought for - legalized contraception and abortion, financial credit, and workplace equality - became normative. The combination of contraception allowing for family planning and increased labor law protections allowed women's participation in the labor force to resemble that of men (Ryle 2020). It also marked the first time in U.S. history that women outnumbered men in college enrollment. With that came a staggering number of sexual assaults on college campuses, many of which were unreported (Fisher et al. 2002). The federal government responded to college campus sexual violence by enacting a series of legislation, including the Clery Act of 1990.

The Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Crime Statistics Act, or the Clery Act, was named after a student who was raped and murdered in her dorm room at Lehigh University. The Clery Act was passed in 1990 to bring awareness and transparency regarding violent crimes occurring on college campuses. This act requires United States universities to annually report any criminal activity on their campus to the federal government. Universities

must also provide evidence of crime deterrent efforts and programs that prevent and respond to victimization on university campuses (Fisher, Hartman, Cullen and Turner 2002). Because sexual violence is a crime that disproportionately affects females more than males, it is considered a form of gender discrimination, falling under Title IX. As such, under the Clery Act (1990) and Title IX (1972), universities are specifically required to document any instances of sexual harassment and sexual assault that occur on their campus (United States Department of Education 2017).

The Clery Act requires publicly funded colleges and schools to use the FBI's definition of sexual assault to comply with the Uniform Crime Report as the basis for their annual statistics. While there is a generally agreed-upon definition of sexual assault based on this, it is often misused and misframed under the umbrella of "sexual misconduct (Bouffard and Goodson 2017)." This syntactical difference is important because it leaves room for misinterpretation of what constitutes rape on the end of the student (the accuser or the accused). Additionally, when defining campus sexual assault, university reporting numbers may or may not include a rape or sexual assault that happens off-campus. Yet, the collegiate experience extends beyond the physical boundaries of a college campus.

Provisions in Title IX include the 2011 Dear Colleague Letter. The Dear Colleague Letter, produced by the U.S. Department of Education Office of Civil Rights (OCR), states that cases of sexual violence are included in discrimination and harassment based on sex, therefore, prohibited under Title IX. The Dear Colleague Letter, coupled with the creation of the *White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault*, lead to increased directives for schools to both respond to current acts of sexual violence and take action to prevent similar acts in the future (United States Department of Justice 2014).

Under the 2013 Reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, the Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act (Campus SaVE Act) was passed. The Campus SaVE Act amends the Clery Act to broaden the crimes that college campuses must disclose in their Annual Security Report to include all reports received by campus authorities of interpersonal violence (dating/domestic) occurrences. Additionally, public and private universities that receive federal funding are required to adopt sexual misconduct policies consistent with Title IX. This act means that nearly all university campuses offer standardized interventions. Further, to comply with Title IX requirements, college campuses are adopting affirmative consent policies that require both parties to obtain conscious and voluntary consent at each stage of sexual activity (Napolitano 2015). Some college campuses are attempting to enforce affirmative consent by changing the dominant sexual assault narrative from "no means no" to "yes means yes," to say that both parties should get and give consent before engaging in any sexual acts.

An additional Title IX requirement mandates that students take part in some sort of "Title IX training" that explains to students the importance of Title IX and how it "protects students, faculty, and staff members from all types of sexual misconduct and retaliation." Individual schools have the freedom to implement whatever type of training, program, or prevention campaign they want, as long as all students are at least made aware of the campus-wide policy regarding "sexual misconduct." In this case, sexual misconduct acts as an umbrella term that covers an array of behaviors that would create a sexually discriminatory hostile learning and working environment; this includes "sexual violence, sexual harassment, relationship or dating violence, sexual intimidation, sexual exploitation, stalking, etc. (DeGue et al. 2014)."

2.3. Issues with Campus Sexual Assault Interventions

A report prepared for the *White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault* showed the vast majority of Title IX inspired programs and trainings are unsuccessful at reducing sexual violence on campuses (DeGue 2014; DeGue et al. 2012). The most ineffective programs are brief educational programs that attempt to "increase knowledge or awareness about rape or reducing belief in rape myths (DeGue 2014)." These trainings show no evidence of affecting sexual violence behavioral outcomes despite being consistent with the majority of sexual violence literature. DeGue et al. (2014) measured pretest and post-test sexual violence behavioral outcomes by a) rates of sexual violence victimization or perpetration based on official records (e.g., police or hospital data), or b) self-reported sexual violence victimization or perpetration. Of the 136 programs, DeGue et al. (2014) evaluated, 21 programs measured sexual violence behavioral outcomes; 14.3% yielded a *negative effect* or an increased reporting of sexually violent behavior. Additionally, 18 programs measured rape proclivity or the "self-reported likelihood of future sexual perpetration;" 11.1% yielded a *negative effect,* or an increased reporting of rape proclivity. Overall, null effects were higher and positive effects lower for sexually violent behavior and rape proclivity outcomes compared to other outcomes measured (attitudes towards sexual violence; knowledge of sexual violence; bystander behavior and intentions, and arousal to violence).

These boomerang effects may occur because these prevention strategies (Hillenbrand-Gunn et al. 2010; Potter, Moynihan, and Stapleton 2011; Stephens and George 2009) do not intervene in the heterosexual interaction norms that prescribe men to be sexually assertive and women sexually passive (Hamilton and Armstrong 2009). This is likely because providing information regarding rape and rape myths actually works to reinforce both explicit and implicit

attitudes about men and women. These trainings explicitly reinforce gender stereotypes by describing gender roles and stereotypes related to gender and sex. I argue the underlining sexual assault language found in Title IX policy statements and policy trainings also implicitly reinforces gender stereotypes because rape is inherently gendered. Previous findings (DeGue et al. 2014; Malamuth et al. 2008) highlight the seeming paradox whereby people resist anti-sexual assault training but embrace their aims (Tinkler 2007).

Social psychological theories of status may help us understand how gender stereotype activation contributes to the rape paradox. This project aims to utilize these theories to reveal the mechanisms through which anti-sexual assault policies affect gender beliefs and beliefs about sexual assault. Similar to Tinkler's findings (2007) regarding sexual harassment policy exposure, I hypothesize that undergraduate males who read a brief anti-sexual assault policy will express stronger male-advantaged gender beliefs than those who have no exposure to an anti-sexual assault policy.

2.4. Conceptual Framework

Status Characteristics and Expectation States Theory (SCES) research program was developed to understand better the emergence of influence and prestige variation in small groups (Wagner and Berger 2002). Since its inception, status scholars have repeatedly demonstrated how interaction processes contribute to the persistence of inequality (Berger and Webster 2006; Correll and Ridgeway 2003; Goar and Sell 2005; Manago, Sell and Goar 2018; Ridgeway 2011; Ridgeway and Correll 2006; Ridgeway and Correll 2006). Status theorists also elucidate how powerful forces continue to uphold and reinforce gender inequalities, thereby maintaining resistance to gender equalizing efforts.

SCES introduced the fundamental concept of performance expectations, or the "implicit, often unconscious, anticipations of the relative quality of individual members' future performance (Correll and Ridgeway 2003)." According to Ridgeway and Walker (1995), performance expectations are ‘‘unaware hunches about whose suggestions are likely to be better.’’ Performance expectations shape observable power and prestige order (OPP). Observable power and prestige is defined as, "inequalities in social interactions that are based on status characteristics, and take the form of deference, agreement, disagreement, etc." (Correll and Ridgeway 2003). By examining OPP, SCES research aims to predict in a group of individuals with different statuses, such as mixed gender, age, race, etc., who is most likely to be listened to, agreed with, and have their ideas promoted. SCES also predicts deference, or how often participants change their answers to match other participants.

According to Status Characteristics and Expectation States literature, each person in society has a set of characteristics they possess that are connected to societal expectations and beliefs that are reproduced in society (Berger and Conner 1969; Berger, Wagner, and Zelditch 1985). These beliefs, known as status beliefs, are culturally derived, shared, and understood within a society and reflected at the micro-level (Ridgeway 2011). Status beliefs relate to an individual's characteristics or the characteristics of the group (Ridgeway 2006). Status beliefs put people into a social category based on an attribute, such as gender (man, woman, non-binary) or race/ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic and/or Latinx, Asian, etc.). Certain categories (such as man and/or white) are treated as more competent and held in higher esteem compared to others (such as woman and/or racial minority). These beliefs are associated with assumptions about individuals' competence based on their social category.

Status Characteristics and Expectation States Theory defines a *status characteristic* as "any characteristic around which beliefs and expectations about actors come to be organized" (Berger and Webster 2006). Status characteristics are individual attributes that are socially significant (Correll and Ridgeway 2003). There are two types of status characteristics: 1) Specific Status Characteristics and 2) Diffuse Status Characteristics. Specific Status Characteristics carry cultural expectations for performance pertaining directly to certain situations/tasks. A characteristic is a Specific Status Characteristic if 1) it involves two or more states that are differentially evaluated and 2) associated with each state is a distinct expectation state. Examples of Specific Status Characteristics include reading ability, mathematical ability, and writing ability. Intelligence, however, is not a Specific Status Characteristic because it cuts across multiple situations. As such, intelligence is a Diffuse Status Characteristic.

Diffuse Status Characteristics (DSC) are characteristics applied across social situations that help individuals navigate their social world. DSC are defined as "the attributes given to individuals, including gender, race, and class that shape performance expectations and interaction, even when they are not relevant to a given task" (Correll and Ridgeway 2003). Diffuse Status Characteristics consist of a set of stereotypes and are evaluated based on at least two states of evaluation (Goar and Sell 2005). DSC are a set of stereotypes that are overall evaluated as positive or negative and the evaluation determines the state or category of the characteristics. The attribute of each stereotype is treated as either negative or positive. These stereotypes then add up to create an overall "value" of the characteristics so that someone is associated with primarily negative or primarily positive stereotypes. Gender is an example of a Diffuse Status Characteristic with primarily positive stereotypes for men and primarily negative stereotypes for women.

Status characteristics are tied to expectations of performance and shape the way people interact with each other. Status characteristics research has shown that when people interact in a goal-oriented setting and a status characteristic is salient, such as race or gender, those who are generally perceived to have higher status, i.e., white men, are afforded more influence and evaluated more positively than those of lower status (Berger et al. 1977; Berger and Webster 2006; Correll, Benard, and Paik 2007; Correll and Ridgeway 2003; Ridgeway 2011; Ridgeway and Correll 2006). In contrast, those of lower status who are evaluated more harshly must perform better than those with higher status to be seen as equally competent (Correll et al. 2007; Correll and Ridgeway 2003; Ridgeway and Correll 2006). As a result, status beliefs reproduce patterns of inequality based on status differences (Correll et al. 2007). The process of reproducing inequality on the interactional level maintains the legitimacy of these inequalities on the macro-structural level (Ridgeway 2011). This is why EST would predict that (all things being equal) when men and women work together in groups, men's higher status would lead to women deferring to men more often than to other women and men deferring to other men more often than to women; this means that men, compared to women, will have more observable power and prestige in small group interactions.

2.4.1. Gender as a Diffuse Status Characteristic

Sex categorization, i.e., whether someone is considered a man or woman, is one of the most recognized social categories (Fiske 1998). There is a cultural consensus of what kind of behavior to expect from people based on their sex category, otherwise treated as gender (Ryle 2020). Men and women's socialization process determines differential expectations for men and women based on their gender, and people rely on these expectations to dictate how they communicate with one another (Ridgeway 2011). We use "taken-for-granted common sense to

manage relationships with others" to ease interactions (Ridgeway 2011). This taken-for-grantedness can lead to stereotyping. According to Correll (2007), gender stereotypes are a set of beliefs about the kinds of traits, attributes, or behaviors that can be (or should be) expected of a person of a given sex category. Gender status beliefs, however, are a specific component of gender stereotypes that regard men as more socially valued and diffusely more competent than women. The result is that overall, women are considered less valuable than men (Ridgeway 2011). Status beliefs are held by everyone so that even women adhere to status beliefs about women and evaluate other women based on status beliefs (Correll et al. 2007; Correll and Ridgeway 2003; Ridgeway and Correll 2006).

Ridgeway (2011) suggests a shared categorization system of gender and gender beliefs determine status hierarchies. In patriarchal societies, men have more status than women. Gender stereotypes influence interpersonal negotiations. The way we view gender does not change just because females enter the male sphere. Though people are not consciously aware of the status beliefs, Ridgeway makes a case for how the perpetuation of status beliefs maintains gender hierarchy, not only on a macro (policy) level but on the interactional level. These gendered interactions reproduce patterns of inequality that exist in the larger society, thus maintaining the legitimacy of gender stratification (Ridgeway 2011). According to Ridgeway, this is why gender gaps and inequalities persist despite social and economic transformations and movements that reduce women's subordination. As such, macro-level policies, like anti-sexual assault policies, may not garner as much support as one may assume. Women are also likely to adhere to gender status beliefs regarding women and sex (Tinkler 2013).

Despite the resiliency of shared stereotypes (Fiske 1998; 2017), it is important to note that it is possible to intervene in the formation of status hierarchies by directly modifying

performance expectations by providing information about the specific status that contradicts the state or evaluation of diffuse status characteristic (Freese and Cohen 1973; Lucas 2003; Markovsky, Le Roy and Berger 1983; Webster and Driskell 1978). For example, gender, as a diffuse status characteristic, works to reinforce cultural beliefs that assume men's higher competence and status worthiness, thus entitling them to higher rewards so that men are less likely to defer to women. However, when men interact with a woman and are informed the woman scored higher on a relevant task, such as an ability test, the woman becomes less disadvantaged based on her external status marker of gender. As a result, the man is more likely to defer to the woman in that case.

Tinkler (2007 et al.; 2013) argues that because sexual harassment policies aim to reduce unequal relations between men and women working together in the workplace (a goal-oriented context), they are similar to the gender-based interventions used in classic status characteristic studies (Tinkler 2013). Additionally, it is important to note that information provided in sexual harassment and sexual assault policies can shape interaction beyond the scope of task relevance. As such, sexual harassment and sexual assault policies aim to intervene in gender interaction norms. These gender interaction norms reflect the gender status hierarchy. Thus, exposure to policies that challenge gender status, such as sexual assault trainings, may disrupt that status order and equalize gender beliefs *or* elicit resistance and backlash (a boomerang effect) and lead to more unequal gender beliefs.

2.5. Gendered Language in Policy Framing

2.5.1. Gender Stereotype Activation

Justine Tinkler conducted experiments that examined the effect of expectation states on interaction concerning sexual harassment policies (Tinkler, Li, and Mollborn 2007) and policy

training (Tinkler 2013). Tinkler relied on Status Characteristics and Expectation States theory because it explains how observed differences between genders serve as the basis for inequality. Like Ridgeway and Correll (2004), Tinkler's research suggests that people draw from stereotypes that comprise diffuse status characteristics to relate and interact. Social norms and gender stereotypes dictate interaction, including flirting and courting styles. An example of these gender stereotypes includes men being more assertive and women being passive. Further, heterosexual interaction norms prescribe that men explicitly flirt in an attempt to achieve sex, whereas women should respond deferentially through body language and subtle flirtation (Tinkler 2013). Thus, the primary objective of sexual harassment policies is to implement protective practices in the workplace that reduce sex-based discrimination. These policies change the way women and men interact in the workplace, and target behaviors that are deemed normative outside the workplace.

Tinkler (2013) applied SCES to sexual harassment training and found that sexual harassment policies and trainings activate diffuse status characteristics, subsequently polarizing men and women further. She argued that sexual harassment policies and trainings activate gender stereotypes because women and men are held to different sexuality standards. Given that men are considered more sexually aggressive, policies that target eliminating sexually aggressive behavior target male behavior more than female behavior. Tinkler's (2013) results showed that men tended to see these policies as a threat to privilege while women were seen as victims or complainers. Sexual harassment laws reinforce men as strong and women as weak, preventing men from seeing themselves as potential victims and disempowering women by highlighting their status as victims. Women also showed reduced support for sexual harassment training. Women who adhered to egalitarian gender norms responded to the sexual harassment training intervention by rating women as “less considerate.”

Further, Tinkler (2012) argued that policies must challenge gender stereotypes and focus on inequality at the interaction level to be effective in creating workplace equality and reduced sexual harassment. I hypothesize this will be the same for anti-sexual assault policies. Sexual assault policies rely heavily on gendered language, or what I refer to as *gendered framing*, that works to reinforce gender stereotypes.

2.5.2. Rape Myth Activation

Rape myths are also grounded in gender stereotypes, thereby working to uphold traditional gender beliefs. Rape myths are "attitudes and beliefs that are generally false but are widely and persistently held and serve to deny and justify male sexual aggression against women" (Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1994: 134). The acceptance of rape myths leads to the generalization, trivialization, or even denial of sexual assault. Rape myth acceptance is a contributing factor to victim-blaming because it leads to individuals displacing responsibility by shifting blame from sexual assault perpetrators onto victims, minimizing the severity of the assault, and/or questioning the legitimacy of the victim (Maxwell and Scott 2014).

Commonly accepted rape myths, such as "she asked for it," serve to falsely perpetuate the idea of a "just world" (Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1994). The just world hypothesis suggests that good things happen to good people and bad things happen to bad people. Shifting the blame of rape from the offender to the victim allows society to avoid confronting the true scope of rape and sexual assault. Some victims internalize this and blame their decision-making process for their victimization, seeing it as a result of their actions or that they "should have known better." Another common rape myth is that rape is just "normal male behavior" or "sex gone wrong" that is a natural part of sex. Rapists benefit by taking advantage of these rape myths to claim their innocence or justify their actions. This allows rapists to continue and repeatedly offend, resulting

in a cruel cycle of sexual violence. When society fails to recognize the severity of rape and sexual assault, fewer victims report their sexual assault, thereby driving down the reported numbers of sexual assault and increasing societal denial.

Rape myths also suggest that victims are always aware they were sexually victimized and/or willing to report their attackers. It is also a myth that rape is fully prosecuted under the law. Only 5% of reported rapes result in prosecuting the perpetrator for rape (National Crime Victimization Survey 2016). Further, research on restorative justice suggests that some victims of sexual assault may benefit from reconciliation (mediation) rather than going through the formality of the criminal justice system and pursuing prosecution against their assailant (Cyphert 2018; Koss, Wilgus and Williamsen 2014). Overall, the traditional criminal justice approach to combating sexual assault is largely ineffectual and reinforce rape myths and misconceptions about rape and trauma experienced by victims (survivors) of rape.

College sexual assault policies attempt to intervene in rape myths by listing them but, similar to gender stereotype activation, this may reinforce rape myths. For example, anti-sexual assault policies commonly utilize false models of campus sexual assault, such as the "campus serial rapist" and "stranger rape." Neither are theoretically supported (Swartout et al. 2015) and reinforce college campus rape myths specifically. Moreover, even when these policies list different types of (or definitions of) "sexual assault" or "rape," most student victims do not define their experience of rape as a crime (Black et al. 2011; Karjane, Fisher and Cullen 1999). This may further confuse students on what constitutes sexual assault.

Currently, the majority of Title IX-inspired policy trainings discuss both gender stereotypes and rape myths; this is with the intention of identifying implicit gender bias and acknowledge that rape is a gendered crime. However, considering gender is a unique diffuse

status characteristic, directly emphasizing a disruption in gender statuses might generate resistance, i.e., a boomerang effect. When gender is made salient, gender beliefs are activated (Correll 2001). As such, I expect that highlighting gender stereotypes and gender-based rape myths, i.e., gender framing, in anti-sexual assault policies reinforces gender beliefs rather than reduces the effects of gender or favor women.

Hypothesis 1: Gendered vs. gender-neutral language will have a direct effect on attitudes towards gender and support for anti-sexual assault policies. Gendered language will lead to greater support for traditional gender beliefs, gender stereotypes, and rape myths. Conversely, gendered language will lead to lower support for anti-sexual assault policies.

2.6. Sex Language in Policy Framing

Gender, violence, and sex discourse are closely linked. As such, I argue that the language used in patriarchal societies to discuss rape and sexual assault is inherently gendered, leading to gender stereotypes and rape myth activation. There is little to no research examining the way "rape language," or what I am referring to as *sex framing*, affects gender stereotypes and rape myth activation. I suggest that the current rape language frames sex negatively, reinforcing traditional sexual scripts that give men more authority in all sexual acts, not just sexual assault.

2.6.1. Sex-Negative Framing

Rape is not treated like other forms of violent crime because it triggers traditional gender stereotypes (Kim 2012; Sanday 1996). Compared to other violent crimes, there is a "rape tolerance" in the United States as evidenced by low rates of arrest, prosecution, and conviction of rapists (Kim 2012). The "feminization of rape" treats rape as a women's issue and a gendered crime that feminizes rape victims (Marcus 1992). In this case, rape and the omnipresent threat of rape, i.e., the fear of rape, becomes an ideological weapon used by men to subordinate women.

This ideology also assumes that only women get raped because there is something inherently weaker about women that makes women more susceptible to this crime (Mardorossian 2014). The "feminization of rape" also feminizes victims of rape who are men because people assume a "real man can't be raped" (Marcus 1992). It suggests a man should be able to overpower his attacker (if raped by another man) or would not be able to "perform" (if raped or coerced by a woman) (Javaid 2016). These narratives expose the proclivity toward the "masculinity as dominance" discourse and the treatment of rape as a marginalized phenomenon. Rape myths purport that feminine traits make people more predisposed to being raped (Mardorossian 2014).

According to Campbell (2005:119), many anti-sexual assault prevention strategies "(re)produce gendered bodies – the vulnerable/indefensible feminine and the potent/unstoppable masculine – which does not disrupt the possibility of rape, more exactly, it makes rape seem evermore inevitable and unstoppable." With this, prevention trainings and policies advise women to engage in "safe-keeping" behavior – such as, "protecting" themselves by not dressing in certain ways, avoiding being alone in public, parking in well-lit areas, etc. Encouraging these restrictive acts reinforces normative femininity. Anti-sexual assault strategies that reinforce the idea that women are potential victims and men are potential perpetrators also work to protect women victims and punish male offenders. Policies that protect one group by punishing another group may elicit backlash from perceived threats to status and the underlying normative order (Tinkler 2015).

In feminist literature, the term "sex-negative" describes the societal perception that any form of sexual behavior aside from heterosexual procreative marital sex is deviant or abnormal (Wodda and Panfil 2018). Sex-negativity treats sex as a "dangerous, destructive, negative force" (Rubin 2011). Within the university context, sex is restricted to the negative sense (e.g., sexual

assault), even though such acts are not sex at all. This language is often enmeshed in the assumptions that reinforce rape myths (Campbell 2005). As such, for the sake of this project, I will treat the existing narratives surrounding sexual assault on college campuses as an overarching *sex-negative framing* and focus on the effects of this gendered narrative and how to intervene in this framing.

2.6.2. Sex-Positive Framing

Sex-positive feminism emerged as a movement in the 1980s (Khan 2017). Opposing discussions of sexual oppression at the 1982 "The Feminist and The Scholar" Barnard Conference spurred the "sex wars" between feminists. Before the sex-positivity movement, sexuality studies were dominated by radical feminism. Radical feminism treated sexuality as the "preeminent stage for exploitation, misogyny, and violence, with pornography identified as one of the main purveyors of sexual oppression" (Khan 2017:347, "The Sex Wars"). Sex-positive, or sex-radical, feminism offered an alternative analysis of sexuality and sexual pleasure as, "an intrinsic good (for some) and as a potential tool for empowerment" (Khan 2017). At the time, most of the focus of sex-positivist feminism was on the problematic labeling of "deviant" sex (gay and lesbian sex, sadomasochistic sexual practices (BDSM), erotic pornographic text, etc.) and the debate over the legalization of sex work. Since then, it has been used as a potential response to sexual assault on college campuses; I will focus on this aspect of sex-positivity.

As a broad ideology, sex positivity is the idea that all sex, as long as it is healthy and explicitly consensual, is positive. The core of sex-positivity is the idea of informed consent and agency within one's own sexuality. A sex-positive framework transforms typical patriarchal, phallic-focused sex rhetoric -such as sexual assault language - into pleasure-focused sex language (Khan 2017). The language used emphasizes "embodied, communicative, and

pleasurable sex." Sex-positivity is thought to value sexual expressions and bodily autonomy; as such, it aims to reduce stigma and shame from all sexual choices that have explicit consent.

Similar to sex-positivity, the "sexual citizenship" perspective examines sex beyond a binary of sexual assault and consensual sex, and measures sex on a spectrum (Hirsch and Khan 2020). In their book, *Sexual Citizens*, Hirsch and Khan (2020) argues that "people are "sexual citizens" when they know they have the right to say "yes" and the right to say "no" to sex. They also must recognize that everyone else has the same rights. Sexual citizenship is developed through education and supported by communities." In their book, Hirsch and Khan "shy away from judgement about the morality" of different sexual preferences and advocate that young people [college students] should cultivate their sexual citizenship.

Campuses that are adopting sex-positive policies suggest that sex-positivity is the notion that consensual sexual expression is both healthy and essential in contributing to a safe and inclusive campus climate. The Feminist Campus is a pro-choice student network that leads a "Campaign for Sex Positivity," that advocates for sex-positive sexual education on college campuses. They claim that: "Sex-positivity is grounded in comprehensive sex education, exploring and deconstructing gender norms, and promoting body-positivity and self-love…Sex-positivity celebrates healthy sexual relationships, diversity within those relationships, bodily autonomy, and empowering individuals to control their own sex life (or lack thereof). You define what is right for you – there is no "right" way to engage in sex and express your sexuality as long as everything involves consent, empowerment, and respect" (Feminist Campus 2021).

It is important to note that positive sex framing does not ignore power dynamics in sexual assault (Wooda and Panfil 2018). It does not assume that if people were less sexually repressed or had more sexual opportunities, sexual assault would be eliminated. Instead, sex-positive

framing acknowledges that people commit sexual assault because they feel entitled to other people's bodies and disregard another's right to consent. Sex-positivity aims to combat sexual assault by ending stigma affiliated with sexual activity, examining harmful elements of hyper-masculinity, encouraging bodily autonomy, and deconstructing harmful power dynamics in relationships (Khan 2017; Wooda and Panfil 2018). For example, victims of sexual assault may benefit from exposure to sex-positive ideology because it allows them to claim or reclaim a sexual identity independent of their assault (Baggett et al. 2017). In a *Medium* article, survivors of sexual assault who were interviewed about their post-trauma sex said that when they focused on coping on the assault through sex-positivity they were able to focus on "pleasure, enthusiastic consent, assertive communication, and sexual exploration" more than they were even before their assault (Simon 2019).

Because of this, I am suggesting it may be better for universities if sexual assault is positioned as a matter of sexual health rather than as a “scary threat.” This is important to test because previous research on the legal regulation of sexual harassment has shown that attitudes shift towards an agreement with institutional policies (Tinkler 2003). So, suppose the current anti-sexual assault policy language is too threatening to gender norms. In that case, a paradigm shift towards healthy sex practices may intervene in this and may reduce backlash to the policy.

Hypothesis 2: Negative vs. sex-positive language will have a direct effect on attitudes towards gender and support for anti-sexual assault policies. Sex-negative language will lead to greater support for traditional gender beliefs, gender stereotypes, and rape myths. Conversely, sex-negative language will also lead to lower support for anti-sexual assault policies.

Hypothesis 3a: Gendered language paired with sex-negative language will have a stronger effect than either type alone. When gendered language is paired with sex-negative

language, support for traditional gender beliefs, gender stereotypes, and rape myths will be stronger than that expressed when only gendered language is present or when only sex-negative language is present. It will also lead to lower support for anti-sexual assault policies than when only gendered language is present or when only sex-negative language is present.

Hypothesis 3b: Conversely, when gender-neutral language is paired with sex-positive language, there will be less support for traditional gender beliefs, gender stereotypes, and rape myths than when only gender-neutral language is present or when only sex-positive language is present. It will also lead to higher support for anti-sexual assault policies than when only gender-neutral language is present or when only sex-positive language is present.

3. POLICY INTERVENTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

Few anti-sexual assault policies utilize theoretical models to inform the type of intervention used in their anti-sexual assault prevention policies and programs (Sabina and Ho 2014). Without theory to guide administrative decisions about the strategies to be included in anti-sexual assault efforts, the potential effectiveness and ability to evaluate the results of interventions may be lessened. Many anti-sexual assault prevention trainings do not take properly consider empirical findings. For example, a good number focus on a bystander approach (Banyard, Plante, and Moynihan 2004; Exner and Cummings 2011); however, less than 20% of sexual assault occurs when a bystander is present (NCVS 2016).

A gender-neutral, sex-positive approach may offer a theoretically sound solution to the issues both “No Means No” and “Yes Means Yes” models of consent present. Both of these approaches focus on the potential victim's behavior rather than the preparators. They reinforce the traditional notion that sexual consent is a woman's acquiescence to male sexual initiative (Anderson 2005). They reinforce the gender stereotypes that men should be sexually aggressive or seek out sex and have sex with a number of different partners and women should be the gatekeepers of sex or deny sex until they are “convinced” to have sex. Both models rely on men's ability to interpret women's nonverbal behavior (Anderson 2005; Jozkowski 2015). There is evidence that men fail at this and confuse women's platonic interest with sexual interest (Farris et al. 2008).

According to the “No Means No” model, a sexual act where the victim says no or resists physically is non-consensual. The “No Means No” model does not account for victims who experience peritraumatic paralysis and/or dissociation before, during, and after a sexual assault.

Peritraumatic paralysis and/or dissociation prohibits victims from protesting or resisting a sexual assault. The “No Means No” model allows a person to infer consent from a person's silence and lack of physical resistance. According to the “Yes Means Yes” Model, a sexual act that occurs without affirmative consent, by verbal or physical behavior, is non-consensual. This model, in practice, allows a person to infer that a person's willingness to participate in non-penetrative sexual activity is a reliable indicator of penetration consent. For some schools initiating a “Yes Means Yes” model, the sexual misconduct policy would require students to verify that a verbal “yes” was given prior to engaging in sexual acts. If there was not a verbal yes continuing with any sexual act would be considered sexual assault.

Based on the existing literature, my key argument is that the current policy trainings activate gender norms, thereby reinforcing stereotypes surrounding gender and rape myths and reducing support for anti-sexual assault policy trainings. I tested the effect of anti-sexual assault policy framing --gendered versus gender-neutral and/or negative versus positive sex framing -- had on the attitude measures of gender beliefs, gender stereotypes, and rape myth acceptance. I also tested the effect anti-sexual assault policy intervention had on rape proclivity and policy compliance, behavioral intention measures, and actual willingness to donate to a campaign that supports sexual assault or consensual sex awareness, a behavioral measure.

3.1. Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Gendered vs. gender-neutral language will affect attitudes towards gender and support for anti-sexual assault policies.

I predicted that those in gendered language conditions would be more accepting of traditional gender beliefs, gender stereotypes, and rape myths. I also predicted they would report higher levels of rape proclivity, be less likely to comply with the sexual assault policy they were

exposed to and be less likely to donate to a campaign that supports sexual assault, compared to those in the gender-neutral language conditions.

Hypothesis 2: Negative vs. sex-positive language will affect attitudes towards gender and support for anti-sexual assault policies.

I predicted that those in sex-negative language conditions would be more accepting of traditional gender beliefs, gender stereotypes, and rape myths. I also predicted they would report higher levels of rape proclivity, be less likely to comply with the sexual assault policy they were exposed to and be less likely to donate to a campaign that supports sexual assault, compared to those in the sex-positive language conditions.

Hypothesis 3a: Gendered language paired with sex-negative language will have a stronger effect than either type alone.

I predicted that those in the gender + sex-negative language condition would be the most accepting of traditional gender beliefs, gender stereotypes, and rape myths. I also predicted they would report the highest levels of rape proclivity, be the least likely to comply with the sexual assault policy they were exposed to and be the least likely to donate to a campaign that supports sexual assault, compared to those in the other conditions.

Hypothesis 3b: Gender-neutral language paired with sex-positive language will have a stronger effect than either type alone.

I predicted that those in the gender-neutral + sex-positive language condition would be the least accepting of traditional gender beliefs, gender stereotypes, and rape myths. I also predicted they would report the lowest levels of rape proclivity, be the most likely to comply with the sexual assault policy they were exposed to, and be the most likely to donate to a campaign that supports sexual assault, compared to those in the other conditions.

3.2. Scope Conditions

I tested my hypotheses under specific scope conditions (specific theoretical constraints): 1) All participants self-identify as white heterosexual men (those with uniformly high diffuse status characteristics); 2) Participants are making individual-level decision and choices; 3) Participants are actively involved in "performing" the language involved in the policy; and 4) ceteris paribus.

4. EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

4.1. Overview

I tested my hypotheses with an online experiment in which I evaluated behavioral and attitudinal responses to a campus sexual misconduct policy that varies in the framing. While the original study was designed as an in-person laboratory experiment, COVID-19 interrupted all in-person experiments. As a result, I designed an online study to test hypotheses. Testing policy framing via an experimental design allowed me to isolate and test the theoretically relevant concepts of gender beliefs and sex-positive feminism. Utilizing experimental design allowed me to control the independent variable before measuring the level of the dependent variable(s) (Webster and Sell 2014) to test the effect(s) of anti-sexual assault policy framing.

Undergraduate male participants were invited to participate in a study aimed at developing improved policies for issues around college campuses. I used a between-subjects design that crossed gender language and sex language. Additionally, I included baseline conditions that allowed me to assess the relative strength of the manipulations. Participants were randomly assigned to read one of six policy statements (experimental conditions): 1) gender/sex-negative; 2) gender-neutral/sex-negative; 3) gender/sex-positive; 4) gender-neutral/sex-positive; or 5) and 6) baseline conditions. Conditions 5 and 6 were baseline (control) conditions in which the participant read a neutral policy related to academic dishonesty.

In a pre-recorded video, a white woman researcher introduced the research as a study looking at the development and presentation of policies. In an additional pre-recorded video, the same researcher read a specific policy statement. The policy statement video provided close captioning to allow the participant to read along with the policy statement. Then participants

were asked to read the same policy statement out loud while being recorded. The recording was used to ensure the participant understood and paid attention to the language in the policy. After the recording, the participants answered questions measuring their beliefs about gender, rape myth acceptance, and anti-sexual assault policies (dependent variables). They were also asked if they wished to donate a portion or all ($0-$17) of their participation earnings to a cause that supports sexual assault or consensual sex awareness.

The policy manipulation design borrowed language from actual sexual misconduct policies but highlighted the effect of gender versus gender-neutral framing and sex-negative versus sex-positive framing. Because sex-positive policy framing is unique, and to my knowledge never tested, I conducted pretests to examine the presentation of this language in a policy statement I generated. The sex-negative framing was consistent with policies and language already adopted by universities. Previous studies exclusively utilized attitude measures as the dependent variables; as such, I pretested an instrument that measures behavior, in addition to the attitude measures.

4.2. Pretests

The experimental policy framing was designed to be consistent with the language and procedures that would be found in an actual university student handbook and/or anti-sexual assault training. However, the statements had to be consistent and straightforward enough for the participant to recognize and remember the specific language used in each policy condition. As such, I pretested the policy language. Before running the study, I tested the framing in an undergraduate sociology course that had 12 students in it (3 per policy condition). The purpose was to ensure that students understood the language of the policy and recalled the manipulations (i.e., the framing).

I also recruited eight male graduate sociology students, two male undergraduate students, and two female undergraduates to pretest the procedure/protocol, particularly in regard to the video recording procedure. I recorded the time of each pretest to determine that each session took approximately 30 minutes. I conducted a pretest focus group with five students whom all participated in different conditions. I asked questions regarding the policy, recording, and survey. I asked the volunteers if they understood the instructions and if there was any confusion during the administration of the experiment. I also asked the volunteers how they felt about being recorded reading the policy.

Because I am testing multiple dependent variables, I pretested the order that the dependent variables were presented. I also tested the possibility of carryover effects. From this, I determined that the order of the surveys had to be adjusted to prevent the manipulation questions from priming gender and sex attitudes before the participants completed the Gender Belief Inventory. I also adjusted the order of surveys to make sure questions regarding Gender Beliefs came before questions regarding rape myths. I also adjusted the donation language from asking how much the participant would donate on a scale to a two-part question: 1) asking whether they would donate (yes or no) and 2) if so, how much? (fill in the amount). It is also one of the few force-response questions on the survey; this ensures participants pay attention and respond to the donation measure. Manipulation checks determined that participants were able to identify different policy framing.

Based on the feedback from the students, I revised the formatting of the policy presentation. The framing is still similar to that of actual university policies and reads like a policy statement, but the formatting (font, bullet points, etc.) was altered to make the policy conceptually more clear and easier to read. Pretests allowed for the researcher to standardize the

research protocol. Pretests also helped determine how many participants should be used in each condition, that is, provided estimates for power.

4.3. Participants and Recruitment

Multiple factors intertwine to make college students vulnerable to sexual assault. Many are outside of their control, such as being away from parents for the first time, seeking social ties, being eager to make friends and fit in, and possibly drinking alcohol for the first time. College campuses are unique environments that increase the likeliness of sexual assault. Current college students are most directly affected by Title IX anti-sexual assault policies. Because of this, this research utilizes a sample from a relatively large, public university. Additionally, because men are significantly more likely to commit sexual assault and women more likely to be assaulted (Flood and Pease 2009; NCVS 2016), I am interested in the effect anti-sexual assault policies have on the gender beliefs and attitudes of self-identified heterosexual men.

In SCES, initial conditions demarcate the particular circumstances, such as the time and place, under which the theory will be relevant (Sell and Martin 1983). In current patriarchal societies, the diffuse status characteristic of "gender" has a high (status) level, which is occupied by men, and a low (status) level, which is occupied by women. As shown in previous research, white men have more status than white women and men and women of color. This does not mean that white men are inherently superior or that this status will not equalize or reverse, but that at this current point in time, SCES predicts white men to have higher status and be given more deference than women or BIPOC. This is why I am controlling for status characteristics.

Participants were recruited through campus emails. The recruitment email (see Appendix A) asked for only white men aged 18-25 years old to participate in the study. Women and men of color were excluded from the study. Participants had to be 18 years of age to participate; those

under 18 were excluded from participating in the study. Those who did not self-identify as white (non-Hispanic), male, and heterosexual on their demographic questionnaire were dropped from the analysis. Participants were also made aware of and offered a financial incentive for participation in the study. Participants were paid $17 for completing the study. Based on past studies, we sought to ensure there were enough participants in each condition to detect differences between the conditions.[1]

To ensure confidentiality, participants assigned themselves a unique identification code at the beginning of the study. Participants were identified only by their consent form that they signed with a self-generated unique subject number. The participants' name or contact information (email) was never associated with their responses. The participants' ID number was not linked to the participants' name. The unique identification code was used so that participants'' names were never linked to any of their responses and only to the condition to which they were assigned. Consent forms were stored with restricted access and separate from any other study materials.

I restricted the participant pool to college-aged white men. The participants consisted of 157 self-identified white (non-Hispanic) men enrolled at Texas A&M University. To ensure that scope conditions were met, participants responded to attention checks as well as manipulation checks. Participants who did not meet the scope conditions or pass the manipulation checks were dropped prior to analysis. Thirty-one participants were dropped from the analysis for not meeting the scope conditions or failing the manipulation/attention checks.[2]

[1] We aimed for at least 25 participants per condition. The factorial design enabled effective comparisons of 50 for each comparison based on gender language (gendered or neutral) and sex language (negative or positive). Baselines were added to infer the relative importance of the conditions and the donation language.

[2] Number of dropped participants per condition: Condition 1 = 6; Condition 2 = 4; Condition 3 = 5; Condition 4 = 1; Condition 5 = 12; Condition 6 = 3

4.4. Procedure & Materials

The entire online experiment took place on the survey platform Qualtrics. Participants participated in the experiment online via a personal computer (laptop or desktop). Due to the requirement for recording and screen size for viewing the recorded policies, participants could not use mobile phones. After completing a brief screening questionnaire to confirm participation eligibility, white (non-Hispanic) male participants were redirected to a randomly assigned survey page. This page was one of the six experimental conditions.

First, the participants were provided a brief overview of the experiment. This overview included an initial consent form that made participants aware of the sensitive nature of topics and informed them of their ability to drop out of the study at any time (please see Appendix A). They were also informed that their names were not associated with any responses. After the participant signed the consent forms, the participant watched a brief (3 minutes) pre-recorded introduction YouTube video of the Sociology Department Head (a white woman) explaining the study in more detail. This video informed the participant that the study involved the development of college policies and the way in which the policies are presented. Then, they were asked to record themselves, if they chose to, reading over the version of the college policies script they were given. The participant was informed that the recording was for an informational video that was being produced that combines different studies. They were also told they could decline to participate in the recording or if they were not comfortable with us using the recording, it would not be used and, instead, destroyed. In fact, each recording was immediately destroyed, and the participant is informed of this in the debriefing (see Appendix D).

Participants then watched a video of the Sociology Department Head reading a policy statement. The policy statement varied based on the participant's assigned condition. To provide

control, the words used, formatting, word count, and the length of each policy are all as consistent as possible (see Appendix B for a copy of the policy scripts). All policy statement videos were pre-recorded in the same room, with the same speaker, and were 3.5-4 minutes. The videos all had closed captioning so the participant can read the policy script as well.

After the participant listened to the policy video, the participant recorded themselves reading the policy statement via an embedded audio recorder (no video). The participant was instructed to focus on the words and that if they made a mistake to correct the mistake and continue recording. This stage served as the policy intervention/manipulation.

Immediately after the policy intervention, participants were told they would complete a series of questions related to the policy statement they read and recorded themselves reading. The questions on the survey included (in order): 1) compliance to policy index 2) donation measure; 3) manipulation checks; 4) Gender Status Beliefs Inventory; 5) Ambivalent Sexism Inventory; 6) Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (IRMAS-R); 7) Propensity to Sexual Assault, and 8) demographic questionnaire. These instruments provide a measure of participants' attitudes toward gender, sexual assault, and likeliness to commit sexual assault (please see Appendix C for the inventories).

Once the survey was complete, the participant read the debriefing script. The debriefing script informed the participant the policy they read borrowed language from actual university student handbook policies and the researcher expected that people respond differently to policies depending on the framing, or language, used in the policy and that may be reflected based on their responses on the survey. The participant was also informed that the videos would not actually be used, and the audio recording would be deleted immediately. The participant was told that if they chose to donate to a campaign that supports sexual assault or consensual sex

awareness[3], the researchers would actually donate the amount suggested by each participant to a local sexual assault resource center. They were told we supplement their giving so that they would receive the full $17 for participation. Then the participant could provide any feedback they had regarding the study via an optional fill-in-the-blank response, concluding the study. Each condition took approximately the same amount of time to complete (30-45 minutes total).

4.5. Experimental Manipulations

4.5.1. Policy Intervention

I tested my hypotheses with a between-subjects experiment, in which each participant was tested in only one condition. Random assignment helps ensure that extraneous variables are randomly distributed across conditions so that the individual characteristics of the male participants do not account for differences between conditions. Male participants were randomly assigned to one of six policy intervention conditions: 1) gendered/sex-negative policy; 2) gender-neutral/sex-negative policy; 3) gendered/sex-positive policy; 4) gender-neutral/sex-positive policy; and 5) academic dishonesty policy/no manipulation sex-negative DV donation (baseline) and 6) academic dishonesty policy/no manipulation sex-positive DV donation (baseline). This factorial design varied the gendered language (neutral or not) and sex language (assault language or sex positive language). Additionally, as mentioned, two baseline conditions are added for comparison to factorial results.

[3]Donation language varied based on what condition they were in. Those in the sex-negative language conditions were asked whether they wanted to donate to a campaign that supports programs for the prevention of sexual assault; those in the sex-positive conditions were asked whether they wanted to donate to a campaign that supports consensual sex awareness. The baseline conditions had no policy training aspects but included all the other dependent variables. One baseline condition included a donation question for the prevention of sexual assault, and the other conditions included a donation question for consensual sex awareness. In this way, the baselines enable comparisons to the experimental conditions.

The participant was exposed to the policy four ways to strengthen the effect of the manipulation: 1) the policy was read out loud to the participant via a pre-recorded video; 2) the participant read a policy script while following along with the video; 3) the participant recorded themselves reading the policy out loud, and 4) the policy appeared on the desktop screen before the participant completed the survey. The experiment also emphasized that participants should pay attention to the script because they would record themselves reading the policy.

4.6. Dependent Variables

4.6.1. Gender Status Beliefs Inventory

The Gender Belief Inventory (GBI) serves as an attitudinal measure. The GBI, based on Expectations States theory, provides a measure for how gender beliefs may vary depending on exposure to the anti-sexual assault policy statement. I replicated the Explicit Gender Beliefs inventory from Tinkler's (2007; 2012) previous experiments to measure self-reported ratings of men and women and gender attitudes scales. Tinkler's inventory adopted the semantic differential scales used in Ridgeway's status construction experiments (Ridgeway et al. 1998; Ridgeway and Erickson 2000). Participants rated men and women on the semantic differential scales according to both “most people's” opinions and their personal opinions of pairings of words related to gender beliefs. “Most people” is used because it gauges consensual beliefs, a crucial component of status beliefs (Correll and Ridgeway 2006; Tinkler et al. 2007). These beliefs have been shown to affect behaviors regardless of whether they match personal beliefs (Sechrist and Stangor 2001; Tinkler et al. 2007). Additionally, the comparison between beliefs about what most people think vs. what I personally think provides an estimate of how different participants view themselves and their beliefs about men and women.

The inventory consists of seven-point scales for pairs of words that measure three dimensions of gender beliefs: 1) status: *respected/not respected, powerful/powerless, high status/low status, leader/follower* 2) competence: *competent/incompetent, knowledgeable/unknowledgeable, capable/incapable;* and 3) considerateness: *considerate/ inconsiderate, pleasant/unpleasant, likable/unlikable, cooperative/uncooperative.* Scores were averaged to create three indexes measuring the status, competence, and considerateness dimensions of participants' explicit gender beliefs. So, there are three indexes for most people's beliefs and three for participants' beliefs, totaling six indices (Tinkler et al. 2007).

The Gender Belief Inventory scales was used to indicate whether the policy intervention(s) make people more likely to explicitly express greater differences between women and men (Tinkler et al. 2007). Testing effects of the conditions will determine if any of the policy conditions increased participants' explicit beliefs that favor males over females. A high score on the GBI indicates a higher acceptance of male-advantaged gender beliefs. Analyses will be run separately for "most people's" and participants' personal beliefs. I performed a reliability test on the indexes for most people's beliefs and personal beliefs about both men and women and obtained reasonably high Cronbach's alphas ranging from .72 to .88.

4.6.2. Ambivalent Sexism Inventory

The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) serves as an attitudinal measure. According to Tinkler et al. (2007) the Gender Belief Inventory (semantic differential scales) measures explicit gender status beliefs but may not fully capture more subtle gender stereotypes. To further test explicit gender beliefs, I utilized the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick and Fiske 1996). This inventory, shortened as ASI, is a 22-item survey designed to measure hostile and benevolent sexism as an overall measure of sexism. While hostile sexism, or traditional sexism, is negative

evaluative attitudes against women, benevolent sexism captures sexism that has a more positive tone but still embraces conventional stereotypes of women (weak, pure, and virtuous). Changing social norms related to gender make men less likely to express overt sexism. Men's attitudes toward women have shifted from overt expressions to covert expressions of sexism (Glick and Fiske 1996). Previous research using the ASI suggests that the ASI captures benevolent forms of sexism better than previous self-report measures. I performed reliability tests on the hostile and benevolent scales.

The ASI also measures three benevolent subscales: 1) Paternalism (dominative and protective), 2) Gender Differentiation (competitive and complementary), and 3) Heterosexuality (hostile and intimate). Higher scores on the paternalism subscale indicate support for beliefs that men should protect women and that women are more virtuous than men. Higher scores on the gender differentiation subscale indicate support for traditional sex roles. Higher scores on the heterosexual intimacy subscale show support for the belief that heterosexual relationships are essential to men's emotional fulfillment. The alpha reliability score for the ASI was high, .91. The alpha reliability score for the ASI – Hostile scale was .92, and the alpha reliability score for the ASI – Benevolent scale was .81. For the Benevolent subscales, Paternalism alpha was .77, Gender Differentiation alpha was .65, and Heterosexuality alpha was .77

4.6.3. Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale

The Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (IRMAS-R) serves as an attitudinal measure. The IRMAS-R (Payne, Lonsway, and Fitzgerald 1999; McMahon and Farmer 2011) is a 20-item questionnaire designed to assess the participants' acceptance of rape myths (Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1994). Each item is rated on a 7-point Likert scale, from "not at all agree" (1) to "very much agree" (7). Scores are obtained by totaling the ratings for 17 of the 20 items (3 items are

simply “filler” items). The scale yields scores ranging from 17 to 119, with higher scores indicating a greater endorsement of rape myths. The alpha reliability score for the IRMAS was .85.

4.6.4. Rape Proclivity

The Rape Proclivity questions serve as attitudinal and behavioral intention measures. Malamuth (1981) notes that rape proclivity questions measure participants' propensity to commit sexual assault. It asks what the likelihood (on a 7-point scale) the participant would force a woman to have sex if they could be assured of not being caught and punished. Malamuth (1981) found that those with high sexism scores are more likely to respond higher on the rape proclivity question. Others found that those who score high on hostile sexism and endorse rape myths, particularly related to acquittance rape and victim-blaming, are the most likely to score high on proclivity to rape (Abrams, Viki, Masser, and Bohner 2003; Loh et al. 2005; Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1994).

I also added a question that asked what (hypothetical) percentage of men would force a woman to have sex if they could be assured of not being caught and punished. I added this question to estimate “most people's,” or consensual beliefs (Correll and Ridgeway 2006), similar to that of the Gender Belief Inventory.

4.6.5. Policy Compliance Index

The Policy Compliance Index is an attitudinal and behavioral intention measure. It measures participants' support and self-reported likelihood to comply with the given policy statement they were assigned to (this measure is partially based on Tinkler, Clay-Warner, and Alinor 2018). This scale consists of 3 questions that ask participants' (on a 7-point scale): 1) if they support the policy (1 being doing not support at all to 7 being very much support); 2) how

likely, as a student, are they to comply with the policy statement they read, and 3) how likely, as a student, are they to report a violation of the policy statement they read to the Office of Student Misconduct (1 being not likely at all to 7 very much likely). Scores were combined to make an index. I also analyzed each item separately. The higher the score on the index, the higher the compliance with the policy.

4.6.6. Donation Measure

The donation measure serves as a behavioral measure that captures participants' willingness to contribute, or willingness to pay (WTP), to a campaign aimed at reducing sexual violence, and if so, how much. Of course, individual differences affect willingness to donate to social causes, but the random assignment enables comparison across the conditions.

Participants were aware they receive a participation award of $17 (electronic gift card) for completing the study. After completing the rest of the study, participants were asked if they would like to donate any portion of the $17 award to a campaign that supports either anti-sexual assault awareness or consensual sex awareness. Those in the sex-negative language conditions were asked their willingness to donate to a sexual assault awareness program. Those who were in the sex-positive language conditions were asked their willingness to donate to a consensual sex awareness program. Participants in the baselines were exposed to either sexual assault awareness or a consensual sex awareness program to compare to the experimental conditions.

Participants indicated if and how much they wanted to donate. As such, participants were asked a two-part question: 1) "You will receive a $17 payment for your participation today. You may choose to donate a portion of your earnings to a campaign that supports anti-sexual assault (or consensual sex) awareness. Would you like to donate?" (choose yes or no) and 2) "Please list

how much you would like to donate by writing the amount in the blank below (fill in the blank)." The campaign or organization for the donation was never explicitly stated to prevent bias.

Participants thought they would receive an award of $17 for completing the survey, less their donations. Having them donate from their award goes beyond hypothetical willingness to contribute to actual contribution. Hypothetical willingness to contribute is not as reliable of a measure because of hypothetical bias (Christie 2007; Loomis 2011). According to Loomis (2011), hypothetical bias is when respondents report a willingness to pay (WTP) that exceeds what they actually pay using their own money in laboratory or field experiments. Participants will be asked to donate from their actual funds to avoid hypothetical bias. The reason the amount was fixed at $17, besides researcher cost restraints, was to prevent bias from windfall gain from occurring.

Windfall gain, or windfall profit, occurs when there is a sudden and unexpected gain in income. Previous studies found that windfall gains are spent more readily than other types of assets (Arkes et al. 1994) and can result in people being more willing to engage in charitable behavior because the "extra" income allows them to. This is also why participants were made aware of the $17 award in the Consent Form and the Study Overview section of the study so that they could anticipate the money so that when they were asked about the donation it was not a surprise to them. Though the donation amount is an open-ended question, i.e., fill in the blank, the range is set so participants must donate between $0.00 and $17.00, giving a lower and upper limit of the donation amount.

4.7. Other Variables

4.7.1. Demographic Questionnaire

The brief demographic questionnaire is an original questionnaire consisting of 11 questions that ascertain participants' relevant personal information regarding socio-demographic characteristics. These variables included participants' major, sexual orientation, classification, current religious affiliation, current dating/marital status, current political affiliation, gender, race and/or ethnicity, and year of birth.

4.7.2. Previous Exposure to Sexual Assault Prevention Training

Participants were asked if they participated in sexual assault prevention training before and, if so, what type(s). Most, if not all, of the participants should have taken part in the required university Title IX training. I also wanted to record any additional sexual assault prevention training, such as military or victim advocacy training, beyond a one-time university training.

4.7.3. Previous Exposure to Sexual Assault

Participants were asked about direct and indirect exposure to sexual assault. Direct exposure questions asked, “In your lifetime, have you been forced, or coerced, to engage in unwanted sexual activity?” and, “In the past year, have you been forced, or coerced, to engage in unwanted sexual activity?”

Because peers are more likely to disclose their experiences of sexual violence to each other than to campus resources, such as the Title IX office (Sabina and Ho 2014), I asked participants about their exposure to someone else who experienced sexual assault. These questions asked, “In your lifetime, has someone you personally know been forced, or coerced, to engage in unwanted sexual activity?” and, “In the past year, has someone you personally know been forced, or coerced, to engage in unwanted sexual activity?”

4.7.4. Manipulation Checks

The manipulation check questions asked the participant to identify which policy statement they read. Definitions from each of the five conditions were listed. The participant identified which policy they read by selecting "true" or "false" to whether a certain definition was listed or not listed. The descriptive analysis determined the majority of participants were able to answer questions regarding the policy they read correctly.

There was also an open-ended question that asked participants, "What was the purpose of the policy you read? Briefly describe the policy you read.[4]" As such, manipulation checks determined if participants recalled the correct definitions in the condition they were exposed to and/or if they described the policy they were exposed to with the specific language of the policy statement they read. These questions substantiate that the participants paid attention to the policy language.

Participants that failed the manipulation checks were dropped from the analysis. This included participants that provided "straight-line answers" and answered the same for all of the questions provided. This also included participants who failed at least two of the "yes/no" questions for the condition they were in. Participants who responded incorrectly to being provided the definition for "sexual assault" or being provided the definition for "consensual sex" but correctly responded to the other three manipulation checks and used the correct verbiage in the open-ended responses were kept in the analysis. Thirty-one participants were dropped from

[4]This question was added after pretests revealed that some people in the positive-sex condition would answer "yes" to being provided the definition for "sexual assault" (they were not) and "yes" to being provided the definition for "consensual sex." This implied that participants might see these terms as synonymous. When asked an open-ended question, participants would utilize the correct language (sexual assault vs. consensual sex) for the condition they were in.

the analysis because they failed to meet the scope conditions as indicated by the manipulation checks.

5. RESULTS

5.1. Overview

The participants consisted of 157 self-identified heterosexual, white (non-Hispanic) men who were randomly assigned to one of six conditions. A 2x2 factorial design was employed to enable an analysis of the conditions and the interaction between them. This design allowed for comparison between different groups, looking at the effect of gender framing (gender or gender-neutral) versus sex framing (positive or negative). I hypothesized that the interaction effect between gender and sex framing will create the greatest effect. I also predicted that both gender and sex framing would have direct effects (see Table 1).

The effects of gendered framing (gender vs. gender-neutral) and sex framing (negative vs. positive) on DV's – *attitudes about gender* (Gender Belief Inventory Ambivalent Sexism Inventory), *attitudes about rape* (Rape Myth Acceptance and Likeliness to Rape), *behavioral intention* (Policy Compliance), and *behavior* (Willingness to Donate) - were tested with analysis-of-variance (ANOVA) to compare the policy intervention conditions to each other. I will analyze the main effect of gender framing, the main effect of sex framing, and the interaction between these two types of policy framing. I used ANOVA to compare the results across conditions for all DVs. The ANOVA indicated whether gender framing significantly affected the DVs, if sex framing significantly affected the DVs, and/or if there was an interaction of gender and/or sex framing that affected the DVs. Additionally, I compared results from the baselines, in which policies do not refer to Title IX training, to the factorial results in which Title IX training is central.

Table 1. Test of Hypothesis

	Gendered Framing	**Gender-Neutral Framing**
Negative Sex Framing (emphasis upon sexual assault)	1	2
Positive Sex Framing (emphasis upon consensual sex)	3	4

^Conditions 5 & 6 serve as baseline conditions.

HYP 1: Gender framing (gender vs. gender-neutral) will have an independent effect. Traditional gender beliefs, sexist attitudes, and rape myth acceptance will be stronger for those who read policy statements emphasizing gender language. Policy compliance and donations to sexual assault prevention campaigns will be weaker for policy statements emphasizing gender language.

HYP 2: Sex framing (negative vs. positive) will have an independent effect. Traditional gender beliefs, sexist attitudes, and rape myth acceptance will be stronger for those who read policy statements emphasizing sexual assault language vs. consensual sex language. Additionally, policy compliance and donations to sexual assault prevention campaigns will be weaker for policy statements emphasizing sexual assault language.

HYP 3: The interaction between gender framing and sex framing will generate the largest differences, with a) gender + sex-negative framing pushing gender beliefs, sexist attitudes, and rape myths furthest in the traditional direction. Policy compliance and donations to sexual assault prevention campaigns will be weakest for policy statements emphasizing gender + sex-negative framing. and b) gender-neutral + sex-positive framing pushing gender beliefs, sexist attitudes, and rape myths furthest in a non-traditional

direction. Policy compliance and donations to sexual assault prevention campaigns will be strongest for policy statements emphasizing gender-neutral + sex-positive framing.

^*Baseline Conditions (Neutral Policy).* The fifth and sixth conditions, the baseline conditions, were added only to determine the degree to which any differences obtained in the factorial design are different from baselines that did not include policies related to Title IX relevant information. They are included to gauge whether the differences obtained were different from a condition in which no information about gender or sex framing was available. The dependent variables are also the same, minus the language in the donation measure. For condition 5, the donation measure asks whether the participant would be willing to donate to a campaign that supports sexual assault awareness. For condition 6, the donation measure asks whether the participant would be willing to donate to a campaign that supports consensual sex awareness. Using these two different baselines allows me to compare whether the sex language used in the donation measure has an effect.

To test my hypotheses about the experimental treatments, I first detail the descriptive results for the factorial experiment and the two baseline conditions. I then test my hypotheses concerning how the experimental treatments affect the dependent variables of interest: the GBI, ASI, IRMAS, Policy Compliance, and the Donation measures. Finally, I summarize the findings.

5.2. Descriptive Results

Participants varied in age, classification, and represented different majors. The mean age was 22 years old; the youngest participant was 19, and the oldest was 40. There were 28 freshmen, 30 sophomores, 37 juniors, 50 seniors, and 12 graduate student participants. Political and religious affiliation also varied --the majority of participants identified as Protestant-

Christian (53%). Previous sexual assault prevention was relatively the same across conditions (64% completed a training, 24% did not, and 11% reported being unsure). The vast majority who reported exposure said it was the standard university Title IX training; some students had other sexual assault prevention workplace training, including training while in the military. More participants in conditions 1 and 2 (the negative language conditions) said they have previous training than those in other conditions ($X^2 = .03$). I will address this further in the discussion section.

Previous exposure to sexual assault was approximately the same across conditions (the Chi-square tests across conditions were not significant). For previous direct exposure to sexual assault, 15.29% reported experiencing unwanted sexual activity in their lifetime, and 2.55% reported experiencing unwanted sexual activity in the last twelve months. For previous indirect exposure to sexual assault, 65.61% reported knowing someone who experienced unwanted sexual activity in their lifetime and 22.93% reported knowing someone who experienced unwanted sexual activity in the last twelve months.

5.3. Hypothesis Testing

5.3.1. Gender Belief Inventory (GBI)

The Gender Belief Inventory (GBI), using the semantic differential items, indicates whether the policy intervention(s) make people more or less likely to explicitly express greater differences between women and men (Tinkler et al. 2007). Participants rated men and women on the GBI according to both "most people's" opinions and their personal opinions of pairings of words related to gender beliefs. Scores were averaged to create three indexes measuring the status, competence, and considerateness dimensions of participants' explicit gender beliefs. Scores were coded so that all word associations went from a positively associated word to a

negatively associated word: 1) status: *respected/not respected, powerful/powerless, high status/low status, leader/follower;* 2) competence: *competent/incompetent, knowledgeable/unknowledgeable, capable/incapable;* and 3) considerateness: *considerate/ inconsiderate, pleasant/unpleasant, likable/unlikable, cooperative/uncooperative.* A total of six indexes were created, three for most people's beliefs and three for participants' personal beliefs.

I predicted that the policy to which the participants were exposed would make a difference, with higher male-advantaged beliefs in conditions with gendered language and sex-negative language. The table below indicates the mean values of the participants' explicit gender beliefs that the participants thought *most people* held. The GBI was scored so that the higher the mean the *less* positive the association of the semantic differential item. Comparing the means will indicate whether there is a higher acceptance of male-advantaged gender beliefs, meaning participants think men or women rate higher on the questions asked. The means for the different conditions for Most People's Gender Beliefs are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Mean Values for Gender Belief Inventory for Most People's Beliefs, by Condition

	Mean Value (Std. Dev.)			
	Condition 1 (n= 29)	Condition 2 (n=26)	Condition 3 (n=20)	Condition 4 (n=30)
Low Status:				
Men	2.87 (.89)	2.81 (.67)	2.73 (.73)	2.57 (.91)
Women	3.97 (1.11)	4.01 (1.00)	3.56 (1.04)	4.07 (1.25)
Low Competence:				
Men	3.13 (1.12)	2.91 (.98)	2.82 (.75)	2.8 (1.00)
Women	3.40 (1.18)	3.19 (1.14)	3.38 (1.12)	3.43 (1.32)
Low Considerateness:				
Men	4.24 (1.15)	4.00 (1.16)	3.82 (1.12)	3.86 (1.12)
Women	2.48 (.95)	2.44 (.79)	2.68 (1.10)	2.29 (.93)

Conditions: 1=Gender + Sex-Negative; 2=Gender-Neutral + Sex-Negative; 3=Gender + Sex-Positive; 4= Gender-Neutral + Sex-Positive

Additionally, I indicate in the table below, the mean values of the participants' personal explicit gender beliefs that the participants held. The higher the mean the less positive the association of the semantic differential item. The means for the different conditions for Personal Gender Beliefs are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Mean Values for Gender Belief Inventory for Personal Beliefs, by Condition

	Mean Value (Std. Dev.)			
	Condition 1 (n= 29)	Condition 2 (n=26)	Condition3 (n=20)	Condition 4 (n=30)
Status:				
Men	3.59 (.77)	3.34 (.61)	3.44 (.67)	3.32 (.69)
Women	3.52 (.68)	3.51 (.59)	3.69 (.58)	3.69 (.66)
Competence:				
Men	3.18 (1.19)	2.81 (.91)	2.98 (1.09)	2.89 (.93)
Women	2.60 (1.05)	2.45 (1.04)	2.97 (.95)	2.81 (1.19)
Considerateness:				
Men	3.52 (1.39)	3.23 (1.22)	3.17 (1.09)	3.44 (1.24)
Women	3.48 (.44)	3.46 (.51)	3.62 (.54)	3.37 (.48)

Conditions: 1=Gender + Sex-Negative; 2=Gender-Neutral + Sex-Negative; 3=Gender + Sex-Positive; 4= Gender-Neutral + Sex-Positive

I then conducted three Analysis of Variance tests to determine if the means are different from each other. I summarize the findings from those below:

Table 4. Explicit Gender Beliefs: Expectations of Most People's Evaluations

	ANOVA F-values (Prob>F)		
	Gender Language	Sex Language	Gender * Sex
Status:			
Men	0.47 (.50)	1.43 (.24)	0.09 (.77)
Women	1.51 (.22)	0.65 (.42)	1.14 (.29)
Competence:			
Men	0.35 (.55)	1.15 (.29)	0.26 (.61)
Women	0.11 (.74)	0.22 (.64)	0.30 (.59)
Considerateness:			
Men	0.20 (.65)	1.60 (.21)	0.39 (.53)
Women	1.42 (.24)	0.02 (.89)	0.88 (.35)

n=105
*** $p < .01$; ** $p < .05$; * $p < .10$

For men's status, competence, and considerateness, ANOVA revealed no significant effects. The experimental condition had no effect upon what participants though about others' views about men's status, competence, and considerateness. For women's status, competence, and considerateness, ANOVA revealed no significant effects. The experimental condition had no effect upon what participants though about others' views about women's status, competence, and considerateness.

I now consider the participants' personal evaluation of men and women in terms of status, competence and considerateness. See Table 5 for the ANOVA results.

Table 5. Explicit Gender Beliefs: Personal Evaluations

	ANOVA F-values (Prob>F)		
	Gender Language	Sex Language	Gender * Sex
Status:			
Men	1.56 (.21)	0.63 (.43)	0.13 (.72)
Women	1.59 (.21)	0.57 (.45)	1.03 (.31)
Competence:			
Men	1.32 (.25)	0.09 (.77)	0.47 (.49)
Women	0.52 (.47)	2.97 (.09)*	0.00 (.99)
Considerateness:			
Men	0.00 (.99)	0.08 (.78)	1.30 (.26)
Women	1.96 (.16)	0.04 (.84)	1.39 (.24)

n=105
*** $p < .01$; ** $p < .05$; * $p < .10$

In terms of personal evaluation, there is no difference by conditions for participants' estimation of either men's or women's status or considerateness. ANOVA revealed no significant effects of the conditions on personal evaluations of men's competence. However, for women, there was an effect at the .09 level for sex language. In particular, women were seen as less competent in the conditions emphasizing sex-positive language. In the sex-negative conditions (condition 1 and 2) the means for personal beliefs of women's competence/incompetence were M = 2.60 (SD =1.05), and M = 2.45 (SD = 1.04), whereas the means for sex-positive were M = 3.73 (SD = .55), and M = 2.97 (SD = .95). The higher the mean, the more negative of an association between the paired words.

Lastly, I examined the difference between how participants viewed most people vs. how they viewed themselves in regard to gender beliefs. See Table 6 for the ANOVA results.

Table 6. Explicit Gender Beliefs: Comparison of Most People to Personal Evaluations

	ANOVA F-values (Prob>F)		
	Gender Language	Sex Language	Gender * Sex
Status:			
Men	0.16 (.69)	0.32 (.57)	0.42 (.52)
Women	1.68 (.20)	2.84 (.10)	1.19 (.28)
Competence:			
Men	0.43 (.51)	0.69 (.41)	0.05 (.82)
Women	0.11 (.74)	1.40 (.24)	0.38 (.54)
Considerateness:			
Men	0.21 (.65)	1.04 (.31)	0.45 (.51)
Women	0.25 (.62)	0.00 (.86)	0.12 (.73)

n=105
*** $p < .01$; ** $p < .05$; * $p < .10$

To compare how the participants viewed most people vs. how they viewed themselves, I subtracted their views of others from their views of themselves. Larger numbers would indicate larger discrepancies between what they thought personally and what they thought others believed. As Table 6 indicates, there were no differences found due to policy exposure.

5.3.2. Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI)

The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) measures hostile and benevolent sexism as an overall measure of sexism. Hostile and benevolent sexism components are equally weighted and averaged for a total score for hostile and benevolent sexism. The ASI also measures three benevolent subscales: 1) Protective Paternalism (dominative and protective), 2) Gender Differentiation (competitive and complementary), and 3) Heterosexuality (hostile and intimate). As a reminder, higher scores on the paternalism subscale indicate support for beliefs that men should protect women and that women are more virtuous than men. Higher scores on the gender differentiation subscale indicate support for traditional sex roles. Higher scores on the

heterosexual intimacy subscale show support for the belief that heterosexual relationships are essential to men's emotional fulfillment.

I predicted that the policy to which the participants were exposed would make a difference, with higher ASI scores in conditions with and gendered language and sex-negative language. The means for the different conditions are shown in Table 7 and Table 8.

Table 7. Mean Values for Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Hostile Sexism, by Condition

	Mean Value (Std. Dev.)			
	Condition 1 (n= 29)	Condition 2 (n=26)	Condition 3 (n=20)	Condition 4 (n=30)
Ambivalent Sexism Inventory	**2.12 (.58)**	**2.16 (.49)**	**2.24 (.41)**	**2.12 (.36)**
Hostile Sexism Subscale	2.04 (.74)	2.09 (.67)	2.08 (.52)	1.98 (.55)
ASI-14: Women exaggerate problems at work.	1.83 (1.75)	1.96 (1.28)	2.35 (1.04)	1.93 (1.31)
ASI-5: Women are too easily offended.	1.90 (1.71)	2.35 (1.55)	2.3 (1.30)	1.67 (1.32)
ASI-4: Most women interpret innocent remarks as sexist.	1.86 (1.35)	2.19 (1.36)	1.9 (1.25)	2.17 (1.15)
ASI-16: When women lose fairly, they claim discrimination.	1.52 (1.48)	1.88 (1.11)	1.4 (.94)	1.87 (1.20)
ASI-2: Women seek special favors under guise of equality.	1.76 (1.92)	1.81 (1.36)	2.6 (1.67)	1.57 (1.36)
ASI-21: Feminists are making reasonable demands.	2.59 (1.76)	2.12 (1.61)	1.8 (1.40)	2.17 (1.49)
ASI-7: Feminists not seeking more power than men.	2.90 (1.92)	2.19 (1.55)	2 (1.56)	2.3 (1.66)
ASI-11: Women seek power by gaining control over men.	1.69 (1.63)	2.04 (1.51)	2 (1.49)	1.83 (1.44)
ASI-18: Few women tease men sexually.	3.21 (1.57)	2.58 (1.45)	2.65 (1.31)	3 (1.46)
ASI-15: Once a man commits, she puts him on a tight leash.	1.45 (1.57)	1.77 (1.24)	1.7 (1.03)	1.67 (1.30)
ASI-10: Women fail to appreciate all men do for them.	1.79 (1.80)	2.12 (1.24)	2.15 (1.35)	1.6 (1.30)

Conditions: 1=Gender + Sex-Negative; 2=Gender-Neutral + Sex-Negative; 3=Gender + Sex-Positive; 4= Gender-Neutral + Sex-Positive

Table 8. Mean Values for Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Benevolent Sexism, by Condition

	Mean Value (Std. Dev.)			
	Condition 1 (n= 29)	Condition 2 (n=26)	Condition 3 (n=20)	Condition 4 (n=30)
Ambivalent Sexism Inventory	**2.12 (.58)**	**2.16 (.49)**	**2.24 (.41)**	**2.12 (.36)**
Benevolent Sexism Subscale	2.19 (.55)	2.23 (.54)	2.40 (.58)	2.26 (.43)
Protective Paternalism Scale	2.43 (.86)	2.57 (.72)	2.76 (.85)	2.33 (.78)
ASI-17: A good woman should be set on a pedestal.	2.3 (1.63)	2.12 (1.34)	2.85 (1.63)	1.7 (1.29)
ASI-9: Women should be cherished and protected by men.	3.41 (1.40)	3.35 (1.47)	3.35 (1.57)	3.55 (1.57)
ASI-20: Men should sacrifice to provide for women.	2.21 (1.57)	2.5 (1.45)	2.85 (1.60)	2.23 (1.59)
ASI-3: In a disaster, women need not be rescued first.	1.79 (1.55)	2.31 (1.54)	2 (1.38)	1.9 (1.47)
Complementary Gender Differentiation Scale	1.84 (1.19)	1.77 (1.04)	2 (.94)	1.97 (1.01)
ASI-19: Women have a superior moral sensibility.	1.59 (1.43)	1.85 (1.41)	1.9 (1.07)	1.8 (1.30)
ASI-8: Women have a quality of purity few men possess.	1.90 (1.68)	1.31 (1.16)	1.75 (1.33)	1.93 (1.46)
ASI-22: Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.	2.03 (1.35)	2.15 (1.22)	2.35 (1.57)	2.17 (.95)
Heterosexual Intimacy Scale	2.22 (.63)	2.25 (.69)	2.35 (.62)	2.41 (.55)
ASI-12: Every man should have a woman he adores.	1.90 (1.90)	1.85 (1.59)	2.5 (1.50)	2.23 (1.61)
ASI-13: Men are complete without women.	2.55 (1.86)	2.81 (1.27)	2.3 (1.66)	2.57 (1.63)
ASI-1: Despite accomplishment, men are incomplete without women.	1.48 (1.78)	1.27 (1.48)	2.05 (1.61)	1.5 (1.78)
ASI-6: People are happy w/out heterosexual romance.	2.97 (1.74)	3.04 (1.43)	2.55 (1.64)	3.33 (1.35)

Conditions: 1=Gender + Sex-Negative; 2=Gender-Neutral + Sex-Negative; 3=Gender + Sex-Positive; 4= Gender-Neutral + Sex-Positive

I then conducted Analysis of Variance tests on the total ASI, Hostile Sexism, Benevolent Sexism, and ASI subscales[5] to determine if the means are different from each other. I summarize the findings from those below:

Table 9. Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Hostile Sexism, Benevolent Sexism, and Subscales

	ANOVA F-values (Prob>F)		
	Gender Language	Sex Language	Gender * Sex
ASI Total:	0.17 (.68)	0.20 (.66)	0.78 (.38)
Hostile Sexism:	0.04 (.85)	0.09 (.76)	0.35 (.55)
Benevolent Sexism:	0.26 (.61)	1.36 (.25)	0.77 (.38)
Subscale PP:	0.87 (.35)	0.09 (.77)	3.26 (.07)*
Subscale GD:	0.06 (.81)	0.73 (.39)	0.01 (.93)
Subscale H:	0.11 (.74)	1.36 (.25)	0.02 (.89)

n=105
*** $p < .01$; ** $p < .05$; * $p < .10$

There are no significant differences by condition for any of the ASI scales except for the Subscale Protective Paternalism at the .07 level for gender and sex language. This subscale measures sexism as a form of ambivalence and suggests that men are dyadically dependent on women as wives, mothers, romantic objects, etc., because of heterosexual reproduction; therefore, women should be loved, cherished, and protected. Protective Paternalism implies women are subordinate because their "weak nature" requires that men fulfill the protector-and-provider role (Glick and Fiske 1996). This gender and sex language interaction is somewhat

[5] Subscale 1: Paternalism (dominative and protective); Subscale 2: Gender Differentiation (competitive and complementary), and Subscale 3: Heterosexuality (hostile and intimate).

difficult to interpret in this context but basically shows that means are slightly higher when language is gendered and consensual sex is emphasized (condition 3).

5.3.3. Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (IRMAS-R)

The Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (IRMAS) – short form, developed by Payne, Lonsway, and Fitzgerald (1999), is a 20-item questionnaire designed to assess the participants' acceptance of rape myths. Each item is rated on a 7-point Likert scale, from "not at all agree" (1) to "very much agree" (7). Scores are obtained by totaling the ratings for 17 of the 20 items. To be consistent with the ASI scoring, "1" is "not at all agree" and "7" is "very much agree," so that higher total scores would indicate a greater endorsement of rape myths. The scale yields scores ranging from 17 to 119. There are also seven subscales.

I predicted that the policy to which the participants were exposed would make a difference, with higher IRMAS scores in conditions with and gendered language and sex-negative language. The means for the different conditions are shown in Table 10.

Table 10. Mean Values for Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (IRMAS), by Condition

	Mean Value (Std. Dev.)			
	Condition 1 (n=29)	Condition 2 (n=26)	Condition 3 (n=20)	Condition 4 (n=30)
IRMAS total:	28.66(11.1)	30.85(11.5)	32.15(10.4)	28.87(12.4)
Subscale SA:	5.97 (2.31)	7.62 (4.45)	7.8 (3.75)	6.7 (3.87)
Subscale NR:	2.28 (0.84)	2.19 (.57)	2.6 (1.23)	2.37 (1.15)
Subscale MT:	4.83 (2.84)	5.04 (2.73)	5.9 (3.21)	5.53 (2.67)
Subscale WI:	2.93 (1.64)	2.81 (1.13)	2.9 (1.74)	3.07 (2.26)
Subscale LI:	5.10 (3.23)	5.35 (2.73)	5.35 (2.56)	4.63 (2.37)
Subscale TE:	2.76 (1.35)	2.81 (1.27)	2.8 (2.56)	2.6 (1.33)
Subscale DE:	5.31 (3.24)	5.73 (3.22)	5.25 (2.47)	5.2 (2.70)

Conditions: 1=Gender + Sex-Negative; 2=Gender-Neutral + Sex-Negative; 3=Gender + Sex-Positive; 4= Gender-Neutral + Sex-Positive

I then conducted Analysis of Variance tests on the IRMAS and IRMAS subscales[6] to determine if the means are different from each other. I summarize the findings from those below:

Table 11. Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (IRMAS) and Subscales

	ANOVA F-values (Prob>F)		
	Gender Language	Sex Language	Gender * Sex
IRMAS Total:	0.00 (.98)	0.31 (.58)	0.97 (.33)
Subscale SA:	0.15 (.70)	0.41 (0.53)	3.63 (0.06)*
Subscale NR:	0.68 (.41)	1.68 (.20)	0.15 (.70)
Subscale MT:	0.02 (.89)	1.94 (.17)	0.26 (.61)
Subscale WI:	0.00 (.95)	0.11 (.74)	0.17 (.68)
Subscale LI:	0.19 (.66)	0.18 (.67)	0.78 (.38)
Subscale TE:	0.08 (.78)	0.10 (.75)	0.22 (.64)
Subscale DE:	0.10 (.75)	0.26 (.61)	0.16 (.69)

n=105
*** $p < .01$; ** $p < .05$; * $p < .10$

If we consider the entire IRMAS scale (with an alpha of .85), there is no effect by condition. The only subscale that demonstrates an effect is "she asked for it (SA)" (F (1, 101) =3.63, p=.06) for the interaction between gender and sex language. The Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale was coded so that higher means on the IRMAS and IRMAS subscales indicate greater endorsing of rape myths. The interaction suggests that those in the condition in which sexual assault language and gendered language is used endorse "she asked for it" rape myths *less* than in other conditions.

[6] Subscale 1: She asked for it (SA); Subscale 2: Subscale: It wasn't really rape (NR); Subscale 3: He didn't mean to (MT); Subscale 4: She wanted it (WI); Subscale 5: She lied (LI); Subscale 6: Rape is a trivial event (TE); Subscale 7: Rape is a deviant event (DE)

5.3.4. Likeliness to Rape

The rape proclivity questions measure participants' propensity to commit sexual assault and the (hypothetical) percentage of men that would force a woman to have sex if they could be assured of not being caught and punished. On the rape proclivity question, a score greater than 1 (1 out of 5) indicates a willingness to rape. I predicted that the policy to which the participants were exposed would make a difference, with increased rape proclivity for self and particularly others in conditions with and gendered language and sex-negative language. The means for the different conditions are shown in Table 12.

Table 12. Mean Values for Rape Proclivity, by Condition

	Mean Value (Std. Dev.)			
	Condition 1 (n=29)	Condition 2 (n=26)	Condition 3 (n=20)	Condition 4 (n=30)
Rape Proclivity:	1.14 (.74)	1.15 (.61)	1 (0)	1.07 (.37)

Conditions: 1=Gender + Sex-Negative; 2=Gender-Neutral + Sex-Negative; 3=Gender + Sex-Positive; 4= Gender-Neutral + Sex-Positive

I also added a rape proclivity question for others that asked, "In your opinion, what percentage of men would force a woman to have sex if they could be assured of not being caught and punished?" The score is a percentage of the likelihood of other men's willingness to rape that could range from 0% to 100%. The higher the percentage, or the mean, the higher the percentage participants thought men would force a woman to have sex if they could be assured of not being caught and punished. I predicted that the policy to which the participants were exposed would make a difference, with increased rape proclivity for others in conditions with

gendered language and sex-negative language. The means for the different conditions are shown in Table 13.

Table 13. Mean Values for Percentage Estimates of Rape Proclivity of Others, by Condition

	Mean Value (Std. Dev.)			
	Condition 1 (n=29)	Condition 2 (n=26)	Condition 3 (n=20)	Condition 4 (n=30)
Others:	3.00 (9.03)	8.37 (22.36)	5.23 (12.39)	5.50 (16.28)

Conditions: 1=Gender + Sex-Negative; 2=Gender-Neutral + Sex-Negative; 3=Gender + Sex-Positive; 4= Gender-Neutral + Sex-Positive

I then conducted Analysis of Variance tests on the Rape Proclivity for Self and for Others to determine if the means are different from each other. ANOVA revealed no significant differences by condition. As shown in the means, there was not much variation for rape proclivity or estimated rape proclivity of others. Please see Appendix E for the ANOVA tables for Rape Proclivity and Rape Proclivity for Others.

5.3.5. Policy Compliance

The Compliance to Policy Index measures participants' anticipated support and self-reported likeliness to comply with the given policy statement they were assigned to. This scale consists of 3 questions that ask participants' (on a 7-point scale): Question 1) if they support the policy (1 being "do not support at all" to 7 "very much support"); Question 2) how likely, as a student, are they to comply with the policy statement they read (1 being not likely at all to 7 very much likely); and Question 3) how likely, as a student, are they to report a violation of the policy statement they read to the Office of Student Misconduct (1 being not likely at all to 7 very much likely).

The higher the score on the index, the higher the anticipated compliance with the policy. I predicted that the policy to which the participants were exposed would make a difference, with lower policy compliance scores in conditions with gendered language and sex-negative language. The means for the different conditions are shown in Table 14.

Table 14. Mean Values for Compliance to Policy Index, by Condition

	Mean Value (Std. Dev.)			
	Condition 1 (n=29)	Condition 2 (n=26)	Condition 3 (n=20)	Condition 4 (n=30)
Total Policy Index:	19.55 (1.76)	20.15 (1.35)	18.65 (2.30)	18.97 (2.89)
Q1 Support:	6.38 (1.08)	6.77 (.51)	6.05 (1.15)	6.33 (1.45)
Q2 Compliance:	6.93 (.28)	6.88 (.36)	6.95 (.22)	6.63 (.93)
Q3 Reporting:	6.24 (1.09)	6.5 (.91)	5.65 (1.66)	6 (1.14)

Conditions: 1=Gender + Sex-Negative; 2=Gender-Neutral + Sex-Negative; 3=Gender + Sex-Positive; 4= Gender-Neutral + Sex-Positive

I then conducted Analysis of Variance tests on the Compliance to Policy Index and individual policy questions to determine if the means are different from each other. I summarize the findings from those below:

Table 15. Compliance to Policy Index

	ANOVA F-values (Prob>F)		
	Gender Language	Sex Language	Gender * Sex
Total Policy Index:	1.15 (.29)	5.92 (.02)**	0.11 (.74)
Q1 Support:	2.34 (.13)	3.03 (.09)*	0.06 (.81)
Q2 Compliance:	2.80 (.09)*	1.15 (.29)	1.55 (.22)
Q3 Reporting:	1.66 (.20)	5.33 (.02)*	0.04 (.85)

(n=105)
*** $p < .01$; ** $p < .05$; * $p < .10$

For the most part, the ANOVA indicates that sex language did make a difference in anticipated total policy compliance. When sex-negative, or sexual assault language, was used, agreement with policies was higher, as shown by the higher means indicating higher total compliance with the policy. In particular, those in the sex-negative conditions showed greater total support for the policy they were exposed to than those in the sex-positive conditions. In the sex-negative conditions (conditions 1 and 2), the means for total policy compliance were M = 19.55 (SD =1.76), and M = 20.15 (SD = 1.35), whereas the means for sex-positive conditions (conditions 3 and 4) were M = 18.65 (SD = 2.30), and M = 18.97 (SD = 2.89).

When the policy compliance questions are analyzed separately, anticipated policy support and likeliness to report a violation of the policy were higher for the sex-negative language conditions. In the sex-negative conditions (conditions 1 and 2), the means for policy support were M = 6.38 (SD =1.08), and M = 6.77 (SD = .51), whereas the means for sex-positive (conditions 3 and 4) were M = 6.05 (SD = 1.15), and M = 6.33 (SD = 1.45). In the sex-negative conditions (conditions 1 and 2), the means for policy reporting were M = 6.24 (SD =1.09), and

M = 6.5 (SD = .91), whereas the means for sex-positive (conditions 3 and 4) were M = 5.65 (SD = 1.66), and M = 6 (SD = 1.14).

Those in the gendered language conditions were slightly more likely to respond higher on the policy compliance index question, "On a scale of 1 to 7, how likely are you, as a student, to report a violation of the policy statement to the Office of Student Misconduct?" In the gendered conditions (conditions 1 and 3), the means for policy compliance alone were M = 6.93 (SD =.28) and M = 6.95 (SD = .22), whereas the means for gender-neutral (conditions 2 and 4) were M = 6.88 (SD = .36), and M = 6.63 (SD = .93).

5.3.6. Donation

The donation measure serves as a behavior measure that gauges participants' willingness to contribute, or willingness to pay (WTP), to a campaign aimed at reducing sexual violence, and if so, how much. For the donation question, participants were asked if they would like to donate a portion (or all) of the $17 award to a campaign that supports either anti-sexual assault awareness or consensual sex awareness. They indicated if and how much they would want to donate. As such, participants were asked a two-part question: 1) "You will receive a $17 payment for your participation today. You may choose to donate a portion of your earnings to a campaign that supports anti-sexual assault (or consensual sex) awareness. Would you like to donate?" (choose yes or no) and 2) "Please list how much you would like to donate by writing the amount in the blank below (fill in the blank)."

I predicted that those in gender and sex-negative language conditions would donate less than those in the gender-neutral and sex-positive conditions. The donation amount is an interval measurement, as such, please see Table 16 for the mean value for each condition.

Table 16. Mean Values for Donation Amount, by Condition

	Mean Value (Std. Dev.)			
	Condition 1 (n=29)	Condition 2 (n=26)	Condition 3 (n=20)	Condition 4 (n=30)
Total:	2.34 (4.58)	2.09 (4.18)	0 (0)	0.7 (1.74)

Conditions: 1=Gender + Sex-Negative; 2=Gender-Neutral + Sex-Negative; 3=Gender + Sex-Positive; 4= Gender-Neutral + Sex-Positive

I then conducted Analysis of Variance tests on the Donation Amount measure to determine if the means are different from each other. I summarize the findings from those below:

Table 17. Donation Amount

	ANOVA F-values (Prob>F)		
	Gender Language	Sex Language	Gender * Sex
Donation:	0.12 (.73)	8.10 (0.01)***	0.53(.47)

*** $p < .01$; ** $p < .05$; * $p < .10$

The ANOVA results suggested that those in the sex-negative conditions were significantly more likely to donate than those in the sex-positive conditions. In the sex-negative conditions (conditions 1 and 2), the means for donation amount were M = 2.34 (SD =4.58), and M = 2.09 (SD = 4.18), whereas the means for sex-positive (conditions 3 and 4) were M = 0 (SD = 0), and M = 0.7 (SD = 1.74).

5.3.7. Baselines and Effect Calculations

I found that the experimental conditions made little difference in participants' attitudes toward gender, sexism, or rape myths. However, the language used in the policies did make significant differences for policy compliance and donation to organizations. These differences

were the opposite of what I had predicted. In fact, sex-negative language (sexual assault) led to greater donations (to organizations combatting sexual assault) and greater endorsement of the policies that used sexual assault language.

Whereas I had predicted that gender-neutral language and sex-positive (consensual sex) language would push participants toward more equitable gender attitudes and policy compliance, this was not the case. In fact, gender language had minimal effect. Additionally, it was sexual assault language that had the most effect on policy compliance. While I did not have specific predictions about donations, language that emphasized sexual assault created greater donations than did language about consensual sex.

We know from the ANOVAs that the sexual assault language affected policy compliance and donation measures. We can assess effect sizes to see how strong this effect is. We do this first with the factorial and then in comparison to the baselines.

To assess policy compliance, we can create a t-test between sex assault language conditions and consensual sex conditions and then estimate the effect size. Cohen's d is .46, which is considered a medium effect. See Table 18 below for the t-test and effect size results.

Table 18. Two-Sample t-test with Equal Variances for Policy Compliance by Sex Language Conditions (Factorial)

	Mean	Std. Error	Std. Dev	t-test	Prob
Sex-Negative (n=55):	19.84	.22	1.60	2.36	0.02**
Sex-Positive (n=50):	18.84	.38	2.65		
*** $p < .01$; ** $p < .05$; * $p < .10$					

	Estimate	95% Conf. Interval	
Cohen's d:	.46	.07	.85
Hedge's g:	.46	.07	.84

We can do the same kind of assessment of the effects of sexual assault language on donations. The Cohen's d effect is .55, also considered a medium effect. See Table 19 below for the t-test and effect size results.

Table 19. Two-Sample t-test with Equal Variances for Donation by Sex Language Conditions (Factorial)

	Mean	Std. Error	Std. Dev	t-test	Prob
Sex-Negative (n=55):	2.23	.59	4.35	2.80	0.01***
Sex-Positive (n=50):	.42	.20	1.42		
*** $p < .01$; ** $p < .05$; * $p < .10$					

	Estimate	95% Conf. Interval	
Cohen's d:	.55	.16	.94
Hedge's g:	.54	.16	.93

5.3.7.1. Baselines

I created the baseline conditions to enable estimates of the effects of the factorial conditions themselves. Sexual assault language for policy compliance and for donations was significantly different from other conditions and produced medium effects. We can also assess whether the results obtained from the policy language themselves are different from what was obtained with no relevant policy language. Again, given the lack of significant results for the attitudinal measures regarding gender beliefs, I consider the differences between the significant results for sexual assault language for policy compliance and for donations.

For policy compliance, the manipulation of policy language is more effective than the baselines. The endorsement of policy is different for those who are exposed to policies about sexual assault compared to polices about consensual sex (as indicated by the factorial ANOVA) or to policies about academic honesty. To analyze this, we compare the mean policy

endorsement for the sex assault language in the factorial vs. academic dishonesty compliance language in the baseline.[7] The effect size (Cohen's d) is .95, which is quite large. See Table 20 for the t-test and effect size results.

Table 20. Two-Sample t-test with Equal Variances for Policy Compliance by Sex-Negative Language vs. Academic Dishonesty Language Baseline

	Mean	Std. Error	Std. Dev	t-test	Prob
Sex-Negative (n=55):	19.84	.22	1.60	3.68	0.00***
Baseline 1 (n=21):	17.95	.61	2.80		

*** $p < .01$; ** $p < .05$; * $p < .10$

	Estimate	95% Conf. Interval	
Cohen's d:	.95	.42	1.46
Hedge's g:	.94	.41	1.45

I did the same type of analysis to compare the donation measure prompted by the sexual assault language in the policy exposure and the donation measure in the baseline, which uses sexual assault language but does not include sexual assault training. However, when we compare the result from the sex-negative language conditions vs. the baseline condition, which assesses only the language for the donation measure, we see little difference between them. Consequently, it is the *language of sexual assault* driving the heightened donations, not necessarily the policy manipulations themselves. See Table 21.

[7] A comparison with Baseline 1 for the other baseline is not needed, as it was lower than the other.

Table 21. Two-Sample t-test with Equal Variances for Donation by Sex-Negative vs. Sex-Negative Baseline

	Mean	Std. Error	Std. Dev	t-test	Prob
Sex-Negative (n=55):	2.23	.59	4.35	-0.01	0.99
Sex-Negative Baseline (n=21):	2.24	1.13	5.17		

*** $p < .01$; ** $p < .05$; * $p < .10$

6. DISCUSSION

6.1. Summary of the Experimental Results

This study was unique in that it experimentally manipulated different policy interventions to determine if the different kinds of policies might lead to differences in attitudes, behavioral intentions, and donations to organizations. The experiment's premise was that changing the language used to discuss both gender and sexual behavior would have strong effects on policy compliance and attitudes toward gender. To assess the premise, I created an experiment in which white men were participants. The experiment created conditions in which the men read and actively spoke the policies aloud for a recording. Further, they answered questions that ensured that they understood the policies to which they were exposed. I randomly assigned the participants in a factorial experiment that varied the language of gender (either traditional or neutral) and the language of sexual assault (either against sexual assault or emphasizing consensual sexual behavior). Additionally, I included two baseline conditions in which the policies read did not incorporate gender or sex language but did include all of the same the dependent variables used in the factorial design.

I found that none of my hypotheses were supported. In fact, emphasizing gender-neutral language had virtually no effect, and emphasizing sexual assault language had a large effect on compliance to policies and to donations to organizations. These findings demonstrates that the general measures of attitudes -- the GBI, ASI, and the IRMAS -- are resistant to change. However, importantly, anticipated compliance measures did indicate that language of the policies made a difference. This difference was brought about by the language and trainings themselves, as evidenced by comparing the effects between the sex language conditions of the

factorial with the baselines. Anticipated compliance was higher when policy language used the language of preventing sexual assault.

On the other hand, there was a significant effect of sex language for donations; larger donations resulted from questions emphasizing the prevention of sexual assault. When I compared these robust results to the baseline measures, which did not employ the same training language but did use the same language for donation, the results were virtually the same. This finding indicates that, for donations, only the asking language itself phrased in terms of sexual assault made the difference—it was not the training language, per se.

6.2. Conclusions and Implications

There are multiple implications of this research. Utilizing experimental method enables the isolation of mechanisms based on the scope conditions in which anti-sexual assault policies encounter resistance or compliance. As mentioned, one of the puzzling issues surrounding gender equality is that despite a steady decline in sexism and sexist attitudes, increased support for gender equality, and reduction of private/feminine versus public/masculine sphere ideology, there is still resistance to policies surrounding reducing sexual violence against women. As such, this research aimed to identify the causal mechanisms affecting this resistance to provide new ways of exploring and disrupting attitudes against sexual violence policies.

As mentioned, my hypotheses suggested that gender-neutral language and sex-positive language would produce more positive attitudes toward women and increased compliance to policies. While language did have an effect, it was opposite to what I predicted. Sexual assault language used in the policy statements drove compliance to the policies higher and increased donations to organizations. There are several plausible reasons why this might occur.

First, the criminology literature and the social psychology literature point toward more emotional responses to violence (sexual assault) rather than to its opposite, sexual consensus. There is a long line of social psychological research that has indicated that people respond differently to losses (in this case, the loss by the man or woman assaulted) than to gains (in this case, consensual sexual relations) (See Kahneman and Tversky 1979; Sell and Son 1984). It may be that the consequences of sexual assault are viewed as so negatively that they increased the importance of compliance and the impetus for donation. This may be related to the recent visibility of high-profile rape and sexual assault cases due to the #MeToo movement, which may have raised participants' awareness of gender issues, including sexual violence, or the social desirability of being seen as non-sexist and not sexually violent.

While current sex-positive rhetoric inspired the sex-positive policies I generated, this rhetoric is not the norm for university policies. Therefore, participants may not have processed the language as intended, or if they did, resisted complying with it because they felt it infringed on their perceived behavioral freedoms (Byrne and Hart 2016; Malamuth, Huppin, and Linz 2018). Previous studies such as Malamuth et al. 2018 found that men exhibit a "hostility reactance," based on the idea that when people feel a perceived threat to behavioral freedom, they will be motivated by distress, anxiety, and/or resistance to restore that freedom (Brehm 1966). This may help to explain why men resist anti-sexual assault policy trainings.

It is possible that the participants in this study did not see themselves violating the sexual assault language policies, i.e., did not see themselves as rapists, so there was no threat to their behavioral freedom, but did see the sex-positive policies as a threat. The participants may have felt that the sex-positive approach, compared to the sex-negative/sexual assault language, imposed men's current sexual privileges and power. Previous research has found that while there

are gender similarities in how people define sexual consent, there are gender differences in how men and women indicate and gain consent and interpret sexual consent and non-sexual consent from potential sexual partners (Jozkowski et al. 2014).

Another possible explanation is that the sex-positive policy scripts I generated aligned too closely with the current "consent is sexy" campaigns. These campaigns also borrow language from sex-positivity, i.e., messages that highlight improved communication between potential sexual partners ("yes means yes" or "consent is sexy") rather than defining sexual assault ("no means no"), to advocate increasing sexual communication and reducing sexual taboos among college students (Hovick and Nathan Silver 2019). Previous studies that explored college students' reactions to "consent is sexy" campaigns found student recall and response was mostly positive for these campaigns (Hovick and Nathan Silver 2019; Thomas, Sorenson and Joshi 2016). However, these campaigns were restricted to campus-wide print media campaigns that used provocative slogans on brightly colored banners and posters, and not university policies.

While the "consent is sexy" mantra is well-meaning, this form of anti-sexual assault campaigning may be seen as "slacktivism" or "cutesy activism" and may trivialize and undermine the severity of sexual assault. While treating consent as a flirtatious process is not necessarily problematic, sexualizing and romanticizing consent may endanger potential sexual partners not treating consent as a mandatory process. It may distort sexual assault as "unsexy sex," further reinforcing existing rape myths of "sex gone wrong." In short, the approach may also undermine its aims.

It is also possible that because public university students, including the students in this study, are required to undergo a Title IX training the participants were more predisposed to understand consent through the conception of sexual assault language, and the sex-positive

language was too different from their existing internalized version of sexual assault prevention. Participants may not have realized the sex-positive language was also addressing that as sex without affirmative consent is sexual assault. This is evident by the fact that for the question, "Have you previously participated in sexual assault prevention training?" participants in sex-negative conditions reported "yes" at a higher rate than those in the sex-positive conditions. Because all of the students who participated in this study would have taken part in at least one mandatory Title IX training through the university (in order to register for classes), we know this response should have been "yes" for everyone, and there should *not* have been differences between conditions. In this case, sex-negative language conditions may have reminded students of previous Title IX training, whereas sex-positive language may have seemed very different from the training.

6.2.1. Implications for Application

I address two of the findings that have the most implications for policy. First, donations were more likely when sexual assault language was used. The results indicate similar donation amounts in both the policy and the baseline settings in which there were no policies referring to sexual assault.[8] This finding suggests that donations should be requested for sexual assault prevention; this is an important contribution by the current research because analyzing potential donation behavior based on the language framing has not been much investigated.

Previous research has demonstrated the effectiveness of several types of donation appeals; this includes studies that tested matching donations (Choi, Mattila, and Quadri-Felitti 2019; Hanks, Line and Mattila 2016); the role of cost vs. benefits (self vs. society) for the

[8] Based on the question, "You will receive a $17 payment for your participation today. You may choose to donate a portion of your earnings to a campaign that supports anti-sexual assault (or consensual sex) awareness. Would you like to donate?" (choose yes or no) and 2) "Please list how much you would like to donate by writing the amount in the blank below (fill in the blank)."

potential donor (Richman, DeWall, and Wolff 2015; Sussman, Sharma, and Alter 2015); and the potential donor's perceived impact and effectiveness of the donation (Erlandsson, Björklund, and Bäckström 2015). Previous research also focused on the "warm glow," or a good and warm feeling which comes from the act of giving alone as a giving incentive (Crumpler and Grossman 2008). Because the sex-negative language conditions were far more likely to contribute donations than the experimental conditions, none of those mentioned reasons fully explain donation contributions by participants in this experiment. Sexual assault language alone had an impact on donation contributions.

These findings are notable for application because previous experimental research suggests that the use of charitable donations can enhance prosocial behavior (Butz and Harbring 2020; Charness, Cobo-Reyes and Sánchez 2016; Wood et al. 2016). Donation contributions may give participants the chance to signal their willingness to support, or comply with, a message. Evidence from dictator game experiments suggests that contributions triple when the receiver of a donation is a charity rather than a person (Eckel and Grossman 1996).

Charitable donations may also bring attention to societal issues (in this case, sexual assault prevention) in a more subtle, less "preachy" way compared to other prevention efforts. For example, the state of Texas enacted a law in September 2017 that "directs the Department of Public Safety to allow Texans to contribute to that cause when applying for and renewing driver's licenses and personal identification certificates (Malewitz 2017)." One of these causes is dedicated to the testing of sexual assault kits. Driver's license applications ask Texans whether they would like to donate $1 or more for sexual assault kit testing in a statewide effort to reduce rape kit backlog. Analysis of rape kits cost anywhere from $500 - $2000 each, and according to forensic analysts and victim advocates, testing the kits is paramount to solving sexual assault

cases (Malewitz 2017). Within the first five months of Texas enacting this crowdfunding law, approximately $250,000 was donated (Samuels 2018). While donors may not know how their specific donation affects the rape kit backlog, it does draw attention to the issues.

Secondly, the other important implication for policy relates to the policy compliance findings. My study suggested that total anticipated policy compliance was highest when the policy language used was that of preventing sexual assault. While this contradicted the hypotheses, it does demonstrate that policy compliance is influenced by how specific policy messages are framed and delivered. These findings are important for application because anti-sexual assault policies reflect organizational standards and also construct norms and expectations for students, staff, faculty, and other people in higher education.

There is evidence from previous research that deterrence prevention models, in which individuals are encouraged to comply with policies to protect self- interest and avoid punishment, are more effective than prosocial, social norm (non-deterrence) models (Luengo, Caffera, and Chavez 2020). Anti-sexual violence advocates argue that inadequate university responses to victim complaints and weak punishments for offenders are the primary source for continued college campus sexual assault numbers and rape culture at large (Bazelon 2014; Marcus 1992). That is, universities do not respond punitively enough to sexual assault. Part of this is because, under Title IX's equal education guarantee, campus sexual assault is treated as a civil rights violation and handled through adjudicative proceedings. For some, this is problematic because university officials do not refer the case to criminal courts.

Victim advocates sometimes refer to the Title IX university disciplinary proceedings as "kangaroo courts" because universities lack the institutional competency to address sexual assault since sexual assault is nothing like academic dishonesty or violating an honor code.

College campuses treating sexual assault as a mere violation of the student handbook, rather than an accusation to be referred to the criminal justice system, may affect non-compliance. Based on this study's results, utilizing sexual assault language that reinforces sexual assault as a serious crime may increase compliance.

6.3. Limitations and Considerations for Future Research

There were limitations in the study protocol. Due to COVID-19, the study was moved from an in-person lab study to an online study. While I tried to replicate the online study to be close to the original in-person study, there are some factors I could not control for (such as participants' environment, volume, etc.). To compensate for this, I included multiple attention checks throughout the study. The attention checks included a timer for each survey page and questions for the participant to respond to that verified their understanding of what was being asked of them.

On the other hand, given the majority of Title IX policies and trainings are presented online, it may be advantageous to conduct the study online. Additionally, the participant did not have to meet with a researcher in-person (or via telecommuting), which may have reduced the impact of social desirability. Future studies may aim for in-person studies to replicate these findings and determine differences between online and in-person studies. Differences might point to suggested paths for policy training.

For future research, I would like to isolate sexual assault language further to determine why results were counter to the hypotheses. As a preliminary prediction, it may because sexual assault language was reflective of an increased focus on (perceived) punishment (Tinkler, Clay-Warne, and Alinor 2018). I want to retest the model with sexual assault conditions that emphasize or do not emphasize threat of punishment to determine if there are differences.

Additionally, I would like to generate a series of training programs, similar to Title IX trainings, for participants' active involvement. While participants were exposed to the policy script four different ways in the current study, it may be beneficial to test policy language exposure during longer trainings.

The current study demonstrates the effects of language framing on subsequent donation and policy compliance to specific causes, particularly those related to gender issues. The findings have implications for charitable organizations seeking donations and college campuses designing well-crafted policies that increase compliance. An effectively framed policy can serve as a preventative measure and a tool of deterrence. Future research should further explore the role of language and framing strategies to encourage charitable giving and policy compliance.

REFERENCES

Abrams, Dominic, G. Tendayi Viki, Barbara Masser, and Gerd Bohner. 2003. "Perceptions of Stranger and Acquaintance Rape: The Role of Benevolent and Hostile Sexism in Victim Blame and Rape Proclivity." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 84(1): 111-125. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.84.1.111.

Anderson, Michelle, J. 2005. "Negotiating Sex." *Southern California Law Review* 78(6): 1401-1438.

Arkes, Hal R., Cynthia A. Joynr, Mark V. Pezzo, Jane Gradwohl Nash, Karen Siegel-Jacobs, and Eric Stone. 1994. "The Psychology of Windfall Gains." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 59(3):331-347. doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1994.1063.

Baggett, Linda R., Ethan Eisen, Rivas, Sara Gonzalez, Lacy A. Olson, Rebecca P. Cameron, and Linda R. Mona. 2017. "Sex-Positive Assessment and Treatment Among Female Trauma Survivors." *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 73(8):965-974. doi:10.1002/jclp.22510.

Banyard, Victoria L., Elizabeth G. Plante, and Mary M. Moynihan 2004. "Rape Prevention Through Bystander Education: Bringing a Broader Community Perspective to Sexual Violence Prevention." Final report to National Institute of Justice (NIJ) for grant 2002-WG-BX-0009. Retrieved August 2019 (www.ncjrs.org0pdffiles10nij0grants0208701.pdf).

Bazelon, Emily. 2014. "Suspension isn't Enough: Universities are Letting Students off Way too Easy for Sexual Assault." *Slate*, June 06. Retrieved August 2020 (https://slate.com/human-interest/2014/06/stanford-sexual-assault-case-did-the-university-do-enough-to-punish-a-student-it-found-responsible-for-sexual-misconduct.html).

Berger, Joseph, and Thomas L. Conner. 1969. ‘‘Performance Expectations and Behavior in Small Groups.’’ *Acta Sociologica* 12(4):186-198. doi: 10.1177/000169936901200403.

Berger, Joseph, and Murray Webster, Jr. 2006. “Expectations, Status and Behavior.” Pp. 268-302 in *Contemporary Social Psychological Theories*, edited by P. J. Burke. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Berger, Joseph, David G. Wagner, and Morris Zelditch Jr. 1985. ‘‘Introduction: Expectation States Theory: Review and Assessment.’’ Pp. 1-72 in *Theoretical Research Programs: Studies in the Growth of Theory*, edited by Joseph Berger and Morris Zelditch Jr. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Berger, Joseph M., Cecilia L. Ridgeway and Morris Zelditch, Jr. 2002. “Construction of Status and Referential Structures.” *Sociological Theory* 20(2):157-179. doi: 10.1111/1467-9558.00157.

Berger, Joseph M., Hamit Fisek, Robert Z. Norman, and Morris Zelditch Jr. 1977. *Status Characteristics and Social Interaction: An Expectation States Approach*. New York, NY: Elsevier.

Black, Michelle. C., Kathleen C. Basile, Matthew J. Breiding, Sharon G. Smith, Mikel L. Walters, Melissa T. Merrick, Jieru Chen, and Mark R. Stevens. 2011. “The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 Summary Report. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Bouffard, Leana, and Amanda Goodson. 2017. “Sexual Coercion, Sexual Aggression, or Sexual Assault: How Measurement Impacts our Understanding of Sexual Violence.” *Journal of Aggression, Conflict, and Peace Research* 9(4):269-278. doi: 10.1108/JACPR-05-2017-0292.

Brown, DeNeen L. 2017. “Missouri v. Celia, a Slave: She Killed the White Master Raping Her, Then Claimed Self-Defense.” *The Washington Post*. Retrieved August 2020 (https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/retropolis/wp/2017/10/19/missouri-v-celia-a-slave-she-killed-the-white-master-raping-her-then-claimed-self-defense).

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

Butz, Britta, and Christine Harbring. 2020. “Donations as an Incentive for Cooperation in Public Good Games.” *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* 85:1-9. doi: 10.1016/j.socec.2019.101510.

Byrne, Sahara, and Philip Solomon Hart. 2009. “The Boomerang Effect A Synthesis of Findings and a Preliminary Theoretical Framework.” *Annals of the International Communication Association* 33(1):3-37. doi: 10.1080/23808985.2009.11679083.

Campbell, Alex. 2005. “Keeping the Lady Safe: The Regulations of Femininity through Crime Prevention Literature.” *Critical Criminology* 13(2):119-140. doi:10.1007/s10612-005-2390-z.

Charness, Gary, Ramón Cobo-Reyes, and Ángela Sánchez. 2016. “The Effect of Charitable Giving on Workers’ Performance: Experimental Evidence.” *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 131(A): 61-74. doi: 10.1016/j.jebo.2016.08.009.

Choi, Sungwoo, Anna S. Mattila, and Donna Quadri-Felitti. 2019. "Donation Appeals Rewarding Fitness in the Context of CSR Initiatives." *Journal of Services Marketing* 33(2):160-167. doi: 10.1108/JSM-12-2017-0421.

Christie, Michael. 2007. "An Examination of the Disparity between Hypothetical and Actual Willingness to Pay Using the Contingent Valuation Method: The Case of Red Kite Conservation in the United Kingdom." *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics* 55(2):159-169.

Correll, Shelley J. 2001. "Gender and the Career Choice Process: The Role of Biased Self-Assessments." *American Journal of Sociology* 106(6):1691-1730. doi: 10.1086/321299.

Correll, Shelley J. 2007. "Social Psychology of Gender" in *Advances in Group Processes* Vol. 24, edited by Shelley Correll. New York, NY: Elsevier Science.

Correll, Shelley J., and Cecilia L. Ridgeway. 2003. "Expectation States Theory." Pp. 29-52 in *The Handbook of Social Psychology,* edited by J. Delamater. New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.

Correll, Shelley J., Stephen Benard, and In Paik. 2007. "Getting a Job: Is There a Motherhood Penalty?" *American Journal of Sociology* 112(5):1297-1338. doi: 10.1086/511799.

Crumpler, Heidi, and Philip J. Grossman. 2008. "An Experimental Test of Warm Glow Giving." *Journal of Public Economics* 92(5-6):1011-1021.

Cyphert, Amy B. 2018. "The Devil is in the Details: Exploring Restorative Justice as an Option for Campus Sexual Assault Responses Under Title IX." *Denver Law Review* 96(1): 51-85.

Davis, Angela Y. 1983. *Women, Race & Class*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

DeGue, Sarah. 2014. “Preventing Sexual Violence on College Campuses: Lessons from Research and Practice.” *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention*. Retrieved October 2018 (https://www.notalone.gov/schools).

DeGue, Sarah, Thomas R. Simon, Kathleen C. Basile, Sue Lin Yee, Karen Lang, and Howard Spivak. 2012. “Moving Forward by Looking Back: Reflecting on a Decade of CDC's Work in Sexual Violence Prevention, 2000-2010.” *Journal of Women's Health* 21(12):1211-1218. doi: 10.1089/jwh.2012.3973.

DeGue, Sarah, Linda Anne Valle, Melissa K. Holt, Greta M. Massetti, Jennifer L. Matjasko, and Andra Teten Tharp. 2014. “A Systematic Review of Primary Prevention Strategies for Sexual Violence Perpetration.” *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 19(4):346-362. doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2014.05.004.

Eckel, Catherine C., and Philip J. Grossman. 1996. “Altruism in Anonymous Dictator Games.” *Games and Economic Behavior* 16(2):181-191. doi: 10.1006/game.1996.0081.

Edwards, Katie M., Jessica A. Turchik, Christina M. Dardis, Nicole Reynolds, and Christine A. Gidycz. 2011. “Rape Myths: History, Individual and Institutional-Level Presence, and Implications for Change.” *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research* 65 (11–12): 761-773. doi:10.1007/s11199-011-9943-2.

Edwards, Sarah R., Kathryn A. Bradshaw, and Verlin B. Hinsz. 2014. “Denying Rape but Endorsing Forceful Intercourse: Exploring Differences Among Responders.” *Violence and Gender* 1(4):188-193. doi: 10.1089/vio.2014.0022.

Erlandsson, Arvid, Fredrik Björklund, and Martin Bäckström. 2015. "Emotional Reactions, Perceived Impact and Perceived Responsibility Mediate the Identifiable Victim Effect, Proportion Dominance Effect and In-group Effect Respectively." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 127:1-14. doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2014.11.003.

Exner, Deinera, and Nina Cummings 2011. "Implications for Sexual Assault Prevention: College Students as Prosocial Bystanders." *Journal of American College Health* 59(7): 655-670.

Farris, Coreen, Teresa A. Treat, Richard J. Viken, and Richard M. McFall. 2008. "Sexual Coercion and the Misperception of Sexual Intent." *Clinical Psychology Review* 28(1):48-66. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2007.03.002.

Feminist Campus. 2021. "Sex Positivity." Retrieved May 2021 (https://feministcampus.org/campaigns/sex-positivity).

Fisher, Bonnie S., Francis T. Cullen, and Michael G. Turner. 2000. "The Sexual Victimization of College Women." *National Institute of Justice and Bureau of Justice* Statistics, Report No. NIJ 182369. Washington, DC.

Fisher, Bonnie S., Jennifer L. Hartman, Francis T. Cullen, and Michael G. Turner. 2002. "Making Campuses Safer for Students: The Clery Act as a Symbolic Legal Reform." *Stetson Law Review* 32(1):61-89.

Fiske, Susan. 1998. "Stereotyping, Prejudice, and Discrimination." in *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, Vol. 2, edited by D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, and G. Lindzey. 4th ed. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Fiske, Susan. 2017. “Prejudices in Cultural Contexts: Shared Stereotypes (Gender, Age) Versus Variable Stereotypes (Race, Ethnicity, Religion).” *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 12(5):791-799. doi: 10.1177/1745691617708204.

Flood, Michael, and Bob Pease. 2009. “Factors Influencing Attitudes to Violence Against Women.” *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse* 10(2):125-142. doi:10.1177/1524838009334131.

Glick, Peter, and Susan T. Fiske. 1996. “The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating Hostile and Benevolent Sexism.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 70(3): 491-512.

Glick, Peter, and Susan Fiske. 2000. "Gender, Power Dynamics, and Social Interaction." in *Revisioning Gender*, edited by M. M. Feree, J. Lorber, and B. B. Hess. New York, New York: Rowman-Altamira.

Goar, Carla, and Jane Sell. 2005. “Using Task Definition to Modify Racial Inequality within Task Groups.” *Sociological Quarterly* 46(3):525-543.

Gornick, Janet C., and David S. Meyer. 1998. “Changing Political Opportunity: The Anti-Rape Movement and Public Policy.” *Journal of Policy History* 10(4):367-398. doi: 0.1017/S0898030600007132.

Hamilton, Laura, and Elizabeth A. Armstrong. 2009. “Gendered Sexuality in Young Adulthood: Double Binds and Flawed Options.” *Gender & Society* 23(5): 589-616. doi: 10.1177/0891243209345829.

Hanks, Lydia, Nathan D. Line and Anna S. Mattila. 2016. “The Impact of Self-Service Technology and the Presence of Others on Cause-Related Marketing Programs in Restaurants.” *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management* 25(5):547-562. doi: 10.1080/19368623.2015.1046536.

Harper, Robert Francis. 1904. *The Code of Hammurabi, King of Babylon: About 2250 B.C.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Hiers, Richard H. 2004. "The Death Penalty and Due Process in Biblical Law." *University of Detroit Mercy Law Review* 81:751-843.

Hillenbrand-Gunn, Theresa L., Mary J. Heppner, Pamela A. Mauch, and Hyun-Joo Park. 2010. "Men as Allies: The Efficacy of a High School Rape Prevention Intervention." *Journal of Counseling & Development* 88(1):43-51. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6678.2010.tb00149.x.

Hirsch, Jennifer S., and Shamus Khan. 2020. *Sexual Citizens: A Landmark Study of Sex, Power, and Assault on Campus.* New York City, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.

Hovick, Shelly R. and Nathan Silver. 2019. "Consent is Sexy": A poster Campaign using Sex-Positive Images and Messages to Increase Dyadic Sexual Communication." *Journal of American College Health* 67(8):1-8. doi: 10.1080/07448481.2018.151574.

Javaid, Aliraza. 2016. "Male Rape, Stereotypes, and Unmet Needs: Hindering Recovery, Perpetuating Silence." *Violence and Gender* 3(1):7-13. doi: 10.1089/vio.2015.0039.

Jozkowski, Kristen N. 2015. "Yes Means Yes"? Sexual Consent Policy and College Students." *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 47(2):16-23. doi: 10.1080/00091383.2015.1004990.

Jozkowski, Kristen N., Zoë D. Peterson, Stephanie A. Sanders, Barbara Dennis, and Michael Reece. 2014. "Gender Differences in Heterosexual College Students' Conceptualizations and Indicators of Sexual Consent: Implications for Contemporary Sexual Assault Prevention Education." *The Journal of Sex Research* 51(8): 904-916. doi: 10.1080/00224499.2013.792326.

Kahneman, Daniel, and Amos Tversky. 1979. “Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision Under Risk.” *Econometrica* 47(2):263-291. doi:10.2307/1914185.

Karjane, Heather M., Bonnie S. Fisher, Francis T. Cullen. 2002. “Campus Sexual Assault: How America's Institutions of Higher Education Respond.” Final report submitted to the National Institute of Justice [NCJ 196676]). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Khan, Ummni. 2017. “Let's Get it On: Some Reflections on Sex-Positive Feminism.” *Women's Rights Law Reporter* 38(3-4): 346-354.

Kim, Jane. 2012. “Taking Rape Seriously: Rape as Slavery.” *Harvard Journal of Law & Gender* 35(1): 263-310.

Koss, Mary P., Jay K. Wilgus, and Kaaren M. Williamsen. 2014. “Campus Sexual Misconduct: Restorative Justice Approaches to Enhance Compliance with Title IX Guidance.” *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse* 15(3):242-257. doi: 10.1177/1524838014521500.

Loh, Catherine, Christine A. Gidycz, Tracy R. Lobo, and Rohini Luthra. 2005. “A Prospective Analysis of Sexual Assault Perpetration: Risk Factors Related to Perpetrator Characteristics.” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 20 (10):1325-1348. doi: 10.1177/0886260505278528.

Lonsway, Kimberly A., and Louise F. Fitzgerald. 1994. “Rape Myths: In Review.” *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 18(2):133-164.

Loomis, John. 2011. “What’s to Know about Hypothetical Bias in Stated Preference Valuation Studies?” *Journal of Economic Surveys* 25(2):363-370. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6419.2010.00675.x.

Lovaglia, Michael, Jeffrey W. Lucas, Jeffrey A. Houser, Shane Thye, and Barry Markovsky. "Status Processes and Mental Ability Test Scores." *American Journal of Sociology* 104(1):195-228. doi: 10.1086/210006.

Luengo, Carol, Marcelo Caffera, and Carlos Chavez. 2020. "Uncertain Penalties and Compliance: Experimental Evidence." *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies* 22(2):197-216.

Malamuth, Neil M. 1981. "Rape Proclivity Among Males." *Journal of Social Issues* 37(4): 138-157. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1981.tb01075.x.

Malamuth, Neil M., Mark Huppin, and Daniel Linz, D. 2018. "Sexual Assault Interventions may be Doing More Harm than Good with High-Risk Males." *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 41:20-24. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2018.05.010.

Malewitz, Jim. 2017. "New Law lets Texas Drivers Help Tackle the State's Rape Kit Testing Backlog." *Texas Tribune*, September 18. Retrieved May 2021 (https://www.texastribune.org/2017/09/18/how-texas-drivers-can-help-texas-tackle-its rape-kit-testing-backlog).

Manago, Bianca, Jane Sell, and Carla Goar. 2018. "Groups, Inequality, and Synergy." *Social Forces* 97(3):1365-1388. doi: 10.1093/sf/soy063.

Marcus, Sharon. 1992. "Fighting Bodies, Fighting Words: A Theory and Politics of Rape Prevention." Pp. 385-403 in *Feminists Theorize the Political,* edited by J. Butler & J. Scott (Eds.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Mardorossian, Carine M. 2014. *Framing the Rape Victim: Gender and Agency Reconsidered*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Maxwell, Louise, and Graham Scott. 2014. "A Review of the Role of Radical Feminist Theories in the Understanding of Rape Myth Acceptance." *Journal of Sexual Aggression* 20(1): 40-54. doi: 10.1080/13552600.2013.773384.

Missirian, David E., and Marianne D. Kulow. 2019. "Defenseless against Rape: Outdated Laws and a Proposed Legal Solution." *American University Journal of Gender, Social Policy & the Law* 28(1):1-27.

Napolitano, Janet. 2015. "Only Yes Means Yes: An Essay on University Policies Regarding Sexual Violence and Sexual Assault." *Yale Law & Policy Review* 33(2):387-402.

National Crime Victimization Survey. 2016. Bureau of Justice Statistics' (BJS) National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) Report NCJ 251442.

National Institute of Justice. 2010. "Overview of Rape and Sexual Violence." Retrieved August 2020 (https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/articles/overview-rape-and-sexual-violence).

Payne, Diana L., Kimberly A. Lonsway, and Louise F. Fitzgerald. 1999. "Rape Myth Acceptance: Exploration of Its Structure and Its Measurement Using the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale." *Journal of Research in Personality* 33(1):27-68. doi: 10.1006/jrpe.1998.2238.

Pokorak, Jeffrey J. 2006. "Rape as a Badge of Slavery: The Legal History of, and Remedies for, Prosecutorial Race-of-Victim Charging Disparities." *Nevada Law Journal* 7(1):1-54.

Potter, Sharyn J., Mary M. Moynihan, and Jane G. Stapleton. 2011. "Using Social Self-Identification in Social Marketing Materials Aimed at Reducing Violence against Women on Campus." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 26(5):1-20. doi: 10.1177/0886260510365870.

Reddington, Frances P. 2009. “A Brief History of Rape Law and Rape Law Reform in the United States.” Pp. 319–333 in *Sexual Assault: The Victims, the Perpetrators, and the Criminal Justice System*, edited by Frances. P. Reddington and Betsy. W. Kreisel. 2nd ed. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.

Richman, Stephanie B., Nathan C. DeWall, and Michelle N. Wolff. 2015. “Avoiding Affection, Avoiding Altruism: Why is Avoidant Attachment Related to Less Helping?” *Personality and Individual Differences* 76:193-197. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2014.12.018.

Ridgeway, Cecilia L. 1991. “The Social Construction of Status Value: Gender and Other Nominal Characteristics.” *Social Forces* 70(2):367-386. doi: 10.2307/2580244.

Ridgeway, Cecilia L. 2001. “Gender, Status, and Leadership.” *Journal of Social Issues* 57(4): 637-655. doi: 10.1111/0022-4537.00233.

Ridgeway, Cecilia L. 2006. “Status Construction Theory.” Pp. 301-323 in *Contemporary Social Psychological Theories*, edited by P. J. Burke. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Ridgeway, Cecilia L. 2011. *Framed by Gender: How Gender Inequality Persists in the Modern World.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Ridgeway, Cecilia L. 2013. “Why Status Matters for Inequality.” *American Sociological Review* 79(1):1-16.

Ridgeway, Cecilia L., and Kristan Glasgow Erickson. 2000. “Creating and Spreading Status Beliefs.” *American Journal of Sociology* 106(3):579-615. doi: 10.1086/318966.

Ridgeway, Cecilia L. and Shelley J. Correll. 2004. "Unpacking the Gender System: A Theoretical Perspective on Gender Beliefs and Social Relations." *Gender & Society* 18(4):510-531.

Ridgeway, Cecilia L. and Shelley J. Correll. 2004. "Motherhood as a Status Characteristic." *Journal of Social Issues* 60(4):683-700. doi: 10.1111/j.0022-4537.2004.00380.x.

Ridgeway, Cecilia L. and Shelley J. Correll. 2006. "Consensus and the Creation of Status Beliefs." *Social Forces* 85(1):431-453.

Ridgeway, Cecilia L. and Henry A. Walker. 1995. ''Status Structures.'' Pp. 281-310 in *Sociological Perspectives on Social Psychology*, edited by K. S. Cook, G. A. Fine, and J. House. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Ridgeway, Cecilia L., Kristen Backor, Yan E. Li, Justine E. Tinkler, and Kristan G. Erickson. 2009. "How Easily Does a Social Difference Become a Status Distinction? Gender Matters." *American Sociological Review* 74(1):44-62.

Rosenthal, Robert. 1976. *Experimenter Effects in Behavioral Research*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Rubin, Gayle. S. 2011. "Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality" Pp. 137-181 in *Deviations: A Gayle Rubin Reader*, edited by G. S. Rubin. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Ryle, Robyn. 2020. *Questioning Gender: A Sociological Exploration*. 4th ed. Los Angeles, CA: Sage/Pine Forge.

Sabina, Chiara and Lavina Ho. 2014. "Campus and College Victim Responses to Sexual Assault and Dating Violence: Disclosure, Service Utilization, and Service Provision." *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse* 15(3):201-226.

Samuels, Alex. 2018. "After Crowdfunding Law, Texans Raise Nearly $250,000 Toward Testing Rape Kits," *Texas Tribune*, June 2018. Retrieved May 2021 (https://www.texastribune.org/2018/06/08/crowdfunding-Texas-rape-kit-testing-victoria-neave-wendy-davis).

Sanday, Peggy Reeves. 1996. “Rape-Prone Versus Rape-Free Campus Cultures.” *Violence Against Women* 2(2):191-208.

Sechrist, Gretchen B., and Charles Stangor. 2001. “Perceived Consensus Influences Intergroup Behavior and Stereotype Accessibility.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 80(4):645-654. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.80.4.645.

Sell, Jane and Michael. W. Martin. 1983. “An Acultural Perspective on Experimental Social Psychology.” *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 9(3):345-350. doi: 10.1177/0146167283093003.

Sell, Jane and Yeongi Son. 1997. “Comparing Public Goods with Common Pool Resources: Three Experiments.” *Social Psychology Quarterly* 60(2):118-137. doi: 10.2307/2787100.

Simon, Katie. 2019. “How Sexual Assault Survivors Are Redefining Pleasurable Sex.” *Medium*, January 4. Retrieved August 2020 (https://elemental.medium.com/how-sexual-assault- survivors-are-redefining-pleasurable-sex-c9c44a88dbce).

Slatton, Brittany C. and April L. Richard. 2020. “Black Women's Experiences of Sexual Assault and Disclosure: Insights from the Margins.” *Sociology Compass* 14(6):1-12. doi: 10.1111/soc4.12792.

Smith, Merril D. 2004. *Encyclopedia of Rape*, edited by Merril D. Smith. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Spikes, Caitlin and Miglena Sternadori. 2018. “Boomerang Effects of Sexual-Violence Prevention Messages on College Men’s Attitudes.” *Building Healthy Academic Communities Journal* 2:45-57.

Stempl, Lara and Ilan H. MeyerMeyer. 2014. “The Sexual Victimization of Men in America: New Data Challenge Old Assumptions.” *American Journal of Public Health* 104(6): e19-e26.

Stephens, Kari A. and William H. George. 2009. “Rape Prevention with College Men: Evaluating Risk Status.” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 24(6):996-1013.

Sussman, Abigail B., Eesha Sharma, and Adam L. Alter. 2015. “Framing Charitable Donations as Exceptional Expenses Increases Giving.” *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied* 21(2):130-139. doi: 10.1037/xap0000047.

Swartout, Kevin M., Mary P Koss, Jacquelyn W White, Martie P Thompson, Antonia Abbey, and Alexandra L Bellis. 2015. “Trajectory Analysis of the Campus Serial Rapist Assumption.” *JAMA Pediatrics* 169(12):1148–1154. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2015.0707.

Tinkler, Justine E. 2012. “Resisting the Enforcement of Sexual Harassment Law.” *Law & Social Inquiry* 37(1):1-24.

Tinkler, Justine E. 2013. “How Do Sexual Harassment Policies Shape Gender Beliefs? An Exploration of the Moderating Effects of Norm Adherence and Gender” *Social Science Research* 42(5):1269-1283. doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2013.05.002.

Tinkler Justine E., Jody Clay-Warner, and Malissa Alinor. 2018. “Communicating About Affirmative Consent: How the Threat of Punishment Affects Policy Support and Gender Stereotypes.” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 33(21):3344-3366. doi: 10.1177/0886260518798356.

Tinkler, Justine E., Sarah Becker, and Kristen A. Clayton. 2018. “Kind of Natural, Kind of Wrong”: Young People's Beliefs about the Morality, Legality, and Normalcy of Sexual Aggression in Public Drinking Settings.” *Law and Social Inquiry* 43(1):28-57.

Tinkler, Justine E., Skylar Gremillion, and Kira Arthurs. 2015. “Legal Messengers, Gender, and Sexual Harassment Policy Training.” *Law and Social Inquiry* 40(1):152-174. doi: 10.1111/lsi.12065.

Tinkler, Justine E., Yan E. Li, and Stefanie Mollborn. 2007. “Can Legal Interventions Change Beliefs? The Effect of Sexual Harassment Policies on Gender Beliefs.” *Social Psychology Quarterly* 70(4):480-494.

Thomas, Kristie A., Susan B. Sorenson, and Manisha Joshi. 2016. “Consent is Good, Joyous, Sexy”: A Banner Campaign to Market Consent to College Students.” *Journal of American College Health* 64(8):639-650.

United States Department of Education. 2017. *Know Your Rights: Title IX Prohibits Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence Where You Go to School*. United States Department of Education: Office of Civil Rights. (Rescinded under the Trump Administration).

United States Department of Justice. 2014. *Preventing Sexual Violence on College Campuses: Lessons from Research and Practice*. White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault. United States Department of Justice.

Wagner, David G. and Joseph Berger. 1982. ‘‘Paths of Relevance and the Induction of Status-Task Expectancies: A Research Note.’’ *Social Forces* 61(2):575-586. doi: 10.2307/2578242.

Wood, Chantelle, Mark Conner, Eleanor Miles, Tracy Sandberg, Natalie Taylor, Gaston Godin, and Paschal Sheeran. 2016. “The Impact of Asking Intention or Self-Prediction Questions on Subsequent Behavior: A Meta-Analysis.” *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 20(3):245-268. doi: 10.1177/1088868315592334.

Wooda, Aimee, and Vanessa R. Panfil. 2018. “Insert Sexy Title Here: Moving Toward a Sex-Positive Criminology.” *Feminist Criminology* 13(5):583-608. doi: 107.171/1775/51755078058151717669933088

APPENDIX A

EXPERIMENTAL PROTOCOL

RECRUITMENT EMAIL

My name is Dr. Jane Sell. My research team and I are conducting a study looking at policy development around college campus issues. We would like to invite you to participate! You do not need to have expert knowledge, awareness, or interest in policies to participate. We are just interested in certain people's reactions to college campus policies.

The study consists of two parts: 1) a 2-5 minute screener questionnaire (that will determine eligibility for the study) and 2) a 30-minute study.

This study is administered entirely online but requires participants to complete the study on a desktop or laptop (the operating system doesn't matter). This study is not suited for mobile devices.

If you are eligible and complete the entire study, you will be emailed a $17 electronic gift card for your participation.

First, to access the screener questionnaire from a computer or laptop, follow this link to the Survey: ${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}
OR copy and paste the following URL into your browser: ${l://SurveyURL}

Study Eligibility:

- Participants must identify as a white, non-Hispanic male.
- Participants must be age 18 or older to participate.

Note: All of your responses are confidential. Your name and/or email will not be linked to your responses in any way. Participation in this study is voluntary. You may choose not to take part and you may choose to stop taking part at any time.

Once eligibility is verified, we will email you a second personalized link to start the study.

If you have any questions about the study, please contact the research team at policyissuesstudy@tamu.edu.

IRB Approval No.: IRB2020-0646D IRB Approval Date:

We look forward to having you as a participant!

In regards,
Jane Sell

PARTICIPANT SCREENER QUESTIONNAIRE

Thank you for your interest in our study!

This study is affiliated with the Stuart J. Hysom Social Psychology Laboratory, housed in the TAMU Sociology Department. It is one of many studies we are currently running. As an overview, this particular study looks at policy development around college campus issues. You do not need to have expert knowledge, awareness, or interest in policies to participate. We are just interested in certain people's reactions to college campus policies.

The study takes about 30-45 minutes to complete. This study requires participants to complete the study on a desktop or laptop (the operating system doesn't matter). This study is not suited for mobile devices.

In order to claim your $17 electronic gift card upon completion, you must successfully qualify for and complete the study (on a desktop or laptop).

Please answer the following questions, as they pertain to you, to verify your eligibility for this study. Verifying eligibility prevents you from spending unnecessary time and energy on the survey if you do not qualify for this particular study.

After eligibility is verified, you will be follow a link to access the next portion of the study. If you do not qualify for this particular study, we may contact you in the near future with additional participation opportunities.

For more information about the study and requirements, please click the link below to view and download a copy of the Informed Consent Form:

CONSENT FORM

(5/30/2017)

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY HUMAN RESEARCH PROTECTION PROGRAM

INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

Title of Research Study: Policy Issues Concerning Sexual Behavior

Investigator: Dr. Jane Sell

Funded/Supported By: This research is funded/supported by Texas A&M University, Department of Sociology.

Why are you being invited to take part in a research study?

This study looks at college campus policy development. You have been asked to participate in this study because you are a college-aged male; therefore, you may have a unique perception of the policy presented during the study. You must be 18 years of age or older to participate.

What should you know about a research study?

- Each step of the study will be explained to you via written instructions.
- Whether or not you take part is up to you.
- You can choose not to take part.
- You can agree to take part and later change your mind.
- Your decision will not be held against you.
- You may email any questions to the researcher before you decide to participate.

Who can I talk to?

If you have questions, concerns, or complaints, or think the research has hurt you, talk to the research team at phone: (979) 845-6120 and email: j-sell@tamu.edu.

This research has been reviewed and approved by the Texas A&M Institutional Review Board (IRB). You may talk to them at 1-979-458-4067, toll free at 1-855-795-8636, or by email at irb@tamu.edu., if

- You cannot reach the research team.
- Your questions, concerns, or complaints are not being answered by the research team.
- You want to talk to someone besides the research team.
- You have questions about your rights as a research participant.
- You want to get information or provide input about this research.

Why is this research being done?

The purpose of the study is to learn about how the presentation of different policies affects how they are perceived.

How long will the research last?

We expect that you will be in this research study for one session that lasts 30-45 minutes total.

How many people will be studied?

We expect to enroll about 150 people in this research study online. You, and other participants, will be randomly assigned to participate in 1 of 6 different groups. Regardless of what group you are assigned to, all participants will engage in similar activities.

What happens if I say "Yes, I want to be in this research"?

This study examines the development of policies and the way in which they are presented. For this, you will be asked to read over a policy statement. Then, we will record you (audio only) reading the same policy statement. You can decide if we are free to use all or part of the recording. After the recording, you will be asked to answer a series of questions about the statement and its content, as well as some other questions related to issues surrounding interaction. After the study is completed, you will be paid for your participation.

- The length and duration of study is 30-45 minutes total.
- The research will be done between Summer 2020 and Fall 2020.
- The research will be completed entirely online via Qualtrics.com.
- Your responses will be assigned to a unique id-number to ensure confidentiality. Your responses will only be identified by your unique ID number throughout the entirety of the study. **Your name will not be linked to your responses in any way.**
- You will be asked to record yourself reading a policy statement via a pre-written script. The recording will consist of an audio recording only. We ask that you do not include your name or other identifying information in the recording. Agreement to be recorded is not required for participation. The audio recording is optional. If you do not want the audio recording from the study kept, you can ask that they be destroyed after the study.
- Audio recording will be used during this study via an embedded audio recorder (service provided by AddPipe.com) in the Qualtrics survey. You simply use the embedded recorder to record yourself reading the policy out loud. The audio data is always encrypted to ensure security. **Your name and/or face will never be linked to the audio recording in any way.**
- Your email address is solely used for recruitment and payment purposes. After successful completion of the study, we will email your $17 electronic gift card. We will use the same email we used to recruit you (your TAMU email). **After you are paid, your email will be permanently removed from the study.**
- You may leave the study at any time, but you will not be eligible for the additional $17 electronic gift card.

INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

What happens if I do not want to be in this research?

If you don't want to be in the study, you can choose to not participate. You can also withdraw from the research at any time and it will not be held against you.

What happens if I say "Yes", but I change my mind later?

You can leave the research at any time and it will not be held against you.

If you decide to withdrawal, the data collected to the point of withdrawal will not be used in the final report. You will not be required to explain your reason for withdrawal.

Is there any way being in this study could be bad for me?

There is a risk of discomfort, as some of the questions are sensitive. You can skip questions you do not wish to answer and/or exit the survey at any point.

What happens to the information collected for the research?

Efforts will be made to limit the use and disclosure of your personal information, including research study and other records, to people who have a need to review this information. We cannot promise complete privacy. Organizations that may inspect and copy your information include the TAMU HRPP/IRB and other representatives of this institution.

Optional Elements:

The following research activities are optional, meaning that you do not have to agree to them in order to participate in the research study. Please indicate your willingness to participate in these optional activities by placing your initials next to each activity.

I agree	I disagree	
_____	_____	The researcher may audio record me to aid with data analysis. The researcher will not share these recordings with anyone outside of the immediate study team or TAMU Compliance.

IRB NUMBER: IRB2020-0646D
IRB APPROVAL DATE: 07/28/2020

INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

Signature Block for Capable Adult

Your agreement documents your consent to take part in this research.

By selecting the "Yes" box below I confirm that:

- I am an adult over the age of 18,
- I have read and understand the above consent, and
- I agree to participate in this study.

[Select One]

____ YES - I consent to participate in this study.

____ NO - I do not consent to participate in this study. *

If you selected "YES" and agree to participate in this study, please create a unique id-number consisting of your first and last initial followed by six digits only you will be able to recognize. For example, for the name John Doe, it could be JD145670.

Please enter your unique identifier in the blank below. This unique identifier will serve as your "signature."

_____

*Note: If the participant selects NO the survey is redirected to the end of the survey. No information will be collected or kept without getting consent first.

INTRODUCTION SCRIPT AND VIDEO

Introduction Video Directions:

To begin, you will watch a quick video of Dr. Sell, the Sociology Department Head, who will explain the study in more detail. Please make sure to adjust your volume, as needed.

Turn on the closed captioning so you can read along with the subtitles. To do so, click the "CC" button on the bottom right of the video. If needed, you can adjust the font size of the CC by hitting Settings (bottom right of video) --> Subtitles/CC --> Options --> Font Size.

Make sure to pay attention to the video, with no distractions, so you will know what is expected of you today. Hit the start button when you are ready. Once the video is over, please answer the questions below the video before moving on to the next part of the study.

<participant watches introduction video>

Introduction Video Script:

Hello. My name is Dr. Jane Sell and I am a member of the research team of social scientists who is conducting these series of studies today. We'd like to thank you for coming to participate in our research. You will be in one study today. We are interested in developing improved policies for issues around college campuses. The study you are in today has to do with the development of policies and the way in which they are presented. We would like you to carefully read over a policy. I will also be reading the policy statement to you as you follow along. Then we are hoping that YOU can agree to carefully read, out loud, the policy. We will film you while you read the policy statement. You have probably seen different kinds of clips of people reading statements, often public service notices, where many different people read parts of the notice. Then, the different readings are edited together. That is our plan today. We would like you to read, out loud, a policy statement we will give you. It is one of several that we are assessing. After you have finished reading it, we will ask you a few questions about the content of the statement, and then your opinion. Also, we will ask you if you are comfortable allowing us to use the audio of your reading or none of your reading. You can tell us what you are comfortable with. If you are not comfortable with us using the audio, we will simply not use it.

So in summary:

1) We are trying to assess the adequacy of different policy statements.
2) You have one policy statement that you will read. I will first read this statement to you.
3) We then will film YOU reading the same policy statement. Feel free to emphasize certain points during your filming.
4) If you make a mistake, just correct your mistake, and then finish.
5) After the filming, you can decide if we are free to use all or part of the filming.
6) After the filming, we will ask you a few questions about the statement and its content; additionally, we will have a few other questions.
7) After the study is completed, we will pay you for your participation.

Thank you for your time. I will soon read the policy statement and ask *you* to read the statement. After you are finished, we will ask you a few questions about the content of the statement as well as a few other questions.

<end of introduction video>

Do you understand what you will be doing today?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

If yes, please proceed with the study. If no, please re-watch the introduction video before proceeding.

Policy Statement Video Directions:

Now, please watch the video below in which Dr. Sell reads the Policy Statement. Please make sure to adjust your volume, as needed.

Turn on the closed captioning so you can read along with the subtitles. To do so, click the "CC" button on the bottom right of the video. If needed, you can adjust the font size of the CC by hitting Settings (bottom right of video) --> Subtitles/CC --> Options --> Font Size.

Remember, you are going to record yourself (audio only) reading the same Policy Statement presented in the video. Pay close attention by watching the video and reading along with the subtitles.

Hit the start button when you are ready. Once the video is over, please answer the questions below the video before moving on to the next part of the study.

<participant watches 1 of 6 randomized policy videos>

Please see Appendix B for policy scripts.

<end of policy video>

Do you understand that you will be recording yourself reading this same policy script?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

If yes, please proceed with the study. If no, please re-watch the policy video before proceeding.

AUDIO RECORDING

Audio Recording Directions:

Next, we will have you record yourself reading the policy you just heard. You will simply start the recorder, scroll along with the script and read it out loud, and then scroll back up to stop the recording.

Please note, you will need to have the most recent version of Flash downloaded and may need to give Qualtrics permission to access your microphone before you can record. Make sure to record in a quiet area with no distractions.

The recording is just an audio file. Do not worry about being able to see the audio recorder, as it will pick up your voice as you scroll. Just focus on reading the script. If you make a mistake, just correct the mistake, and continue reading. At the end of the study, we will give you more information regarding the recording and, at that time, you can also tell us if we are free to use part, all, or none of your audio recording.

When the recorder starts, it will count down from 5 minutes. The recording is meant to be completed in one attempt (thought you may start over if needed) and take no longer than 5 minutes to record. When you are done reading the policy, just scroll back up to the top to hit the red button again to end the audio recording.

So, you:

1) Press "Record Audio."
2) Give permission to access your microphone via the dialogue box.
3) Hit the red circle (record) when ready to start recording.
4) Start reading out loud at "University Student Handbook Policy" and continue reading and scrolling until you reach the end of the script.
5) When complete, scroll back up and hit the red circle again to end the recording.
6) A "Saved" message will appear in the center of the recorder when you have successfully stopped the recording.
7) When done recording, please proceed to the next part of the study.

Please proceed to the next page to continue with the script and audio recording.

<participant records themselves reading the assigned script>

On the next page, please carefully re-read the policy statement in order to proceed with answering a series of questions. Some questions will be related to the content of the policy statement, others will not.

Please answer each question to the best of your ability. It is important to not include your name anywhere in the questionnaire. Your responses will not be linked to your name in any way.

<participant re-reads the assigned script then proceeds to questionnaires, see Appendix C>

Thank you for participating in our study today. We would like to tell you a little more about the study today. The study involved you reading a University Student Handbook Policy:

1. The policy you read borrowed language from actual university student handbook policies. We expect that people respond differently to policies depending on the framing, or language, used in the policy. The aim of the study is to examine white, non-Hispanic males' attitudes towards policies related to sexual behavior. As such, we were interested in how the specific policy you read might or might not affect your reactions to the questionnaire. We will compare your responses to the questions with people who read the same policy statement as you. We will also compare others who read different statements than what you read today to see if they respond more positively or negatively to the statement they read.

2. In order to assure that you paid attention to the language in the policy, we asked you to record yourself reading the policy out loud. In truth, we do not plan on using these audio recordings. You do not have to tell us whether or not we can use the audio because we will immediately and permanently delete your audio recording.

3. We also asked whether you would donate part or all of your $17 participation fee to a campaign that supports sexual assault awareness. For those who chose to donate, the Social Psychology Laboratory, housed in the Department of Sociology at Texas A&M University, will actually donate the amount suggested by each participant to Brazos Valley Sexual Assault Resource Center (SARC).

4. We will also supplement donation amounts, so that all participants will receive the full amount for their participation. Meaning, participants will get the full amount we advertised for participation and we will give the donation amount each participant suggested.

We are hoping that you won't talk about the specifics of the study—because we know that people might not act the same if they know exactly what we are studying. Of course, you can talk generally about the study, but please don't mention exactly what we are studying because it may alter the results of the study.

If you have any questions regarding this study, you may email Dr. Jane Sell and the research team at policyissuesstudy@tamu.edu.

That completes our study today. Thank you for your participation! Please feel free to leave any comments or feedback you have about the study in the blank below:

APPENDIX B

POLICY INTERVENTION SCRIPTS

Condition 1: Sex negative and gender framing

University Student Handbook Policy

I. Policy Summary:

This university seeks to foster and maintain a community of mutual respect and concern for all of its members. There can be no greater violation of the terms of that community or of the essential dignity of any member of it than an act of sexual assault. Sexual assault constitutes the deepest affront to university standards and will not be tolerated in any form.

All members of this community—students (current and applicants), faculty, staff, applicants for employment, persons doing business with or acting on behalf of the university, and visitors to campus—are protected under this policy and share in the responsibility for creating and maintaining an environment that promotes the safety and dignity of each person. Towards this end, this policy provides the framework for understanding what sexual assault is:

II. Definitions:

A. Sexual Assault:

- Sexual assault is having or attempting to have sexual intercourse or sexual contact with another person without consent.
- This includes sexual intercourse or sexual contact achieved by:
    - The use or threat of force or coercion
    - When a person does not, or cannot, consent to the sexual act
    - When a person is incapacitated
- Sexual assault includes rape, fondling, incest, and statutory rape.
- Sexual assault violates people's bodily autonomy and denies individual control of their bodies.
- Sexual assault is an expression of violence and dominance.

Sex without clear and affirmative consent from both parties is sexual assault.

B. Gender Roles:

- Gender roles are cultural and behavioral expectations for how a person is supposed to behave, what they should believe, or what they should want for themselves based on their perceived gender binary, that is male or female.
- Stereotypes based on gender, such as women being passive and men being aggressive, position women as submissive to men in regard to sexual autonomy.
- Gender roles or stereotyping may result in the coerced, unwanted, or forced sex of women, disproportionately, when compared to men.
- It is important to understand that neither gender or sexuality precludes you from following this policy.

Sex without clear and affirmative consent from both parties is sexual assault.

Any sexual act that falls in the parameter of sexual assault violates the University Student Handbook Policy.

Condition 2: Sex negative and gender-neutral framing

University Student Handbook Policy

I. Policy Summary:

This University seeks to foster and maintain a community of mutual respect and concern for all of its members. There can be no greater violation of the terms of that community, or of the essential dignity of any member of it than an act of sexual assault. Sexual assault constitutes the deepest affront to university standards and will not be tolerated in any form.

All members of this community—students (current and applicants), faculty, staff, applicants for employment, persons doing business with or acting on behalf of the university, and visitors to campus—are protected under this policy and share in the responsibility for creating and maintaining an environment that promotes the safety and dignity of each person. Towards this end, this policy provides the framework for understanding what sexual assault is:

II. Definitions:

Sexual Assault:

- Sexual assault is having or attempting to have sexual intercourse or sexual contact with another person without consent.
- This includes sexual intercourse or sexual contact achieved by:
    - The threat or use of force or coercion
    - When a person does not, or cannot, consent to the sexual act
    - When an individual is incapacitated
- Sexual assault includes rape, fondling, incest, and statutory rape.
- Sexual assault violates people's bodily autonomy and denies individuals control of their bodies.
- Sexual assault is an expression of violence and dominance.

Sex without clear and affirmative consent from both parties is sexual assault.

III. Student Awareness of Policy:

Please note it is the responsibility of the university to ensure that this policy is widely disseminated to all relevant persons. As such, all new students will be made aware of this policy as part of their New Student Orientation. It is also to be included in the University Student Handbook under *Code 24.4.20.*

Sex without clear and affirmative consent from both parties is sexual assault.

Any sexual act that falls in the parameter of sexual assault violates the University Student Handbook Policy.

Condition 3: Sex positive and gender framing

University Student Handbook Policy

I. Policy Summary:

This University seeks to foster and maintain a community of mutual respect and concern for all of its members. The best way to maintain that community, and of the essential dignity of any member of it, is to respect each other's personal autonomy. Violating another's personal autonomy constitutes the deepest affront to university standards and will not be tolerated in any form.

All members of this community—students (current and applicants), faculty, staff, applicants for employment, persons doing business with or acting on behalf of the university, and visitors to campus—are protected under this policy and share in the responsibility for creating and maintaining an environment that promotes the safety and dignity of each person. Towards this end, this policy provides the framework for understanding what consensual sex is:

II. Definitions:

1. Consensual Sex:

- Consensual sex consists of both parties in a sexual encounter obtaining conscious, voluntary, and affirmative consent at each stage of sexual activity.
- Consent is the expression of a mutual desire between parties to take part in a sexual activity.
- Consensual sex celebrates healthy sexual relationships, bodily autonomy, and empowering people to control their sex.
- It is an expression of mutual empowerment and respect.
- Sex with clear willingness from both parties allows for pleasurable sex for both parties.

Sex with clear and affirmative consent from both parties is consensual sex.

B. Gender Roles:

- Gender roles are cultural and behavioral expectations for how a person is supposed to behave, what they should believe, or what they should want for themselves based on their perceived gender binary, that is male or female.
- Stereotypes based on gender, such as women being passive and men being aggressive, position women as submissive to men in regard to sexual autonomy.
- Gender roles/stereotyping may result in ignoring the sexual desires and expectations of the female, generating less pleasurable sex for both partners.
- It is important to understand that neither gender or sexuality precludes you from following this policy.

Sex with clear and affirmative consent from both parties is consensual sex.

Any sexual act that falls outside the parameter of consensual sex violates the University Student Handbook Policy.

Condition 4: Sex positive and gender-neutral framing

University Student Handbook Policy

I. Policy Summary:

This University seeks to foster and maintain a community of mutual respect and concern for all of its members. The best way to maintain that community, and of the essential dignity of any member of it, is to respect each other's personal autonomy. Violating another's personal autonomy constitutes the deepest affront to the university standards and will not be tolerated in any form.

All members of this community—students (current and applicants), faculty, staff, applicants for employment, persons doing business with or acting on behalf of the university, and visitors to campus—are protected under this policy and share in the responsibility for creating and maintaining an environment that promotes the safety and dignity of each person. Towards this end, this policy provides the framework for understanding what consensual sex is:

II. Definitions:

Consensual Sex:

- Consensual sex consists of both parties in a sexual encounter obtaining conscious, voluntary, and affirmative consent at each stage of sexual activity.
- Consent is the expression of a mutual desire between parties to take part in a sexual activity.
- Consensual sex celebrates healthy sexual relationships, bodily autonomy, and empowering people to control their sex.
- It is an expression of mutual empowerment and respect.
- Sex with clear willingness from both parties allows for pleasurable sex for both parties.

Sex with clear and affirmative consent from both parties is consensual sex.

III. Student Awareness of Policy:

Please note, it is the responsibility of the university to ensure that this policy is widely disseminated to all relevant persons. As such, all new students will be made aware of this policy as part of their New Student Orientation. It is also included in the University Student Handbook under *Code 24.4.20.*

Sex with clear and affirmative consent from both parties is consensual sex.

Any sexual act that falls outside the parameter of consensual sex violates the University Student Handbook Policy.

Condition 5: Control (no sex or gender framing)

University Student Handbook Policy

I. Policy Summary:

This University seeks to foster and maintain a community of academic integrity. Academic integrity is an essential force in the academic life of a university. It enhances the quality of education and celebrates the genuine achievements of others. Academic dishonesty constitutes the deepest affront to the university standards and will not be tolerated in any form.

All members of this university—students (current and applicants) and faculty—are held accountable under this policy and share in the responsibility for actively promoting and maintaining an environment of academic integrity. Additionally, instructors are expected to adhere to the policy pertaining to the reporting of violations of academic integrity. Towards this end, this policy provides the framework for understanding what academic dishonesty is:

II. Definitions:

Academic Dishonesty:

- Academic dishonesty is defined as a student's use of unauthorized assistance with intent to deceive an instructor or other such person who may be assigned to evaluate the student's work in meeting course or degree requirements.
- Misconduct in research or scholarship includes fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, reviewing, or reporting research.
- Academic dishonesty does not include honest error or honest differences in interpretations or judgments of data.
- Every field of study has its own preferred style for citing and referencing.
- It is the responsibility of the student to consult with the instructor or other scholars in the field of study to determine which citation style should be used and how to properly cite.

III. Student Awareness of Policy:

Please note it is the responsibility of the university to ensure that this policy is widely disseminated to all relevant persons. As such, all new students will be made aware of this policy as part of their New Student Orientation. It is also to be included in the University Student Handbook under *Code 24.4.20.*

Any act of scholastic dishonesty violates the University Student Handbook Policy.

APPENDIX C

INVENTORIES

DONATION

Sex-Negative Conditions:

You will receive a $17 payment for your participation in this study today.
If you choose, you may donate some, none, or all of your earnings to a campaign that supports anti-sexual assault awareness.

The researchers will pay the amount you offer as a donation to the campaign directly.
Please respond to the following questions regarding your choice to donate or not donate.
As a reminder, your responses are anonymous.

Would you like to donate to a campaign that supports anti-sexual assault awareness?

O Yes O No

Please enter the amount you would like to donate between 0.00 and 17.00 dollars.
Enter the donation amount in XX.XX format in the blank below:

_____

Sex-Positive Conditions:

You will receive a $17 payment for your participation in this study today.
If you choose, you may donate some, none, or all of your earnings to a campaign that supports consensual sex awareness.

The researchers will pay the amount you offer as a donation to the campaign directly.
Please respond to the following questions regarding your choice to donate or not donate.
As a reminder, your responses are anonymous.

Would you like to donate to a campaign that supports anti-sexual assault awareness?

O Yes O No

Please enter the amount you would like to donate between 0.00 and 17.00 dollars.
Enter the donation amount in XX.XX format in the blank below:

_____

POLICY COMPLIANCE

Dr. Sell introduced the policy you read today.
Please answer the following questions as they pertain to the policy you read today:

1. What was the purpose of the policy you read? Briefly describe the policy you read.

(Fill in the blank)

2. In your opinion, would your university be able to implement this policy into their student handbook? Briefly describe why or why not.

(Fill in the blank)

3. On a scale of 1 to 7, do you support the policy?

Do not Support at All						Very Much Support
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

4. On a scale of 1 to 7, how likely are you, as a student, to comply with the policy statement you read?

Not Likely at All						Very Much Likely
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

5. On a scale of 1 to 7, how likely are you, as a student, to report a violation of the policy statement to the Office of Student Misconduct?

Not Likely at All						Very Much Likely
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

GENDER BELIEF INVENTORY

As you know, women and men often have different characteristics. For each of the following pairs of adjectives, please select on the scale where you think **most people** would rank **men**.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
inconsiderate	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**considerate**
competent	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**incompetent**
respected	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**not respected**
unpleasant	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**pleasant**
powerful	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**powerless**
unlikable	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**likable**
knowledgeable	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**unknowledgeable**
low status	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**high status**
leader	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**follower**
cooperative	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**uncooperative**
incapable	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**capable**

As you know, women and men often have different characteristics. For each of the following pairs of adjectives, please select on the scale where **you personally** would rank **men**.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
inconsiderate	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**considerate**
competent	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**incompetent**
respected	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**not respected**
unpleasant	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**pleasant**
powerful	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**powerless**
unlikable	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**likable**
knowledgeable	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**unknowledgeable**
low status	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**high status**
leader	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**follower**
cooperative	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**uncooperative**
incapable	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**capable**

As you know, women and men often have different characteristics. For each of the following pairs of adjectives, please select on the scale where you think **most people** would rank **women**.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
inconsiderate	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**considerate**
competent	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**incompetent**
respected	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**not respected**
unpleasant	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**pleasant**
powerful	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**powerless**
unlikable	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**likable**
knowledgeable	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**unknowledgeable**
low status	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**high status**
leader	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**follower**
cooperative	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**uncooperative**
incapable	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**capable**

As you know, women and men often have different characteristics. For each of the following pairs of adjectives, please select on the scale where **you personally** would rank **women**.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
inconsiderate	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**considerate**
competent	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**incompetent**
respected	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**not respected**
unpleasant	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**pleasant**
powerful	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**powerless**
unlikable	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**likable**
knowledgeable	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**unknowledgeable**
low status	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**high status**
leader	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**follower**
cooperative	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**uncooperative**
incapable	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	**capable**

MANIPULATION CHECKS

Dr. Sell introduced the policy you read today.
Please answer the following questions as they pertain to the policy you read today:

1. The policy you read discussed sexual assault. It listed the definition of sexual assault as, "having or attempting to have sexual intercourse or sexual contact with another person without consent."

( ) True
( ) False

2. The policy you read discussed workplace discrimination. It listed the definition of workplace discrimination as, "treating, or proposing to treat, someone unfavorably because of a personal characteristic protected by law in the workplace."

( ) True
( ) False

3. The policy you read discussed consensual sex. It listed the definition of consensual sex as, "both parties in a sexual encounter obtaining conscious, voluntary, and affirmative consent at each stage of sexual activity."

( ) True
( ) False

4. The policy you read listed the definition of gender roles as, “cultural and behavioral expectations for how a person is supposed to behave, what they should believe, or what they should want for themselves based on their perceived gender binary (male or female).”

( ) True
( ) False

5. The policy you read discussed academic dishonesty. It listed the definition of academic dishonesty as, "student's use of unauthorized assistance with intent to deceive an instructor or other such person who may be assigned to evaluate the student’s work in meeting course and degree requirements."

( ) True
( ) False

AMBIVALENT SEXISM INVENTORY

Below is a series of statements concerning men and women and their relationships in contemporary society. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement by choosing one of the options below:

1. No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman.

Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
0	1	2	3	4	5

2. Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for “equality."

Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
0	1	2	3	4	5

3. In a disaster, women ought not necessarily be rescued before men.

Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
0	1	2	3	4	5

4. Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.

Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
0	1	2	3	4	5

5. Women are too easily offended.

Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
0	1	2	3	4	5

6. People are often truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the other sex.

Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
0	1	2	3	4	5

7. Feminists are not seeking for women to have more power than men.

Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.

Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
0	1	2	3	4	5

9. Women should be cherished and protected by men.

Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
0	1	2	3	4	5

10. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.

Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
0	1	2	3	4	5

11. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.

Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
0	1	2	3	4	5

12. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores.

Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
0	1	2	3	4	5

13. Men are complete without women.

Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
0	1	2	3	4	5

14. Women exaggerate problems they have at work.

Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
0	1	2	3	4	5

15. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash.

Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
0	1	2	3	4	5

16. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.

Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
0	1	2	3	4	5

17. A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man.

Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
0	1	2	3	4	5

18. There are actually very few women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances.

Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
0	1	2	3	4	5

19. Women, as compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility.

Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
0	1	2	3	4	5

20. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well-being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.

Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
0	1	2	3	4	5

21. Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men.

Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
0	1	2	3	4	5

22. Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.

Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
0	1	2	3	4	5

ILLINOIS RAPE MYTH ACCEPTANCE (IRMA) - SHORT FORM

Please read each of the following statements and indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement by choosing one of the options below:

1. If a woman is raped while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of hand.

Not at all Agree						Very Much Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. Although most women wouldn't admit it, they generally find being physically forced into sex a real "turn-on."

Not at all Agree						Very Much Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3. If a woman is willing to "make out" with a guy, then it's no big deal if he goes a little further and has sex.

Not at all Agree						Very Much Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

4. Many women secretly desire to be raped.

Not at all Agree						Very Much Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

5. Most rapists are not caught by the police.

Not at all Agree						Very Much Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

6. If a woman doesn't physically fight back, you can't really say that it was rape.

Not at all Agree						Very Much Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

7. Men from nice middle-class homes almost never rape.

Not at all Agree						Very Much Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

8. Rape accusations are often used as a way of getting back at men.

Not at all Agree						Very Much Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

9. All women should have access to self-defense classes.

Not at all Agree						Very Much Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

10. It is usually only women who dress suggestively that are raped.

Not at all Agree						Very Much Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

11. If the rapist doesn't have a weapon, you really can't call it a rape.

Not at all Agree						Very Much Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

12. Rape is unlikely to happen in the woman's own familiar neighborhood.

Not at all Agree						Very Much Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

13. Women tend to exaggerate how much rape affects them.

Not at all Agree						Very Much Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

14. A lot of women lead a man on and then they cry rape.

Not at all Agree						Very Much Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

15. It is preferable that a female police officer conduct the questioning when a woman reports a rape.

Not at all Agree						Very Much Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

16. A woman who "teases" men deserve anything that might happen.

Not at all Agree						Very Much Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

17. When women are raped, it's often because the way they said "no" was ambiguous.

Not at all Agree						Very Much Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

18. Men don't usually intend to force sex on a woman, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away.

Not at all Agree						Very Much Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

19. A woman who dresses in skimpy clothes should not be surprised if a man tries to force her to have sex.

Not at all Agree						Very Much Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

20. Rape happens when a man's sex drive gets out of control.

Not at all Agree						Very Much Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

LIKELINESS TO RAPE

Please read each of the following statements and indicate the degree of likeliness for each statement by choosing one of the options below:

1. What is the likeliness you would force a woman to have sex if you could be assured of not being caught and punished?

Not at all Likely				Very Likely
1	2	3	4	5

Please read the following statement and fill in the blank:

In your opinion, what percentage of men would force a woman to have sex if they could be assured of not being caught and punished?

Enter the percentage in 00% format in the blank below:

_____

DESCRIPTIVE AND DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

Below is a series of questions related to you.
Please read each of the following questions and choose the best option.

Previous Exposure to Sexual Assault Prevention Training:

1. Have you previously participated in sexual assault prevention training?

O Yes O No O Unsure

2. If yes, please list which type of training and where you completed the training (university training, workplace training, etc). Please list and separate different types of training with a comma in the blank below:

Previous Exposure to Sexual Assault:

1. In your lifetime, have you been forced, or coerced, to engage in unwanted sexual activity?

O Yes O No O Unsure

2. In the past year, have you been forced, or coerced, to engage in unwanted sexual activity?

O Yes O No O Unsure

3. In your lifetime, has someone you personally know been forced, or coerced, to engage in unwanted sexual activity?

O Yes O No O Unsure

4. In the past year, has someone you personally know been forced, or coerced, to engage in unwanted sexual activity?

O Yes O No O Unsure

Demographic Questionnaire:

1. What is your major? (Please fill in the blank) _____

2. What is your sexual orientation? (Please choose the best option)

1. Heterosexual/Straight
2. Gay
3. Bisexual
4. Asexual
5. Aromatic
6. Questioning
7. Other (Please list, if desired) _____

3. What is your classification? (Please choose the best option)

1. Freshmen
2. Sophomore
3. Junior
4. Senior
5. Graduate Student

4. What is your current religion affiliation, if any? (Please choose the best option)

1. Christian - Catholic (including Roman Catholic and Orthodox)
2. Christian - Protestant (including Baptist, Southern Baptist, Church of Christ, etc.)
3. Jewish
4. Muslim
5. Sikh
6. Hindu
7. Buddhist
8. Agnostic
9. Atheist
10. Other (please list, if desired) _____

5. What is your current political affiliation, if any?

1. Republican
2. Democrat
3. Libertarian
4. Socialist
5. Independent
6. Other (please list, if desired) _____

6. What is your current sexual activity and/or dating status, if any? (Please choose the best option)

1. Prefer not to say
2. Outercourse only - with one or multiple people
3. Hooking up - non-committed sexual activity with multiple sexual partners
4. Dating - monogamous committed relationship/sexual activity with one sexual partner
5. Dating - ethical non-monogamous committed relationship/sexual activity with multiple sexual partners
6. Cohabiting - living with sexual partner
7. Married (or domestic partnership, common-law marriage) – sexual activity with spouse only
8. Married (or domestic partnership, common-law marriage) - sexual activity with multiple sexual partners
9. Not applicable not engaging in sexual activity with another person (please explain, if desired)
10. Other (please list, if desired) _____

7. What is your gender? (Please choose the best option)

1. Male
2. Female
3. Transgender
4. Non-binary gender
5. Other (Please list, if desired) _____

8. What is your race and /or ethnicity? (Please select all boxes that apply)

1. White (Non-Hispanic)
2. Hispanic or Latino
3. Black or African American
4. Asian
5. American Indian or Alaska Native
6. Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
7. Mixed Ethnicity (Please list, if desired) _____
8. Other race, ethnicity, or origin (Please list, if desired) _____

9. What year were you born? (Please fill in the blank) _____

APPENDIX D

DEBRIEFING

Thank you for participating in our study today. We would like to tell you a little more about the study today.

The study involved you reading a University Student Handbook Policy:

1) The policy you read borrowed language from actual university student handbook policies. We expect that people respond differently to policies depending on the framing, or language, used in the policy. The aim of the study is to examine white, non-Hispanic males' attitudes towards policies related to sexual behavior. As such, we were interested in how the specific policy you read might or might not affect your reactions to the questionnaire. We will compare your responses to the questions with people who read the same policy statement as you. We will also compare others who read different statements than what you read today to see if they respond more positively or negatively to the statement they read.

2) In order to assure that you paid attention to the language in the policy, we asked you to record yourself reading the policy out loud. In truth, we do not plan on using these audio recordings. You do not have to tell us whether or not we can use the audio because we will immediately and permanently delete your audio recording.

3) We also asked whether you would donate part or all of your $17 participation fee to a campaign that supports sexual assault awareness. For those who chose to donate, the Social Psychology Laboratory, housed in the Department of Sociology at Texas A&M University, will actually donate the amount suggested by each participant to Brazos Valley Sexual Assault Resource Center (SARC).

4) We will also supplement donation amounts, so that all participants will receive the full amount for their participation. Meaning, participants will get the full amount we advertised for participation and we will give the donation amount each participant suggested.

We are hoping that you won't talk about the specifics of the study—because we know that people might not act the same if they know exactly what we are studying. Of course, you can talk generally about the study, but please don't mention exactly what we are studying because it may alter the results of the study.

If you have any questions regarding this study, you may email Dr. Jane Sell and the research team at policyissuesstudy@tamu.edu. That completes our study today. Thank you for your participation!

Please feel free to leave any comments or feedback you have about the study in the blank below:

_____

APPENDIX E

ADDITIONAL TABLES

Appendix Table 1. Rape Proclivity for Self and for Others

	ANOVA F-values (Prob>F)		
	Gender Language	Sex Language	Gender * Sex
Rape Proclivity Self:	0.15 (.70)	1.14 (.29)	0.06 (.81)

n=105
*** $p < .01$; ** $p < .05$; * $p < .10$

Appendix Table 2. Rape Proclivity for Others

	ANOVA F-values (Prob>F)		
	Gender Language	Sex Language	Gender * Sex
Rape Proclivity Others:	0.81 (.37)	0.01 (.91)	0.66 (.42)

n=105
*** $p < .01$; ** $p < .05$; * $p < .10$