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ABSTRACT

The study examines university students' attitudes toward sexual victimization of women. The study contends that gender and ethnicity, as structural and cultural determinants, affect sex role attitudes, severity perception, encounter with sexual victimization, and issue attentiveness, and further affect the attitudes towards sexual victimization of women.

An in-class questionnaire survey was employed to collect data for this study. Stratified by class size, disciplines and academic classifications, 43 classes at University of Hawaii-Manoa were surveyed in the month of April, 1990, and 1,459 usable surveys were included in the analysis.

Attitudes towards sexual victimization of women were measured by the acceptance/rejection of various misconceptions towards sexual harassment and sexual assault. The study identified four popular misconceptions on sexual victimization of women: 1) Natural/biological model, 2) Depoliticizing model, 3) Social repression model, and 4) Victim-percipitation model.

In general, the surveyed students mildly rejected various misconceptions on sexual victimization of women. In addition, the students mildly rejected sex role stereotyping, perceived sexual aggression as relatively
serious, reported relatively high degree of encounter with sexual victimization and indicated moderately degree of issue attentiveness.

The study found significant gender and ethnicity effects on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. Furthermore, the study found significant correlations between sex role attitudes, severity perception, encounter with sexual victimization, and issue attentiveness with attitudes towards sexual victimization of women.

As hypothesized, female students more than male students, and Caucasians more than Asians, rejected various misconceptions on sexual victimization of women. Compared to their male and Asian counterparts, female and Caucasian students were less sex role stereotyped, perceived sexual aggression as more serious, had encountered more sexual victimization, were more attentive to sexual victimization issues, and expressed less support of misconceptions on sexual victimization of women. These findings are consistent with the majority of previous studies in the literature.

A multiple regression analysis identified sex role attitudes as the most effective variable, followed by severity perception, in predicting attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. Additionally, while women were more influenced by their encounter with sexual victimization on
evaluating various misconceptions, men were more affected by ethnic socialization and issue attentiveness.
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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

The study examines university students' attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. Sexual harassment and sexual assault, as two major categories of sexual victimization of women, have been associated with various misconceptions. Popular misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women include: attributing biological/natural drive to male sexual aggression against women; overlooking gender-power stratification in sexual victimization; trivializing the consequences of sexual victimization for women; discrediting the woman's claim of sexual victimization; and blaming the woman for precipitating her sexual victimization.

These misconceptions, when internalized among men and women, justify male aggression against women and jeopardize the victim's recovery from sexual victimization trauma. As studies suggested, the internalization of misconceptions towards sexual victimization has created numerous "innocent" perpetrators and "hidden" victims among the university students, which accelerates sexual victimization of college/university women into an acute social problem for higher education in the last decade (Brewer, 1982; Kanin, 1957; Kirkpatrick and Kanin, 1957; Kanin and Parcell, 1977; Koss, 1988; Koss, Gidycz and Wisniewski, 1987; Muehlenhard and Linton, 1987; Lafontaine and Tredeau, 1986; Mazer and
Therefore, the study considers it 1) theoretically important to identify specific components of social misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women and 2) educationally imperative to investigate university students' attitudes towards misconceptions on sexual victimization of women.

The study adopts an interdisciplinary approach to explore the dynamic relationship of demographic characteristics, sex role socialization, severity perception, sexual victimization experience, and issue attentiveness, with the attitude toward sexual victimization of women. The study contends that an individual's gender and ethnicity, together with his/her sex role attitudes, severity perception, encounter with sexual victimization, and issue attentiveness, affect his/her attitude towards sexual victimization of women.

The study presents five original contributions to the current literature. First, the study identifies specific components of misconceptions towards sexual harassment and sexual assault and further integrates common misconceptions into a multi-dimensional structure of attitudes towards sexual victimization of women in general. Second, the study
verifies misconception communality\textsuperscript{1} and attitudinal consistency on sexual assault and sexual harassment. This verification lends supports to the representativeness of the four misconception models in characterizing societal attitudes towards sexual victimization of women in general. Third, the study includes rarely-studied ethnic groups -- Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, and Pacific Islanders -- in the analysis to expand ethnic variation in the literature. In particular, the study compares the effect of ethnic socialization between the Caucasian and the Asian on attitude formation toward sexual victimization of women. Fourth, the study integrates communication theories with social-psychological literature to examine the dynamics attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. In examining the effect of issue attentiveness on attitudes towards sexual victimization, the study provides new information to public education on sexual victimization of women. Fifth, the study collects and reports sexual victimization data with a behavior-specific design. This approach avoids difficulties resulting from differing theoretical and methodological approaches adopted by various prevalence studies and facilitates meaningful comparisons with other studies on campus sexual victimization.

\textsuperscript{1} Misconception communality refers to common elements shared between societal attitudes towards sexual harassment and societal attitudes towards sexual assault.
A. Research Rationales

The study is conducted to examine university students' attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. The rationale for studying the attitudes towards sexual victimization of women includes: 1) the widespread of misconceptions on sexual victimization; and 2) various detrimental consequences of misconceptions on the society at large. The rationale for focusing on university students includes: 1) sexual victimization as a social problem in university community; 2) the prevalence of sexual victimization among university women; 3) the prevalence of peer perpetrators to university women.

1. Widespread Misconceptions Concerning Sexual Victimization

Sexual assault is the fastest rising violent crime in the United States (BJS, 1989: 448). A rape is reported every eight minutes by victims of all ages and from all neighborhoods (Janzen, Johnston, and Rockwell, 1980). Nevertheless, societal attitude towards sexual victimization is surrounded with various misconceptions which often place the victim, instead of the assailant, on trial by the legal system in particular, and by the society at large in general (Estrich, 1987; LaFree, 1989).

Misconceptions on sexual victimization include: 1) natural/biological attribution of sexual aggression; 2) depoliticizing the cause of sexual victimization of women; 3) trivialization of the consequences on the victim; 4)
discrediting the woman's claim of sexual victimization; and
5) blaming the victim in precipitating male's sexual aggression.

These misconceptions are prevalent in various social institutions of everyday life: the mass media, the legal system, and the public opinion. Mass media both reflect and shape cultural images, values, social scripts, etc. (Brown, 1981; Goffman, 1979). Studies have indicated that popular media are prevalent with aggressive sexual contact and pornographic media are predominated by sexual violence against women (Donnestein and Linz, 1986). Malamuth and Check (1985) maintained that sexual violence in the mass media plays a significant role in fostering rape myths and the acceptance of rape and other forms of violence against women.

Misconceptions on sexual victimization of women are prevalent among the participants of the criminal justice system. Research has confirmed that rape victim's reputations affect reactions to her case: acquittals or less serious penalties are more likely for men accused of raping women who have "bad" reputations or who are reputedly promiscuous (Bohmer, 1974; Holmstrom and Burgess, 1978; LaFree, 1980; LaFree, Reskin, and Visher, 1985; LeDoux and Hazelwood, 1985). The belief in victim precipitation seems prevalent among the CJS personnel. Feldman-Summers and Palmer (1980) found that judges, prosecutors and police
officers tended to see the causes of rape as lying within the make-up of some men (e.g., sexually frustrated men or men who are mentally ill) and being the result of women's behavior (e.g., women using poor judgement about going out alone).

A Florida rapist was acquitted of a knife-point rape of a 22-year old woman because jurors felt the woman's clothing - a tank top and a short sheer white-lace skirt without underwear - suggested that she had "asked for it."

The widespread misconception among the general public has been well documented (Williams and Holmes, 1982:168, 203). Burt (1978) investigated rape myth acceptance among a general population sample consisting of 599 Minnesota inhabitants 18 years of age and above and concluded that "many Americans do indeed believe many rape myths" (p. 229). The trivialization of women's victimization is reflected in a policewoman's comment when investigating a gang rape case at a university campus: "I got the feeling people at the college felt this was really no big deal." (People, 1990:104)

The New Bedford gang-rape trial featured another aspect of social attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. The Portuguese group, representing a male-dominated and nuclear family-oriented tradition, blamed the victim in violating the proper standards of social behavior, while
maintaining that the men involved were simply "playing by the rules." (Rosen, 1985)

The student population also shows acceptance of misconceptions on sexual victimization of women. A study on sexual crime reported that Swedish adolescents consider only two sexual acts criminal, while at least 7 or 8 acts are criminal in Swedish law (Lewin, 1983).

Mazelan's (1980) study on college students concluded that there is generally thought to be a type of woman who is more likely than others to get raped. Two broad categories emerge from the data: first, the very negative image of the rape victim as a prostitute or tart, who probably behaves and dresses in a provocative manner; and second, the "young attractive flirt" who is naive and probably does not realize the effect she is having on men (p. 130).

A 1988 survey taken at the University of Hawaii found that 50 percent of the male students surveyed believe that women who say "no" really mean "yes." The average number of times in which a woman needs to say "no" in order to be believed is three times (Ka Leo, April 18, 1990).

The widespread misconception on sexual victimization also reflects on the statistics of a substantial percentage of peer offender reported by college women with a disproportionately low rate of self-reported offense from male students (Kanin, 1957: Kanin and Parcell, 1977; Kirkpatrick and Kanin, 1957; Koss, 1988; Rapaport and
Burkhard, 1984). The discrepancy may result from the internalization of misconceptions among the male students. When accepting the biological explanation of sexual aggression, men are likely to view their behavior justifiable; when believing in the token resistance to sex, men are likely to insist on "playing man's role" in sexual interaction. Therefore, men are not likely to consider their sexual aggressive behaviors offensive or criminal.

Nevertheless, women may also subscribe to a variety of misconceptions. Despite that the majority of sexual aggression was initiated by peer/friends, very few complaints were filed against peer offenders. This discrepancy may result from women's internalization of the misconceptions that 1) the sexual offense initiated by peer/partner is not serious enough to make a scene out of it; 2) the sexual offense initiated by peer/partner is not considered a "real" offense by others; and 3) the woman is partially responsible for sexual advances from a peer/partner.

In summary, the widespread misconception on sexual victimization is evident in media portrayal of human sexuality, in the discriminating attitudes of criminal justice system against the victim, and in the social perception of general public and college students. The internalization of these misconceptions has been suggested to create "innocent" sexual offenders and "hidden" victims
among college students. Concerned about the widespread of misconceptions among the student population at UH, the present study examines students' attitude towards sexual assault and sexual harassment and factors contributing to the attitude formation.

2. The Consequences of Misconceptions about Sexual Victimization

The widespread misconceptions on sexual victimization are detrimental to the society at large in three ways. First, societal misconceptions on sexual victimization justify and promote sexual aggression against women. Secondly, the acceptance of rape myths in criminal justice system often results in an insensitive treatment to rape victims, which contributes to lower reporting and prosecuting rate on the crime of sexual assault. Thirdly, societal misconceptions on sexual victimization magnify the impact of sexual assault and prolong the victim's recovery from the trauma.

Societal misconceptions on sexual victimization provide a cultural justification for sexual aggression against women (Alford and Brown, 1985; Marolla and Scully, 1982 and 1986). Feminists contend that the widespread rape myths support and promote rape 2 (Burt, 1980; Brownmiller, 1975; Weis and

2. In this study, "rape" and "sexual assault" are used interchangeable due to practicality considerations. The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) supported legislation to eliminate use of the word "rape", substituting instead terms such as "sexual assault" or "sexual battery". They argue that these latter terms are less emotion-charged and

Empirical studies support the feminist contention by providing a remarkably consistent relationship between rape-myth acceptance and sexual aggression (Malamuth and Check, 1985; Koss and Leonard, 1984; Muehlenhard and Linton, 1987; Peterson and Franzese, 1987). Since Griffin's (1971) examination of cultural supports for rape, a growing number of studies have suggested that rape results from normal socialization process (Briere and Malamuth, 1983; Margolin et al., 1989; Medea and Thompson, 1974; Muehlenhard and Linton, 1987; Peterson and Franzese, 1987; Russell, 1974; Weis and Borges, 1973). In general, these studies found that men's rape supportive attitudes are closely related with their likelihood to conduct sexual aggression against women.

In addition to justifying sexual aggression against women, misconceptions on sexual victimization influence the operation of criminal justice system in terms of reporting, prosecuting, convicting, and sentencing. The acceptance of less subject to distortion on the basis of sex-role stereotypes. Nevertheless, the terms "rape" and "rape myth" have been intensively used in the literature. The present study indiscriminately employs both terms of "rape" and "sexual assault" to refer to sexual offenses meeting legal definition in the State of Hawaii.
rape myths among criminal justice system personnel often contributes to a low reporting rate due to victims' fear of second assault in the legal procedure. The insensitive treatment of rape victims was suggested to magnify sexual assault trauma (Flynn, 1974; Griffin, 1973; Medea and Thomson, 1974; Peters, 1973; Russell, 1974).

The following passage vividly described a rape victim's nightmare of the police investigation process. "It was like being raped all over again," a gang rape victim commented on experiencing the investigating process. A rumor spread throughout the campus depicted her as a sort of accessory to her own rape. Press reports portrayed her as a promiscuous, blackout drinker. "It got to the point where I'd walk down the hall of the dorm and hear people talking about me." The gossip made her wonder whether she really was to blame for the gang rape. "I ended up being nonfunctional. It was the only way to deal with the shame." (People, 1990:99)

Furthermore, societal misconceptions on sexual victimization of women, particularly in blaming the victim, jeopardize the victim's recovery from the trauma (Lenox and

---

3. The estimated reporting rate on rape ranges from 10% (Griffin, 1971) to 54% (BJS, 1990). Koss (1988) found that only 58% of victims reported the rape to anyone and a mere 5% reported the rape to the police. An extensive investigation of rape victimization found that one-half were reported (McDermott, 1979). The FBI estimated only one fourth of the actual cases of forcible rape was reported in 1988 (Andersen, 1988:193). A study of hitchhike rape estimated less than one-third of rape cases were reported (Nelson and Amir, 1975).
Gannon, 1983). The victim's internal attribution (i.e., self-blame) often results in feelings of guilt (Wortman, 1978), which magnifies the traumatic experience of sexual assault for the victim. Furthermore, the victim-blame practice often results in isolating the victim from social support system and in prolonging the recovery process.

In general, societal misconceptions on sexual victimization create a rape supportive climate and exacerbate the traumatic effects of victimization through the following mechanisms: low reporting rate due to victims' fear of second assault in the legal procedure of criminal justice system; victims' hesitance in seeking help from public service agencies; delayed recovery from trauma; ineffective treatment programs for offenders and ineffective protective strategies for potential victims; alienation of victim from social support system; misinformation fed into rape legislation process.

3. Sexual Victimization as a Social Problem

Sexual victimization of university women has been a social problem throughout higher educational institutions in the United States. Numerous colleges and universities have looked into the prevalence of sexual victimization among the students, the staff, and the faculty (Koss, 1988; Koss and Oros, 1982; Lafontaine and Tredeau, 1986; Lott, Reilly, and Howard, 1982; Mazer and Percival, 1989; Reilly et al., 1986). Various policies on correcting and preventing sexual
victimization of female students have been examined and implemented.

University of Hawaii, with its unique social characteristics, encounters sexual victimization issue in a more complicated context. Unlike college-town universities on the mainland, UH is a commuter college where the majority of students conduct a diversified life style. In addition to campus life, UH students also involve in regular work life. The diversified life style increase the student's vulnerability to sexual victimization both at school and at workplace.

Sexual victimization of female students has been a major concern in the University of Hawaii community, and has attained escalating attention since 1988. Sexual harassment is not new to the UH campus. A 1985 survey conducted by the EEO/AA office concluded that 80% of the respondents believed that "sexual intimidation is a serious social problem." (Ka Leo O Hawai'i, Oct. 5, 1988) A 1988 survey taken at the University of Hawaii indicated that one out of every four college women was victim of sexual assault (Ka Leo O Hawai'i, March 6, 1991).

The year of 1988 witnessed a heated debate on the codes of professional ethics and conduct, which denounced and prohibited sexual relations between faculty and students. UH official procedures on reporting and investigating sexual victimization were charged with conflict of interest and
being protective of the offender (the faculty member) at the expense of the victim (the student). The campus paper started publishing sexual harassment and assault stories of female students victimized by male faculty members (Ka Leo O Hawai'i, October 14, 1988).

At the beginning of 1990, anonymous posters accusing faculty members of sexual harassment appeared in public place, which resulted in a heated debate on the power issue between the harasser and the harassed (Ka Leo O Hawai'i, January 26, 1990). The administration denounced the posters as irresponsible while activists attributed the tactics to the power stratification between faculty and students. Later in the year, faulted by a federal agency for not meeting U.S. standards, the UH sexual harassment policy was scrutinized by a task force appointed by the President of UH but no consensus could be derived on the issue of faculty-student relationship.

The issue of sexual victimization received escalating attention with the arrival of 1991. For the first time, UH administrators indicated willingness to release names of faculty members found guilty of sexual harassment. Nevertheless, the Court considered the name releasing unconstitutional and instructed UH to withhold the list until further notice (Ka Leo O Hawai'i, January 28, 1991). The campus paper, however, went ahead to release two names of faculty members confirmed on violating sexual harassment
policy (Ka Leo O Hawai‘i, January 30, 1991). A debate on sexual harassment policy between the convicted professors and the investigating office waged on (Ka Leo O Hawai‘i, January 31, 1991). The event attracted attention from a local television, which eventually covered a live debate on UH sexual harassment policy. Although the policy was criticized across the panel, no consensus was reached on where faults lie (Ka Leo O Hawai‘i, March 6, 1991).

A rape awareness week in March highlighted the issue of sexual victimization. Anti-rape groups held a candle vigil to "take the night back"; campus experts criticized UH policy as lacking sympathy to the assault victims.

A campus hate campaign added even more heat to the debate on sexual harassment policy. The campus newspaper reported that sexual harassment was employed to attack a controversial female professor involved in racial issues (Ka Leo O Hawai‘i, March 11 and 15, 1991). This incident ironically provided justification in discrediting and trivializing the validity of women's claim of sexual victimization during a massive campaign to rectify societal misconceptions toward sexual victimization of women.

Since 1988, the present study has observed an escalating concern about sexual victimization of university women. The concern often resulted into heated debates on the politics of sexual victimization in local community in general and on the UH campus in particular. The study
considers that an empirical investigation on the student's attitudes towards, and encounter with, sexual victimization will contribute timely information to the UH administration in formulating effective policy to combat this social problem.

4. The Prevalence of Sexual Victimization Among College Women

The prevalence of sexual victimization among college women has been well documented. Due to the incompatible theories and methodologies employed in previous studies, the literature displays a wide range estimate on the prevalence of sexual victimization among college women. In general, estimates range from 5% for female students in academic institutions to as high as 40% for sexual harassment and 15% for sexual assault (Brewer, 1982). The modest response rates of most studies are usually in the 35-45% range (Lafontaine and Tredeau, 1986; Mazer and Percival, 1989; Reilly et al., 1986).

a) The Prevalence of Sexual Assault

College women are at high risk for sexual assault because they are in the same age range as the bulk of rape victims. The victimization rate for females peaks in the 16-19 year age group, and the second highest rate occurs in the 20-24 year age group. These rates are approximately three times higher than the mean for all women (BJS, 1990).
Koss (1988) conducted a prevalence study on sexual victimization since age 14 with a national sample of college students. Koss' study found that 46% of the female students reported no experience with any form of sexual assault, while 54% indicated some form of sexual assault. Koss reported 14% of the women experienced sexual contact, 12% experienced sexual coercion and attempted rape respectively, and 15% were rape victims.

Kanin and his associates (Kanin, 1957; Kirkpatrick and Kanin, 1957; Kanin and Parcell, 1977) found that 20-25% of college women reported forceful attempts by their dates at sexual intercourse. Other studies indicate that about 15% of all college women have been raped (Koss, Gidycz and Wisniewski, 1987; Muehlenhard and Linton, 1987; Wilson and Durrenberger, 1982).

The New Mexico Governor's Rape Prevention and Prosecution Commission in 1988 found that, statistically, one in four college women become rape victims. Another study indicated that nearly one in five (20%) women is forced to have sex or are victims of attempted rape while going to college in New York (Ka Leo, Jan. 19, 1990).

A 1988 survey taken at the University of Hawaii indicated that one out of every four college women (between the ages of 18 to 21) was victims of sexual assault (Ka Leo, April 18, 1990).
b) The Prevalence of Sexual Harassment

Approximately one out of every three or four (33% or 25%) undergraduate and graduate women students has experienced some form of sexual harassment or sexually inappropriate behavior (Adams, Kottke, and Padgett, 1983; Benson and Thomson, 1982; Cammaert, 1985; Lott, Reilly, and Howard, 1982; Mazer and Percival, 1989; McCormack, 1985; McKinney, Olson and Satterfield, 1987; Reilly, Lott, and Gallogly, 1986; Wilson and Kraus, 1983). As many as 60% experience what Schneider (1987) terms "everyday harassment" such as jokes about one's body or physical contact. Studies report that, among women students, between 20 to 30 percent of undergraduates, and 30 to 40 percent of graduates, experienced some form of sexual harassment (Sandler, 1990). A 1985 survey of UH students indicated that 17 percent had experienced sexual harassment. However, few of the students filed complaints (Honolulu Star Bulletin, Jan. 30, 1990). A recent study shows that 26% of the surveyed UH students have been victims of sexual harassment on the Manoa campus (Ka Leo, Jan. 9, 1991).4

5. The Prevalence of Peer Perpetrators to College Women

An accumulated evidence indicates that, during the last 30 years, a rapid increase in the sexual victimization of teenage and college women by dates and acquaintances has

4. Due to the incompatible theories and methodologies employed in previous studies, the literature displays a wide range estimate on the prevalence of sexual harassment among college women.
occurred (Levine and Kanin, 1987). A national crime survey reported more rapes were committed by non-stranger than stranger (BJS, 1990). A three year study on a national sample found that 57% of the rapes reported in the study were perpetrated by first dates, and 84% were perpetrated by acquaintances (Koss, Gidycz and Wisniewski, 1987). Kanin and his associates (Kanin, 1957; Kirkpatrick and Kanin, 1957; Kanin and Parcell, 1977) reported that one out of five college women experienced attempt rape by their dates. The New Mexico Governor's Rape Prevention and Prosecution Commission in 1988 found that, among rape victims of college women, the attackers were four times more likely to be an acquaintance than a stranger.

National crime data indicate that a majority of sexual offenses/crimes were conducted by college-age males. Forty-seven percent of all alleged rapists who are arrested are individuals under age 25 (FBI, 1986). A recent crime survey reported that 43.3% of sexual assault offenders are between 18 to 29 years old (BJS, 1990). Approximately 25% of all persons age 18-24 are attending higher educational institutions (US Bureau of Census, 1980).

Despite of the prevalence of date rape among college students, relatively few college men consider their behaviors offensive or criminal. A date rape study on a national student sample indicated that men did not admit enough sexual aggression to account for the number of
victimizations reported by women. The study showed that 54% of women claimed to be sexually victimized, but only 25% of men admitted any degree of sexually aggressive behavior (Koss, 1988:21). Furthermore, according to the same study, fifteen percent of women reported experiencing an act that met legal definition of rape while only 4.4% of men reported perpetrating such crime. Other studies concurred the underreporting of male sexual aggression against their dates: for a 20-25% reporting rate on date rape, only 15-16% of college men acknowledged obtaining sexual intercourse against their dates' will (Kanin, 1957, 1984: Kirkpatrick and Kanin, 1957; Kanin and Parcell, 1977; Rapaport and Burkhard, 1984).

The discrepancy may result from male student's acceptance of misconceptions on sexual victimization. When men accept natural/biological explanation of sexual aggression, they will not consider their sexual advances unjustified. When men discredit women's claim of sexual victimization, they will not take "no" for an answer. When men trivialize the impact of sexual victimization on women, they will not empathize with the victim of sexual aggression. Thus, the acceptance of misconceptions on sexual victimization may lead men to become "innocent" sexual offenders/criminals, who fail to recognize their behaviors as offensive or criminal.
Men are not alone in accepting the misconceptions on sexual victimization. Women's subscription to these misconceptions was reflected on the reporting pattern of sexual victimization. The majority of sexual offenses to college women were initiated from their peers (e.g., friends, classmates) or intimates while very few complaints were filed by students against other students. This discrepancy might reflect internalization of rape myths among the victim, which indirectly contributes to the underreporting of sexual victimization (Cherry, 1983; Wilson, Faison, and Britton, 1983). Thus, the internalization of misconceptions on sexual victimization may lead women to become "hidden victims", who fail to recognize their victim status in the sexual interaction.

Observing a substantial percentage of peer offender to college women but a disproportionately low rate of self-reported offense from male students, the study is concerned about the extent of acceptance of various misconceptions among the college male students. Furthermore, the discrepancy between the prevailing peer offenders and the minimum complaints filed against peer offenders may suggest

5. Koss' (1988) study found that among the female students who were raped, almost 75% did not identify the experience as rape.
6. Of the 74 complaints filed with the UH-Manoa's office of equal employment opportunity and dean of students between 1983 and 1989, almost half -- 49 percent -- were lodged by students against faculty members. Only 12% were filed by students against other students (Source: UH Equal Employment Opportunity Office; Honolulu Star Bulletin, Jan. 30, 1990).
a possible internalization of misconceptions among college women. Concerning the implication of internalizing various misconceptions among young adults, the present study is conducted to investigate the degree of acceptance/rejection of misconceptions on sexual victimization among university students.

B. Original Contributions

The study presents five original theoretical and methodological contributions to the current literature. First, the study identifies specific components of misconceptions towards sexual harassment and sexual assault and further integrates common misconceptions into a multidimensional structure of attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. This effort contributes to 1) identifying specific components in the attitudinal hierarchy on sexual victimization of women, and 2) providing methodological justification for future research to simplify the scale construction on attitude toward sexual victimization of women.

Second, the study verifies misconception communality and attitudinal consistency on sexual assault and sexual harassment. This validation supports the representativeness of the four misconception models in characterizing societal attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. In addition, this effort contributes to facilitating the
interchange of well-established literature on rape attitudes to a less developed area of sexual harassment.

Third, the study examines the effect of ethnic socialization between the Caucasian and the Asian on attitude formation toward sexual victimization of women. This effort contributes to 1) filling the gap between the limited research on the Asians and the appropriate attention due to the Asians on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women, and 2) expanding current knowledge of ethnic socialization on attitude formation between the East and the West. Furthermore, the study uncovers the heterogeneity of Asian culture by examining ethnic variation among the Japanese, Chinese and Filipino on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women.

Fourth, the study integrates communication theories with social-psychological literature to examine the dynamics attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. In examining the effect of issue attentiveness on attitudes towards sexual victimization, the study provides new information to public education on sexual victimization of women.

Fifth, the study collects and reports sexual victimization data with a behavior-specific design. By breaking down sexual victimization into specific acts of sexual aggression, the study avoids 1) victim-labeling effect on data collection, and 2) comparison difficulties
with other prevalence studies on campus sexual victimization.
CHAPTER II. THEORETICAL ORIENTATION

This chapter, presenting the theoretical orientation of this study, is composed of three sections: literature review, research framework, and research hypotheses. A literature review is conducted with an emphasis on 1) attitude theories in general and attitudes towards sexual victimization in particular; and 2) the effects of relevant factors on the attitudes towards sexual victimization, which include demographic variables (gender and ethnicity), sex role attitudes, severity perception of sexual aggression, encounter with sexual victimization, and issue attentiveness.

A research framework, integrating attitude theories from social psychology, communication and sociology, is proposed to examine the attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. Based on the literature, research hypotheses are formulated to explore the dynamics of study variables presented in the framework. These include: 1) the relationship between attitudes towards sexual assault and attitudes towards sexual harassment; 2) the effects of gender and ethnicity on sex role socialization, perception of severity, encounter with sexual victimization, and issue attentiveness; 3) the effects of sex role socialization, perception of severity, encounter with sexual victimization, and issue attentiveness on attitudes towards sexual
victimization of women; and 4) the effects of gender and ethnicity, intervened by sex role socialization, severity perception, encounter with sexual victimization, and issue attentiveness, on the attitudes towards sexual victimization of women.

A. Literature Review

1. Theories of Attitude

The study examines attitudes towards sexual victimization of women among university students. The area of attitude studies has been the meeting ground for the disciplines of psychology, sociology, political science, anthropology and communication. Interested in factors relevant to attitude formation, the study integrates attitude literature in social psychology, communication and sociology in constructing an interdisciplinary framework to guide the present endeavor.

   a) Attitude Theories in Social Psychology

The study of attitude is considered the core of social psychology. Sherif and Sherif (1967) offered five characteristics which distinguish attitude from other psychological concepts. These are 1) attitudes are not innate; 2) attitudes are not temporary states but are more or less enduring once they are formed; 3) attitudes always imply a relationship between the person and objects; 4) relationship between person and object is not neutral but
has motivational-affective properties; and 5) the subject-object relationship is accomplished through the formation of categories both differentiating between the objects and between the person's positive or negative relation to objects in the various categories.

Current definitions of attitudes are plentiful and all essentially indicate that attitudes have three major features (e.g., Ajzen, 1988; Allport, 1935; Bagozzi, 1978; Hilgard, 1980; Smith, Bruner, and White, 1956). First, an attitude develops through experience with an object. Second, an attitude consists of positive or negative evaluations. Third, an attitude predisposes an individual to act in a predictable manner with respect to an object. That is, social psychologists conceptualize an attitude as composing three dimensions: 1) a cognitive dimension, refers to beliefs about an attitude object; 2) an affective dimension, refers to evaluation of, or favorability toward, the object; and 3) a conative dimension, refers to behavioral intentions towards the object (Bogardus, 1925; McGuire, 1985; Triandis, 1977).

Objects-on-Dimensions models offer a working definition of attitudes as a response locating an object of thought on a dimension of judgment (McGuire, 1968; Wyer, 1974; Woelfel and Fink, 1980; Kaplowitz and Fink, 1982). Social Judgment theory offers three concepts to assess the affective dimension of attitudes. These are latitude of acceptance,
latitude of rejection, and latitude of non-commitment (Sherif and Sherif, 1967).

Halloran (1967:29) suggests three main sources for attitude formation: direct experience with the objects and situations; explicit and implicit learning from others; and personality development. McGuire (1985) offers four attitude determinants: genetic endowment, transient physiological states, direct experience with the attitude object, and institutional situations. According to McGuire, parental interjection, peer group norms, ideological schooling, and mass media indoctrination are major social institutions in determining the attitude. The socialization process, in providing a continuing learning opportunity, is invariantly noted as an influential source for attitude formation.

Social judgement theory (Sherif and Hovland, 1959; Sherif and Sherif, 1967) maintains that anchor (or reference point) and ego-involvement determine the process of social judgement. Reference point, based on past experience, serves as an internal framework for social comparison. Ego-involvement indicates the degree of importance the issue is to the individual.

b) Attitude Theories in Communication

Attitude formation and change has been a major topic among communication theories. Information integration theory contends that an individual's attitude can be
affected by information received and integrated into his attitude system. An attitude is a reflection of the accumulation of information about the attitude object. All information have the potential of affecting one's attitudes, but the degree of effect depends on valence and weight of a particular information (Anderson, 1971; Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975).

Elaboration likelihood theory (Petty and Cacioppo, 1981) suggests a central information processing route to obtain effective attitude change. The primary factor determining whether information is processed centrally or peripherally is the personal significance of the topic in question. The more significant the topic is, the more likely an individual will process information through the central route.

c) Attitude Theories in Sociology


Structural theories of attitudes assume that attitude similarity within groups stems from the common life
situations they encounter as a result of their relationships to social structure and institutions (Turner and Kiecolt, 1984). Thus, structural theory contends that an individual's attitudes and values are shaped by his demographic and socioeconomic characteristics in the social structure (Erbring and Young, 1979).

d) Review Summary of Attitude Theories

In summary, social psychology literature maintains that an attitude consists of the latitude of acceptance, rejection and non-commitment, and predicts an individual's behavior pattern. The literature suggests main sources of attitude formation, including experience with the attitude object/situation, socialization process, reference point, and degree of ego-involvement. Communication theories content that media exposure and information integration, as reflected in issue attentiveness, contribute to the formation of attitudes. Sociological theories further suggest demographic variables as structural and cultural determinants in attitude formation process.

The study adopts an interdisciplinary approach to examine the attitude towards sexual victimization of women. Integrating attitude theories of social judgement, information integration, and cultural/structural perspectives, the study constructs a research framework to explore the dynamics of demographic characteristics, sex role socialization, severity perception of sexual
aggression, encounter with victimization exposure, and issue attentiveness to attitudes towards sexual assault and sexual harassment.

2. Attitudes towards Sexual Victimization of Women

The present study maintains that sexual assault and sexual harassment represent two major categories of sexual victimization, each of which covers a variety of unwanted/unwelcomed sexual attention and advances considered intrusive, offensive, or harassing by the recipient. Sexual victimization is perceived as composed of a continuum of severity, with the least form of sexual harassment at one end and the most severe sexual assault at the other end. The concept of sexual victimization is illustrated in the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Harassment</th>
<th>Sexual Assault</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(Continuum of Severity)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sexual victimization has been viewed with ambivalence and skepticism throughout human history and cultures. Take the rape law for example, the victim of sexual assault has been treated differently under the law than victims of other
crimes. Historically, rape laws have subjected victims to a higher standard of proof and a greater degree of cross-examination about their personal lives than is permitted in other criminal proceedings. This has led many victims to believe that they, not the defendant, are on trial (Abarbanel and Adams, 1981; Estrich, 1987; Ng, 1987).

Sexual harassment, as obtaining accelerating public attention during the past decade, further illustrates societal ambivalence and skepticism towards the victim of sexual aggression. Just like rape victims, victims of sexual harassment are often burdened with providing proof of her allegation. However, due to the lack of physical and visible damages caused by the harassment, the victim often face a difficult, and sometimes humiliating situation where substantiating her charge with physical evidence becomes impossible. Various cases of sexual harassment allegation, particularly against authority perpetrator, were dismissed due to insufficient evidence.

Invariantly, societal attitudes towards sexual victimization of women are prevailed with a variety of misconceptions. These misconceptions include biological and psycho-pathetical attribution of sexual aggression, trivializing the consequences for the victim, discrediting women's claims of sexual victimization, and blaming the women for precipitating male's sexual aggression.
Misconceptions on sexual victimization, widespread in criminal legal system, mass media, and public opinion, often bring detrimental consequences to the society at large. Feminists contend that societal misconception on sexual victimization results in justifying sexual aggression against women, creating a hostile climate to the victim in the criminal justice system, and prolonging victim's recovery process from the traumatic experience.

a) Misconceptions on Sexual Assault

The literature has identified various rape myths or rape-supportive beliefs in the American culture (e.g., Ben-Horin, 1975; Branch, 1976; Koss and Leonard, 1984; Lottes, 1984; Salerno, 1975; Van Ness, 1984, etc.). Koss and Leonard (1984) identify the following beliefs as rape supportive: 1) rape is not a serious crime; 2) women are responsible for rape prevention; 3) women provoke and want men to use force in sexual interactions; 4) relationships between men and women are adversarial and manipulative; 5) a man's role is to convince a reluctant women to have sex; 6) some amount of force is a legitimate strategy to get sex; and 7) women do not find offensive the forceful strategies men use to obtain sex.

Lottes (1984:206-211) suggests the following beliefs as examples of callous attitudes towards rape victims: 1) women enjoy sexual violence; 2) sex is the primary motivation for rape; 3) women are responsible for rape prevention; 4) only
certain women are raped; 5) women falsely report rape; 6) women are less desirable after rape; and 7) rape may be justified.

Criminological literature includes examples of common rape myths as follows: 1) healthy women cannot be raped against their will; 2) women often falsely accuse men of rape; 3) rape is an enjoyable experience for the victim; 4) rape is primarily a sex crime committed by sex-crazed maniacs; 5) rape is an impulsive, unplanned act; 6) only bad girls get raped (Groth, 1979; Hursh, 1977; McCaghy, 1980; Schrink and Lebeau, 1984; Schwendinger and Schwendinger, 1974).

Previous studies have suggested a multi-dimensional structure in societal attitudes towards sexual assault and the victim. Feild (1978) extracted the following factors on rape attitudes: 1) the perceived role of victim's contribution to rape; 2) motivation for rape (sex vs. power); 3) perceived punishment for rape; 4) normality of rapists; 5) perception on rape victims; and 6) victim resistance during rape.

Another multi-dimensional study by Williams and Holmes (1981) identifies three sets of ethnic-specific dimensions. The factors of "Male-Female Sexuality," "Skepticism and Female Responsibility" were extracted for the Anglos; "Sexual Conflict," "Blame Skepticism" and "Victim-Defined Rape" for the Blacks; and "Male-Female Sexuality," "Rape

b) Misconceptions on Sexual Harassment

Four explanatory models of sexual harassment have been proposed (Gutek and Morasch, 1982; Tangri, Burt and Johnson, 1982): natural/biological, organizational, social-cultural and sex-role spillover. The natural/biological model explains sexual harassment as natural expression of sexual attraction, and rules out the intent as harassing, dominating and discriminating. Overlooking the power stratification in sexual harassment, this model denies the consequences of sexual harassment on women's careers, physical and emotional health, and job/learning security.

The organizational model holds that the power hierarchy of organizations provides an opportunity structure for sexual harassment. Women, often holding less power than men in the organization, are vulnerable to the economic, psychological, social and physical consequences of sexual harassment.

The social-cultural model suggests that sexual harassment is a manifestation of the larger patriarchal system, which prescribes a male-dominated cultural pattern for gender interaction. More empirical support has been
obtained for the organizational and social-cultural models than for the natural/biological model.

The sex-role spillover model explains sexual harassment as the carryover of behavioral expectations based on the gender into the educational setting or workplace. Sexual harassment of women in non-traditional or in female-populated majors or careers reflects the effect sex-role spillover.

Empirical observations indicated many misconceptions surround sexual harassment (Sandler, 1990). The "beauty" and "clothing" myths view sexual harassment as an extension of biological drives, and thereby, shift the responsibility and blame to the victim, i.e., women through their appearance are inviting men to sexually harass them.

Another myth suggests that the woman could just say no to stop the harassment. This myth ignores the power stratification, either based on gender or organizational structure, and trivializes the consequences of sexual harassment on the victim. Still another myth is that women will falsify charges as a way of getting back at men. Although it is possible, falsification is extremely rare. This myth leads to the suspicion and discrediting of sexual harassment claims.

7. A survey of more than 300 institutions reported that less than one percent of charges were deliberate fabrications (Sandler, 1990).
c) Review Summary on Attitudes towards Sexual Assault and Harassment

Previous studies on attitudes towards sexual assault have identified various misconceptions towards rape and the victim. Popular misconceptions include 1) attributing sexual assault to male sexual drives; 2) attributing sexual assault to psychological abnormality of the assailant; 3) blaming the woman for precipitating male sexual aggression; 4) discrediting the woman's claim of sexual assault; and 5) degrading the rape victim.

A review of the literature on sexual harassment reveals a lack of systematic examination of misconceptions towards the nature and the victim of sexual harassment. Nevertheless, the literature has suggested misconception similarities towards sexual assault and sexual harassment. Similar to sexual assault, sexual harassment has often been 1) attributed to natural/biological causes, 2) blamed on the victim for precipitation, 3) trivialized on the consequence for the victim, 4) taken lightly or even treated as a joke, and 5) overlooked on the power stratification between the harasser and the harassed.

The study contends that sexual harassment and sexual assault constitute two major forms of sexual victimization of women. Accordingly, the study considers the misconception communality between sexual assault and harassment theoretically significant in characterizing
societal attitudes toward sexual victimization of women in general.

In addition, the study considers the validation of the misconception communality methodologically important in facilitating the exchange of a well-established rape attitude literature to a understudied area of sexual harassment. To illustrate these theoretical and methodological potentials, the present study is conducted to: 1) confirm the misconception communality and attitudinal consistency towards sexual assault and sexual harassment; 2) expand the misconception communality to societal attitude toward sexual victimization of women in general; and 3) apply existing literature on rape myths to study the attitudinal correlates of sexual harassment.

3. The Effects of Demographic Characteristics

The structural theories contend that an individual's attitude is shaped by his/her demographic characteristics in the social structure. Literature on rape attitudes also suggests a relationship between an individual's demographic characteristics and his/her attitude towards sexual victimization (Burt, 1978; Field, 1978).

The present study includes gender and ethnicity as demographic characteristics to predict attitudes towards sexual victimization of women in the student population.
a) The Effect of Gender

This section reviews literature concerning the effects of gender on 1) attitudes towards sexual victimization of women; 2) attitudes towards Sex Roles; 3) severity perception of sexual aggression; 4) encounter with sexual Victimization; and 5) issue attentiveness.

(1) The Effect of Gender on Attitudes towards Sexual Victimization of Women

The literature is inconclusive regarding the gender effect on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. Although most studies reported a significant gender difference, a few found no gender difference on the acceptance of misconceptions regarding sexual victimization of women.

Among studies suggesting gender differences on attitude toward sexual victimization, women were found to be more rejecting of rape myths than men (Burt, 1980; Feild, 1978; Margolin et al., 1989). Men tend to believe more than women that women invite rape by their dress or behavior, and that women have the ability to resist rape. Compared to men, women's perception tended to be more favorable towards the victim and less lenient towards the perpetrator; women were more understanding, more accepting and less blaming of the rape victim (Barnett and Feild, 1977; Burczyk and Standing, 1989; Chen and Lin, 1988; Howells et al., 1984; Selby, Colhoun and Brock, 1977) and women were found to be more
likely to support a marital rape law (Jeffords and Dull, 1982).

Studies reported that women expressed stronger rejection than men of misconceptions towards sexual harassment. Female students were less likely than male students to attribute sexual harassment to sexual drive, human nature, or a misunderstanding (Whitmore, 1983). Compared to male students, females held more negative attitude towards sexual harassment of students by faculty, and attributed less blame to the victim (McKinney, 1990; Valentine-French and Radtke, 1989). At workplace, women were more likely than men to believe that the victim had been sexual harassed, and were less likely to attribute the responsibility to the victim (Jensen and Gutek, 1982; Kenig and Ryan, 1986; Sherman and Smith, 1983).

Some studies reported no gender differences on the attitude towards sexual victimization of women. Acock (1983) reported that gender of the college students did not make significant difference on their attribution of responsibility on sexual assault: both rated rape as serious crime, perceived the same degree of norm violation, respected the victim, and did not blame the victim. Studies also indicated that male and female students did not differ significantly on their acceptance of rape myths (Check and Malamuth, 1983; Giacopassi and Dull, 1986). Nor were gender differences evident in the criminal justice system. Juror's
gender was not found to be related with contributing fault and sentencing judgements on rapists (Paulsen, 1979; Pugh, 1983; Scroggs, 1976).

(2) The Effect of Gender on Attitudes towards Sex Roles

The literature has suggested gender difference on sex role attitudes among the general public: women were found to be less sex role stereotyped than men (Burt, 1978; Field, 1978; Hawley and Even, 1982). Nevertheless, a study on sex role attitudes among residents of six states (N=3,639) reported that male attitudes were significantly more stereotyped than female unless they were college educated (Hawley and Even, 1982).

However, a bulk of studies on college students suggest that women held more liberal and more egalitarian attitudes towards sex roles than males (Hartman and Hartman, 1983; Marrone and Rutnik, 1987; Nelson, 1988; Silver et al., 1988). Although both college men and women were relatively liberal, women generally expressed more egalitarian attitudes than men did (Marrone and Rutnik, 1987). Compared to their male counterparts, female students scored higher than male students on five domains of sex role egalitarianism (Beere et al., 1984) and were less sex role stereotyped in their evaluation of wife, mother and father roles (Rao and Rao, 1985b). A cross-cultural study indicates that, among American and Indian students, women
were less traditional in sex role attitudes than men (Rao and Rao, 1985a).

Gender difference on sex role attitudes could be traced back to the adolescent age: female adolescents were found to be less sex role stereotyped than male. A study on adolescent sex role attitudes among a national probability sample (N=1,626) reported that female respondents held a less traditional sex role attitude than the males (Canter and Ageton, 1984). A study comparing attitudes of adolescents towards sex role stereotyping in 1956 and 1982 indicated boys still emphasized both sex role differentiations and symbols of male dominance and female subordination more than girls (Lewin and Tragos, 1987).

(3) The Effect of Gender on Perception of Severity

Among studies suggesting gender differences on the perception of sexual harassment, female students were found to be less tolerant of sexual harassment than males. Recent studies have reported that female students were more likely than male students 1) to define incidents as sexual harassment, 2) to regard such behaviors as serious or offensive; and 3) to express intolerant attitudes towards sexual harassment (Adams et al., 1983; Grauerholz, 1989; Kenig and Ryan, 1986; Konard and Gutek, 1986; Powell, 1986; Reilly, Lott and Gallogly, 1986; Rossi and Weber-Burden, 1983). Compared to males, female college students rated behaviors in sexual harassment scenarios as more
inappropriate (Allen, 1988) and more harassing (Lester et al., 1986). Female students were found to be more likely than male students to disapprove romantic relationships between co-workers if the male has greater organizational authority, and more likely to view sexual harassment as a matter of concern to the organization (Kenig and Ryan, 1986).

The same tendency was observed at the workplace. Women employees, more than men, labeled sexual behaviors at work as sexual harassment and considered sexual harassment a problem at their workplace (Collins and Blodgett, 1981; U. S. Merit System Protection Board, 1981; Reilly et al., 1982; Guteck, Morasch and Cohen, 1983). Compared to men, women employees attributed less responsibility to the victim and were more likely to believe that the victim has been sexually harassed (Sherman and Smith, 1983). Furthermore, women workers' experiences of sexual harassment seem to influence beliefs concerning the seriousness of sexual harassment at the workplace (Powell, 1983).

(4) The Effect of Gender on Encounter with Sexual Victimization

Studies on the prevalence of sexual victimization have documented that sexual assault and harassment are primarily directed to women (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1988; Ryan and Kenig, 1991). According to the 1988 National Crime Survey Report, the victimization rate for rape is 1.2
for female and .1 for male (BJS, 1990). Ryan and Kenig (1991) found significantly more university women than men reported having experiencing various types of sexual harassment behavior.

(5) The Effect of Gender on Issue Attentiveness

Previous studies have indicated a gender difference on the various dimensions of issue attentiveness. Female students were found to be more aware than men of sexual harassment (Whitmore, 1983). Gender was found to be a differentiating variable for the performance of information seeking behavior among the adolescent in the areas of health-maintenance and birth-control (DePietro and Clark, 1983; Newell, 1986).

(6) Review Summary and Research Hypotheses on the Effect of Gender

In summary, although some studies observed no gender differences on attitudes towards sex role and sexual victimization of women, the majority confirmed a significant gender effect on variables of interest to this study.

The study considers gender a structural determinant to attitude formation process. The structural theories contend that gender predetermines an individual's relationship to various social institutions, including sex role ideology and sexual victimization. The common life experience, as induced by gender difference, develops collective consciousness among men and women respectively. This
gender-based life experience and collective consciousness were predicted to reflect in an individual's 1) attitudes towards sex roles, 2) perception of sexual aggression, 3) encounter with sexual victimization, and 4) attentiveness to sexual victimization issue. The gender difference, as intervened by these variables, is predicted to exercise a significant effect on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women.

Based on previous research, the present study hypothesizes that, compared to male, female students express stronger rejection of sex role stereotyping; perceive various forms of sexual aggression as more serious; encounter with more sexual victimization; and indicate higher degree of issue attentiveness to sexual victimization, thereby, the female students express stronger rejection of misconceptions about sexual victimization.

b) The Effect of Ethnicity

The literature has suggested the socialization impact of ethnicity on attitude formation. Cultural theory contends that ethnicity predetermines cultural values which affect the formation of attitudes during socialization process. Structural theories maintain that ethnicity predisposes an individual to a common life situation and contributes to the formation of attitudes towards a particular object/situation.
This section reviews literature concerning the effects of ethnicity on 1) attitudes towards sexual victimization; 2) attitudes towards sex roles; 3) encounter with of sexual victimization; and 4) issue attentiveness.

(1) The Effect of Ethnicity on Attitudes towards Sexual Victimization of Women

Current literature is inconclusive regarding ethnicity effect on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. Among studies suggesting ethnic/racial differences on attitudes towards sexual victimization, Caucasians were found to be less supportive of rape myths than non-Caucasian minorities.

According to the literature, ethnic minority groups were more receptive to the misconceptions on sexual victimization than the Caucasians. Compared to Caucasians, Hispanic students expressed more supportive attitudes towards forcible date rape; Mexican-American women showed more ambivalence towards and acceptance of female responsibility for rape (Fischer, 1987; Williams and Holmes, 1982); Blacks generally were more receptive to rape myths, especially among the males; Black males were skeptical with regard to the creditability of rape, while Black female were more likely to see the victim as blameworthy (Field, 1978; Giacopassi and Dull, 1986; Williams and Holmes, 1982).

Among few studies suggesting no ethnicity effects on attitudes towards sexual victimization, Giacopassi and Dull
(1986) found no racial grouping that consistently accepted or rejected rape myths to a greater degree than all other racial and sexual categories; and Mills and Granoff (1988) found minimal ethnic differences in response patterns to sexual assault scenarios.

(2) The Effect of Ethnicity on Attitudes towards Sex Roles

The literature is in disagreement concerning the effects of race/ethnicity on sex role attitudes: some studies reported significant ethnic differences on sex role attitudes (e.g., Arafat & Yorburg, 1976; Belk et al., 1989; Canter and Ageton, 1984; Fischer, 1987; Seginer et al., 1990; Williams and Holmes, 1982) while others observed no relationship between ethnicity and sex role attitudes (e.g., Bonner, 1974; Brown, Perry, and Harburg, 1977; Hershey, 1978; Grimes, Hansen and Page, 1982).

Among studies suggesting ethnic differences on sex role attitudes, no clear direction on the differences has yet emerged. For example, previous studies reveal that, although Caucasians and Blacks differed significantly on sex role attitudes, the difference was by no means conclusive.

Some studies comparing Caucasian and Black women reported that Caucasians were less traditional than Black on sex role attitudes (Beale, 1970; Cade, 1970; Cole, 1975; Epstein, 1973; Franklin and Walum, 1972; Gump, 1975; Hays and Mindel, 1973; Jackson, 1971; Noble, 1974; Rosen, 1978;
stack, 1974; Young, 1970; Williams, 1980; Williams and Holmes, 1982). However, other studies observed the opposite: Caucasian women were found to be more traditional towards sex role attitudes than Black women (Arafat and Yorburg; 1976; Scanzoni, 1975; Williams and Holmes, 1982).

Nevertheless, Caucasians were found to be less sex role stereotyped than ethnic minority groups. Compared to Caucasians, minority respondents (e.g., Hispanic, Asian, etc.) held more traditional attitudes towards sex roles (Belk et al., 1989; Braun and Chao, 1978; Canter and Ageton, 1984; Fischer, 1987; Williams and Holmes, 1982); and Japanese-Americans differed significantly from Caucasian-Americans on specific aspects of sex roles (Arkoff, Meredith and Iwahara, 1964; Engel, 1985).

Regarding sex role attitudes among Asian minorities, Chinese men were more traditional than Japanese men, and Japanese women were relatively more traditional than the Chinese women (Engel and Dickson, 1985).

Nationality differences were observed, where women from the United States expressed stronger rejection of traditional views about women than women from Mexico; and American college students were less traditional in their sex role attitudes than their Indian counterparts (Belk et al., 1989; Gonzalez, 1982; Rao and Rao, 1985a).

Among studies reporting no significant racial/ethnic differences on sex role attitudes (Bonner, 1974; Brown et
al., 1977; Lyson, 1986; Rao and Rao, 1985b; Ransford and Miller, 1983; Scanzoni, 1975; Silver, 1988), a majority concern themselves with racial difference between the Caucasian and the Black: Caucasians were found to be no different from Blacks on sex role attitudes (Bonner, 1974; Brown et al., 1977; Lyson, 1986; Rao and Rao, 1985b; Scanzoni, 1975).

(3) The Effect of Ethnicity on Experience of Sexual Victimization

Previous studies indicate that women of minority groups are at higher risk of sexual victimization (Cole and Boyle, 1986; U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981, 1988; Tangri, Burt, and Johnson, 1982; Fain and Anderton, 1987). National crime data indicate significant difference on rape victimization rates among Caucasian, Black, Hispanic and other races (BJS, 1990). Blacks reported higher rate of sexual assault than Caucasian, and Hispanic reported higher rate than non-Hispanic. The National Crime Survey reports that the victimization rate of rape is .5 for Caucasian, 1.4 for Black, and .7 for other races including Asian, Pacific Islander and American Indian (BJS, 1990). Among females, rape rate is .9 for Caucasian and 2.6 for Black (BJS, 1990).

(4) The Effect of Ethnicity on Issue Attentiveness

Previous studies have reported ethnic/racial differences on information seeking behavior (DePietro and Clark, 1983; Newell, 1986). A significant difference
between Black and White adolescents was observed on information seeking behaviors in the areas of health-maintenance and birth-control (DePietro and Clark, 1983).

(5) Review Summary and Research Hypotheses on the Effect of Ethnicity

In summary, although some studies observed no ethnicity differences on attitudes towards sex role and sexual victimization of women, the majority confirmed a significant ethnicity effect on variables of interest to this study.

The present study considers ethnicity as both cultural and structural determinants in attitude formation regarding sexual victimization of women. Ethnicity predetermines cultural values to be transmitted to the next generation through socialization process. Ethnic background predisposes an individual to a particular life situation in the structure of sexual victimization.

Current literature has focused on ethnic differences among the Caucasian, the Black, and the Hispanic. Very little attention was directed to the ethnic differences on attitudes towards sexual victimization between Caucasian and Asian, let alone ethnic variation among the Asian group, e.g., Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, etc.

The Asian population needs to be included in current literature on attitudes toward sexual victimization of women for two reasons. First, the Asian is the fast-growing minority in the States (Census, 1980) and requires an
equally growing knowledge in the social psychology of this particular group in relation to other ethnic/racial groups. Second, the Confucian-patriarchy in Asian culture may transfer into a unique mindset towards sexual victimization of women. Asian culture has been characterized by a unique Confucian-patriarchal tradition, which emphasizes male-importance and female chastity in the context of families. In the male-centered culture, male sexual aggression against women has been historically accepted as "normal" and, therefore, women were held responsible to put a check on male's inappropriate sexual advances. As this logic develops, when a man went beyond his limit, it was the women to blame.

The Asian patriarchal culture has emphasized female chastity as a predominant virtue for women. In Ching dynasty of China, the local clan organization even awarded widow-chastity. The over-emphasis on female chastity, particularly in Chinese culture, extended into the depreciation of rape victim. Historically, a rape victim was considered less desirable in the marriage market. When a woman was raped, she would be treated as a "used" and/or "defected" product in the sexual market. It was a common practice for a family of rape victim to withhold the incident from circulation in the community and, if possible, marry her out at a "discounted" price (Ng, 1987).
In addition, a woman's failure in preventing herself from sexual victimization brought tremendous disgrace to herself and her family. In traditional China, a raped woman was more than often forced by her own immediate family, particularly the father and/or the husband, to commit suicide in order to preserve the dignity of the family. This inhumane treatment of rape victims has transferred into hostility and, to say the least, distrust towards victims of sexual aggression in contemporary Asian societies (Hu, 1986).

As cultural theory suggests, an individual's attitudes are acquired through socialization in specific cultures (Howard, 1988). The Asian culture, particularly the Chinese and the Japanese, is characterized by a Confucian-patriarchy, which degrades victims of sexual aggression with ambivalence and skepticism. Individuals of Asian ancestry may acquire a unique attitudes towards sexual victimization of women comparing to other ethnic/cultural groups.

In contrast, the Western culture has been characterized with individualism, which allows for opinion diversification and induces open debate on controversial issues, such as sexual aggression and victimization. The recent social movement on gender relationship -- sexual revolution -- further induces a liberal social climate towards gender/sexual relationship. Individuals socialized in the open and liberal climate might view sexual aggression and
victimization with quite different angel form individuals of Asian ancestry.

The study considers it theoretically important and empirically valuable to examine ethnic variation between the West and East on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. This study takes advantage of the unique ethnic composition in Hawaii to include Caucasian, Chinese, Japanese, Filipino and Pacific Islanders in the analyses. A special emphasis is placed on the ethnic difference between the Caucasian and the Asian on their attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. Based on previous findings, the study hypothesizes that, compared to Asians, Caucasians express stronger rejection of sex role stereotyping; perceive various forms of sexual aggression as more serious; encounter with more sexual victimization; and indicate higher degree of issue attentiveness, and thereby, express stronger rejection of misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women.

c) Review Summary on the Effects of Demographic Variables

In conclusion to the effect of demographic characteristics, the present study found the literature

8. The study did not place emphasis on the Blacks, Hispanic and Pacific Islander due to their small size in the student population of University of Hawaii-Manoa. As indicated in the Spring Enrollment Report (1990), 0.7% of UHM student population is Black, 0.8% is Hispanic, and 6.9% is (part) Pacific-Islander. The study excludes Korean from the Asian group for the same reason that only 2.9% of UHM students are Korean.
inconclusive and incomplete in mapping the relationship between demographic characteristics and variables related to attitudes toward sexual victimization of women. The present study's efforts in examining the effects of gender and ethnicity on attitude formation will contribute to clarifying the current controversy on the relationship between demographic characteristics and attitudes towards sexual victimization. Furthermore, the focus on ethnic difference between the Caucasian and the Asian on attitude formation will expand current knowledge of the cultural and structural consequences on the dynamics of attitude formation between the East and the West.

4. The Effects of Intervening Variables on Attitudes towards Sexual Victimization of Women

The present study includes sex role attitudes, perception of severity, encounter with sexual victimization, and issue attentiveness as intervening variables between the demographic characteristics and attitudes toward sexual victimization of women.

Feminists have maintained that sexual victimization of women is a manifestation of the asymmetrical pattern of male-female sex role socialization. It is often suggested that sexual aggression against women is supported by social beliefs that encourage male domination and exploitation of women. Thereby, this study contends that the attitude towards sexual victimization is an ideological extension of
sex role socialization. Sex role attitudes, representing a social psychological artifact of gender socialization, affect the attitudes towards sexual victimization of women.

Severity perception of sexual aggression serves as a reference point in evaluating the nature of sexual victimization. The study contends that the degree of severity perception on various forms of sexual aggression indicates a basic social evaluation of sexual victimization, and consequently, predicts attitude toward sexual victimization in general.

Attitude literature maintains that the experience with attitude objects/situations is a main source for attitude formation. Social judgement theory suggests ego-involvement a determining factor in evaluative judgement. The study considers that both direct and indirect encounters with sexual victimization reflect the structural position and the degree of ego-involvement in the social structure of sexual victimization and, therefore, serve as a structural determinant in attitude formation towards sexual victimization of women.

An attitude is considered an accumulation of information about the attitude object (Anderson, 1971; Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975; Petty and Cacioppo, 1981). Theories of information integration and elaboration likelihood contend that an individual's attitude is partially formed through the exposure to and processing of,
information pertaining the attitude object. Attitude formation process is influenced by the effectiveness of information integration, which is contingent with personal relevance and ego-involvement of the attitude object.

In containing the components of personal interest, knowledge and information seeking pattern, issue attentiveness renders 1) the degree of issue significance to the individual, and 2) the degree of ego-involvement in the issue. Accordingly, the degree of issue attentiveness indicates the degree of personal involvement and knowledge exposure of the issue of sexual victimization, and consequently, predicts attitude toward sexual victimization of women.

This section reviews literature concerning the effects of a) sex role attitudes, b) perception of severity, c) encounter with sexual victimization, and d) issue attentiveness on the attitudes towards sexual victimization.

a) The Effect of Sex Role Attitudes

Feminists have maintained that sexual assault is a manifestation of the asymmetrical pattern of male-female sex role socialization (Greer, 1973; Griffin, 1971; Russell, 1975; Weis and Borges, 1973). Social-historical analyses suggest that rape reflects a social ideology of male domination over and exploitation of female (Brownmiller, 1975; Sanday, 1986). It is further suggested that rape is a logical extension of sex role socialization that legitimizes
coercive sexuality against women (Burt, 1980; Clark and Lewis, 1977; Russell, 1975; Weis and Borges, 1973). Empirical studies have supported feminists' contention by illustrating that rape myth acceptance is part of a patriarchal ideology, which includes sex roles stereotypes, traditional beliefs in male/female sexuality, adversarial sexual beliefs, and acceptance of violence against women (Burt, 1980; Check and Malamuth, 1983; Williams and Holmes, 1982).

Previous studies on the general population suggested that sex role stereotyping is positively correlated with rape-myth acceptance, acceptance of violence against women, general acceptance of violence and adversarial sex beliefs (Burt, 1980; Feild, 1978; Jefford, 1984; Konrad and Gutek, 1986; Williams, 1979).

Studies on college students confirmed the relationship between sex role attitudes and attitudes towards sexual victimization of women: students with traditional sex role attitudes were more accepting of various misconceptions on sexual victimization of women (Acock and Ireland, 1983; Bunting and Reeves, 1983; Check and Malamuth, 1983; Costin, 1985; Lottes, 1986; Shotland and Goodstein, 1983; Fischer, 1985; Fischer, 1986b; Valentine-French and Radtke, 1989).

Lottes (1986) found that respondents with male-dominant, restrictive beliefs about women's roles tended to have callous attitudes towards rape victims. Shotland and
Goodstein (1983) found that college students with less egalitarian views about women blamed a rape victim more often for her rape. Weidner and Griffit (1983) reported that students with more negative attitudes towards women were more likely to stigmatize the rape victim. Costin (1985) found a correlation between acceptance of rape myths and beliefs in restricting the roles and rights of women. Peterson and Franzese (1987) reported a positive relationship of traditional view of women's role in society with the acceptance of rape myth and the downplaying of sexual assault as a problem. Fisher (1986a) reported that college students with traditional sex role attitudes tended to be more skeptical on the occurrence of, and more accepting of forcible date rape.

Traditional sex role attitudes were found to be associated with tolerant attitudes towards sexual harassment. College students with more sexist and discriminatory attitudes were more tolerant and accepting of sexual harassment, and less aware of potential harms to the victim (Mazer and Percival, 1989; Malovich and Stake, 1990); they tended to blame the victim of sexual harassment (Jensen and Gutek, 1982; Valentine-French and Radtke, 1989) and expressed self-blame for sexual harassment (Jensen and Gutek, 1982).

Cross-cultural studies also reported consistent relationship between sex role attitudes and attitudes
towards sexual victimization (Costin and Schwarz, 1987; McConahay and McConahay, 1977; Williams and Holmes, 1982). Traditional sex role attitudes were found to be associated with acceptance of misconceptions on sexual victimization across countries (Costin and Schwartz, 1987) and across ethnic groups (Williams and Holmes, 1982).

b) The Effect of Severity Perception

Severity perception of sexual aggression serves as an anchor in the evaluation of sexual victimization.

The literature has indicated a relationship between severity perception on, and attitude toward, sexual victimization of women. Mazer and Percival (1989) found significant relationship between perception of, and attitudes towards, sexual harassment. Respondents rating sexual harassment as serious tended to be less tolerant and less accepting of harassment.

Additionally, severity perception of sexual aggression initiated by authority versus peer is of interest to the present study. Although studies agree on that women responded differently to similar behaviors initiated by higher-status personnel versus equal-status employees, the direction of differences is not entirely consistent across studies (Brewer, 1982). Various studies conducted at the workplace found that respondents perceived sexual harassment as less serious when initiated by equal-status than by higher-status offender (Livingston, 1982: Reilly et al.,
Lester et al. (1986) reported that college students perceived action from instructors as more harassing than similar actions from peers. In contrast, airline personnel were found to express less negative reaction to sexual harassment initiated by higher-status than by equal- or lower-status personnel (Little-Bishop et al., 1982).

c) The Effect of Experience of Sexual Victimization

Attitude literature maintains that the experience with attitude objects/situations is a main source for attitude formation. Social judgement theory also suggests that ego-involvement contributes to the attitudinal compositions. Nevertheless, current literature is in disagreement on the effect of sexual victimization experiences on attitudes towards sexual victimization. Some studies found sexual victimization experiences were related to attitudes towards sexual victimization (Barnett, 1984, 1987; Deitz, et al., 1982; Jensen and Gutek, 1982; Konrad and Gutek, 1984, 1986; Krebs, 1975; Stotland and Dunn, 1963) while other studies found no relationships between the personal experiences and the attitudes (Coller and Resick, 1987; Koss, 1985; Mazer and Percival, 1989; Powell, 1983).

Among studies suggesting a relationship between the experience and the attitude, the consensus has been that individuals with sexual victimization experiences tend to be more rejecting of misconceptions and more sympathetic with
the victim. It is often suggested that an observer's
tendency to empathize with the emotions of another
individual, such as a rape victim, is influenced by the
perception of similarity to the other (Barnett, 1984, 1987;
Deitz et al., 1982; Krebs, 1975; Stotland and Dunn, 1963).
Individuals who are similar to the rape victim in gender and
attitudes have generally been found to be more understanding
of her plight, and to evaluate her more favorably, than are
individuals who identify less clearly with the victim
(Barnett et al., 1986, 1987).

Empirical studies suggest a relationship between
experience of, and attitude toward sexual harassment.
Compared to non-harassed women, women with sexual harassment
experience viewed sexual harassment as a more serious social
problem; were less likely to blame women for being sexually
harassed (Jensen and Gutek, 1982; Powell, 1983). Konard and
Gutek (1984, 1986) contend that personal victimization
experiences predict one's definition of sexual harassment.

A few studies report no relationship between sexual
victimization experience and perceptions/attitudes towards
sexual victimization. Powell (1983) found no correlation
between experiencing specific forms of sexual attention and
defining these experiences as sexual harassment. Coller and
Resick (1987) found no correlation between an individual's
own history of victimization and the tendency of victim
blame.
Furthermore, sexual victimization status was found unrelated to attitude toward sexual victimization. Koss' (1985) study on the hidden rape victim reported that the victim's attitudes towards rape myths did not differentiate the degree of sexual victimization they experienced. Mazer and Percival (1989) found no significant relationship between the level of sexual harassment experience and the perception of, and the attitudes towards, sexual harassment. These two studies concluded that sexual victimization status is relatively independent of ideology or a sensitized consciousness (Koss, 1985; Mazer and Percival, 1989).

d) The Effect of Issue Attentiveness

The concept of attentiveness to an issues area includes three major elements: 1) interest in the issue area; 2) knowledge about the issue area; and 3) information seeking pattern for that particular issue area (Beveridge and Rudell, 1988: 145; Miller, 1983, 1985). Previous studies have indicated that the degree of interest and self-perceived knowledge are associated with the intensity of information seeking in an issue area. The degree of issue attentiveness, in reflecting the degree of ego-involvement, and personal relevance, is indicative of the effectiveness of information integration in attitude formation process.

Empirical findings are inconclusive regarding the relationship of knowledge with attitude direction. Among studies suggesting a relationship between knowledge and
attitude formation, the consensus is that increased exposure to knowledge on the issue of sexual victimization reduced acceptance of various misconceptions. Fischer (1986a, 1986b) reported after two years' course in human sexuality, college students became less skeptical on the occurrence of, and less accepting of, forcible date rape. Thomas (1982) reported a training program of rape crisis counseling resulted in a strong tendency to reject the victim blame myth among the trainees. Intons et al. (1989) reported exposure to educational material concerning rape led to a significant decline in beliefs in rape myths, with greater empathy towards rape victim and greater tendency to find the accused assailant guilt.

However, Scott and Brantley (1983) reported no relationship between knowledge and attitude formation in that teachers' knowledge of sex differences does not ensure non-sexist attitudes.

e) Review Summary and Research Hypotheses on the Effect of Intervening Variables

In summary, the preponderance of evidence in the literature indicates a relationship of sex role attitude, perception of severity, encounter with sexual victimization, and issue attentiveness with attitude toward sexual victimization of women in general. The direction of the relationship is consistent across all intervening variables. That is, an individual with more liberal sex role attitudes,
perceiving various forms of sexual aggression as more severe, with more encounter with sexual victimization, and with higher degree of issue attentiveness is less supportive of various misconceptions on sexual victimization of women.

Based on the literature review, the present study hypothesizes that: 1) the stronger the rejection of sex role stereotypes, the stronger the rejection of misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women; 2) the more serious the perception of sexual aggression, the stronger the rejection of misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women; 3) the more the encounter with sexual victimization, the stronger the rejection of misconceptions; and 4) the higher the degree of issue attentiveness, the stronger the rejection of misconceptions on sexual victimization.

B. Research Framework

The present study is conducted to examine the attitudes toward sexual victimization of women among university students. To explore the dynamics of attitude formation on sexual victimization of women, the study integrates social judgement theory, information integration theory, and the cultural-structural perspectives on attitude formation to construct a research framework in highlighting the theoretical orientation of this study. The study contends that gender and ethnicity, as structural and cultural determinants, affect sex role attitudes, severity perception
of sexual aggression, encounter with sexual victimization, and issue attentiveness, and further affect attitudes towards sexual victimization of women.

As illustrated below, the research framework includes three sets of variables: independent variables, intervening variables, and dependent variables. The independent variables include gender and ethnicity of the respondent. The intervening variables contain 1) sex role attitudes; 2) severity perception of sexual aggression; 3) encounter with sexual victimization; and 4) issue attentiveness on sexual victimization. The dependent variables include attitudes towards sexual harassment and sexual assault, which were further integrated into attitudes towards sexual victimization of women in general.

In this study, sexual victimization is perceived as composed of a continuum of severity with sexual harassment at one end and sexual assault at the other end. As societal attitude toward sexual victimization of women is prevalent
with various misconceptions, attitude toward sexual victimization of women is measured by the degree of acceptance or rejection of various misconceptions towards sexual assault and sexual harassment.

As attitude literature suggests, gender prescribes an individual's structural position in the vulnerability to sexual victimization, and ethnicity predetermines the cultural context where an individual is socialized. The study hypothesizes that 1) compared to men, women more strongly reject misconceptions about sexual victimization; 2) compared to the Asians, the Caucasians more strongly reject misconceptions about sexual victimization.

The study includes sex role attitudes, severity perception, encounter with sexual victimization, and issue attentiveness as intervening variables between the demographic characteristics and attitude toward sexual victimization. Sex role attitude, representing the cognitive product of sex role socialization, serves as a reference-point in formulating social perception of gender relationship in general and sexual victimization in particular. Perception of severity on various forms of sexual aggression functions as a reference point to social evaluation of sexual victimization. It is hypothesized that the stronger the rejection of sex role stereotypes, the stronger the rejection of misconceptions on sexual victimization of women; and the more serious the perception
of sexual aggression, the stronger the rejection of misconceptions on sexual victimization of women.

In the present study, encounter with sexual victimization includes exposure to and experience of sexual assault and sexual harassment. As attitude literature maintains, encounter with sexual victimization indicates an individual's vulnerability to sexual victimization and therefore determines the degree of ego-involvement in sexual victimization. Thereby, the study hypothesizes that the higher the degree of encounter with sexual victimization, the stronger the rejection of misconceptions on sexual victimization.

Issue attentiveness includes three dimensions: interest, knowledge and information seeking pattern. The degree of issue attentiveness reflects the effectiveness of information integration and the extent of ego-involvement in the issue of sexual victimization. It is hypothesized that the higher the degree of issue attentiveness, the stronger the rejection of misconceptions on sexual victimization of women.

To be more specific, the study hypothesizes that women more than men, and Caucasians more than Asians: 1) strongly reject sex role stereotypes; 2) perceive various forms of sexual aggression as more severe; 3) report higher degree of encounter with sexual victimization; and 4) indicate higher degree of issue attentiveness. Therefore, the study
contends that women more than men, and Caucasians more than Asians, express stronger rejection of various misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women.

C. Research Hypotheses

1. The Relationship among Dependent Variables

   a) There are positive correlations between attitudes towards sexual assault and attitudes towards sexual harassment: the stronger the rejection of misconceptions towards sexual assault, the stronger the rejection of misconceptions towards sexual harassment;

   b) Social attitudes towards sexual assault and sexual harassment share common misconceptions; each pair of common misconceptions demonstrate substantial internal correlation; and these common misconceptions represent popular misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women in general.

2. The Relationship between Independent Variables and Intervening Variables

   a) Gender Differences

      (1) Females express more liberal sex role attitudes than males, i.e., females more strongly reject sex role stereotypes than males;

      (2) Females perceive sexual aggression as more severe than males;

      (3) Females report higher degree of encounter with sexual victimization than males;
(4) Females report higher degree of issue attentiveness than males.

b) Ethnic Differences

(1) Caucasians express more liberal sex role attitudes than Asians, i.e., Caucasians more strongly reject sex role stereotypes than Asians;

(2) Caucasians perceive sexual aggression as more severe than Asians;

(3) Caucasians report higher degree of encounter with sexual victimization than Asians;

(4) Caucasians report higher degree of issue attentiveness than Asians.

3. The Relationship between Intervening Variables and the Dependent Variable

a) The stronger the rejection of sex role stereotypes; the stronger the rejection of misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women;

b) The more serious the perception of sexual aggression, the stronger the rejection of misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women;

c) The higher the degree of encounter with sexual victimization, the stronger the rejection of misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women;

d) the higher the degree of issue attentiveness, the stronger the rejection of misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women.
4. The Relationship among Independent Variables, Intervening Variables, and the Dependant Variable

a) Gender Difference

(1) Compared to males, females more strongly reject sex role stereotypes, and thereby, more strongly reject the misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women;

(2) Compared to males, females perceive sexual aggression more severe, and thereby, more strongly reject the misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women;

(3) Compared to males, females report higher degree of encounter with sexual victimization, and thereby, more strongly reject the misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women;

(4) Compared to males, females report higher degree of issue attentiveness, and thereby, more strongly reject the misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women.

b) Ethnic Differences

(1) Compared to Asians, Caucasians more strongly reject sex role stereotypes, and thereby, more strongly reject misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women;

(2) Compared to Asians, Caucasians perceive sexual aggression more severe, and thereby, more strongly reject misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women;

(3) Compared to Asians, Caucasians report higher degree of encounter with sexual victimization, and thereby, more
strongly reject misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women;

(4) Compared to Asians, Caucasians report higher degree of issue attentiveness, and thereby, more strongly reject misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women.
This chapter presents the research method for this study. It includes 1) the operationalization of variables, 2) questionnaire design, and 3) data collection.

The section of variable operationalization discusses the working definition and empirical operation of each variable. It includes the operationalization of 1) the dependent variables: attitudes towards sexual harassment, attitudes towards sexual assault, and attitudes towards sexual victimization; 2) the independent variables: gender and ethnicity; 3) the intervening variables: sex role attitude, perception of severity, encounter with sexual victimization and issue attentiveness.

The section of questionnaire design discusses the construction and application of each measurement employed in the survey questionnaire. This section describes content and format of the following measurements: 1) three attitudinal scales: attitudes towards sex role, attitudes towards sexual assault and attitudes towards sexual harassment; 2) perception of severity scale; 3) measurement of encounter with sexual victimization; and 4) measurement of issue attentiveness.

The section of data collection discusses the sampling strategy and field survey experience. The sample
characteristics are presented in comparison to UH student population.

A. Operationalization of Variables

1. Dependent Variables

This section provides working definitions of three dependent variables: attitudes towards sexual harassment, attitudes towards sexual assault, and attitudes towards sexual victimization.

a) Attitudes towards Sexual Assault

The attitude towards sexual assault is defined as the degree of acceptance/rejection of various misconceptions towards sexual assault. The study includes six dimensions of misconceptions towards sexual assault, which are often labeled as rape myths in the literature. Rape myths generally encompass the perspectives of rape motivation, attribution of responsibility, and consequence of victimization. On the issue of motivation, the study examines the controversy on sex as the primary motivation for sexual assault. On the attribution of responsibility, the study explores the dynamics of victim precipitation versus psycho-pathetical rapist model. On the consequence of sexual victimization, the study surveys the creditability and desirability of rape victim.

To be more specific, the study includes the following dimensions in the rape myth scale: 1) the physiological
model, which attributes sex as the primary motivation for rape; 2) victim precipitation and blame; 3) rejection of victim advocacy; 4) the psycho-pathetical model, which attributes sexual assault to abnormal psychological characteristics of the assailant; 5) discrediting the rape claim; and 6) low desirability and reputation of the rape victim.

b) Attitudes towards Sexual Harassment

The attitude toward sexual harassment is defined as the degree of acceptance/rejection of various misconceptions about sexual harassment. The study examines four misconception dimensions towards sexual harassment, and these are: 1) attributing natural/biological drive to sexual harassment and suggesting sexual harassment as a natural expression of sexual attraction of men towards women; 2) rejecting the element of power inequality in the dynamics of sexual harassment; 3) trivializing the consequences of sexual harassment on the recipient; and 4) blaming the victim for precipitating sexual harassment.

2. Independent Variables

The study hypothesizes that the respondent's demographic background is related to his/her attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. Two demographic variables -- gender and ethnicity -- were examined in this study for their effects on attitudes toward sexual victimization. Gender refers to the biological sex of the
respondent. Ethnicity refers to the self-identified ethnic background(s) of the respondent.

3. Intervening Variables

This section discusses the working definitions and operations of four intervening variables between demographic characteristics and attitudes towards sexual victimization. These are a) sex role attitudes, b) perception of severity, c) encounter with sexual victimization, and d) issue attentiveness.

a) Sex Role Attitudes

The study hypothesizes that sex role attitude is related to attitudes towards sexual victimization: the stronger the rejection of sex role stereotypes, the stronger the rejection of misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women.

The literature has suggested a multi-dimensional structure of sex role attitudes (Beere et al., 1984; Belk and Snell, 1986; Belt et al., 1989; Brown, Perry and Harburg, 1977). Brown et al. (1977) identified three factors in sex role attitudes: 1) women in the home, 2) traditional family roles, and 3) job inequality. Studies on sex role attitudes specified traditional role for father, mother, wife and husband, respectively, to solicit responses (e.g., Rao and Rao, 1985; Scanzoni, 1975). Sex-Roe Egalitarianism Scale represented five domains of adult living: marital roles, parental roles, employee roles,
social-interpersonal-heterosexual roles, and educational roles (Beere et al., 1984). Hatchet and Quick (1983) focused on three dimensions in sex role attitudes: attitude towards familial division of labor, perceptions of the consequences of women working, and attitudes towards motherhood.

To reflect the multi-dimensional structure of sex role attitudes, the study includes four dimensions in the sex role scale to solicit evaluations on the appropriate roles for men and women in the area of 1) family and marriage, 2) deviant sexual and social norms, 3) economic/biological right/freedom, and 4) courtship interaction. The first dimension includes traditional role prescription for men and women in the context of marriage, parenting, and family obligations. The second dimension refers to the double standard on deviant behavioral norms for men and women. The third dimension addresses gender inequality on social, economic, and biological freedom. The fourth dimension focuses on men and women's behavioral norms in courtship interaction.

b) Perception of Severity

The study hypothesizes that perception of severity on unwanted sexual attention and advances is related to attitudes towards sexual victimization: the more serious the perception of sexual aggression, the stronger the rejection of misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women.
Included for severity assessment are five forms of sexual harassment: 1) unwanted sexually suggestive looks/remarks; 2) unwanted pressure/request for date; 3) unwanted letters/phone-calls of a sexual nature; 4) unwanted deliberate closeness/touching/pinching; and 5) unwanted pressure/request for sexual activities; and 6) the least form of sexual assault: unwanted sexual contact but not intercourse (Johnson and Shuman, 1983; Ryan and Kenig, 1991).

The study is also interested in the perceptual difference of severity on same act of sexual aggression initiated by authority versus peer. Therefore, the study asks the respondent to assess the severity of each form of sexual aggression as initiated by authority as well as by peer, respectively. It is hypothesized that each act of sexual aggression initiated by authority is perceived as more serious than by peer.

c) Encounter with Sexual Victimization

Personal encounter with sexual victimization provides the major source for attitude formation towards sexual victimization. Experience of victimization determines an individual's position in the structure of sexual victimization and reflects his/her ego-involvement in the issue of sexual victimization. The study hypothesizes that encounter with sexual victimization is related to attitudes towards sexual victimization: the higher the degree of
sexual victimization encounter, the stronger the rejection of misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women.

In the study, encounter with sexual victimization includes exposure to and experiences of unwanted sexual attention and/or advances, which were considered intrusive, offensive, or harassing by the recipient. Exposure to sexual victimization refers to the indirect encounter with sexual victimization through an individual's social network. Experience of sexual victimization refers to direct encounter with sexual victimization through personal experience of any form of sexual harassment and/or sexual assault.

d) Issue Attentiveness

The study hypothesizes that issue attentiveness is related to attitudes towards sexual victimization: the higher the degree of issue attentiveness, the stronger the rejection of misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women. The study employs three indicators to measure the degree of attentiveness on the issues of sexual assault and sexual harassment. They are: 1) the intensity of interest in, 2) the range of knowledge of, 3) the intensity of information seeking behavior on the sexual victimization issues.
B. Questionnaire Design

The section discusses the construction of each measurement employed in the survey questionnaire. It presents content and format for the following measurements: 1) three attitudinal scales: attitudes towards sex roles, attitudes towards sexual assault and attitudes towards sexual harassment; 2) perception of severity scale; 3) measurement of encounter with sexual victimization; and 4) measurement of issue attentiveness.

1. Attitudinal Scales

As Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) noted, a distinguishing characteristic of attitude from other concepts is its evaluative nature. It is the evaluative component of the attitude that predisposes an individual to behave a certain way toward the attitude object (Fishbein, 1967). The proper way to measure an attitude is to locate the holder of the attitude on a bipolar effective or evaluative dimensions with respect to the object (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975).

Corresponding to the evaluative element of attitude, social judgement theory contends that attitude includes the latitude of rejection, acceptance and non-commitment (Sherif and Hovland, 1959).

The study incorporates these three attitudinal latitudes into the construction of all attitudinal scales. That is, all the attitudinal scales provide choice of acceptance (as indicated by "Strongly Agree" or "Mildly
Agree"), rejection (as indicated by "Strongly Disagree" or "Mildly Disagree"), and non-commitment (as indicated by "Neutral/Unsure"). To be more specific, all items on the attitudinal scales were written in a five-point Likert format, ranging from 1 "Strongly Disagree" to 5 "Strongly Agree" with 3 as "Neutral/Unsure." As the scaling design implies, the lower the scores on sex role attitude items, the stronger the rejection of sex-role stereotypes; the lower the scores on sexual harassment attitude items, the stronger the rejection of misconceptions towards sexual harassment; and the lower the scores on rape myth items, the stronger the rejection of misconceptions towards sexual assault.

a) Scale Items

(1) **Attitudes towards Sex Roles**

Sex role attitude scale was composed of 20 survey items covering stereotyped role prescriptions on four dimensions of adult life. The first dimension includes traditional role prescription for men and women in the context of marriage, parenting, and family obligations. Scale items include: "A women's place is in the home looking after her family, rather than following a career of her own," "Women should worry less about being equal with men and more about becoming good wives and mothers," and "Women should give higher priority to marriage or family over a career."
The second dimension refers to the double standard on deviant behavioral norms for men and women. Scale items include: "It's less acceptable for a single woman to have multiple sexual partners simultaneously than single men," "It's less acceptable for the wife to engage in extramarital affairs than for the husband," and "It's worse to see a drunken woman than a drunken man."

The third dimension addresses gender inequality on social, economic, and biological freedom. Scale items include: "Women should be able to go wherever men go and to do whatever men do," and "Women should have completely equal opportunities as men in getting jobs and promotions."

The fourth dimension focuses on men and women's behavioral norms in courtship interaction. Scale items include: "The initiative in dating should come from the man," "Women earning as much as their male dates should share expenses equally when they go out together," and "The initiative in sex should come from the man."

(2) Attitudes towards Sexual Assault

The attitude towards sexual assault scale was composed of 25 survey items on popular misconceptions towards sexual assault and the victim. The study includes six misconception dimensions towards sexual assault: 1) a physiological model - sex as primary motivation for rape; 2) a psycho-pathetical model - the psychological abnormality of the assailant; 3) victim precipitation and blame; 4)
discrediting the rape claim; 5) anti-victim advocacy and 6) low desirability and reputation of the rape victim.

Items in the physiological model include: "Rape is motivated by men's uncontrollable sexual drive," and "Rape is usually an unplanned, impulsive act." Items in the dimension of psycho-pathetical model include: "Normal men do not commit rape," and "Most rapists are sick, psychologically disturbed."

Items in the victim precipitation/blame dimension include: "Most women secretly want to be raped," "Women put themselves in situations in which they are likely to be raped because they have an unconscious wish to be raped," and "Any woman who is a 'tease' or 'leads a man on' should be responsible for the rape." Items in the dimension of anti-victim advocacy include: "Any woman can be raped against her will," and "Marital rape should be considered a crime."

Items in the dimension of low desirability/reputation of rape victim include: "Most men think a raped woman is less desirable," and "Once a woman has been raped, her reputation is ruined as far as men are concerned." Items in the discrediting rape claim dimension include: "Women often engage in token resistance to sex," "Many women claim 'rape' if they have consented to sexual relations but changed their minds afterwards," and "Women often claim 'rape' to protect their reputation."
(3) **Attitudes towards Sexual Harassment**

The attitude toward sexual harassment scale was composed of 15 survey items on popular misconceptions towards sexual harassment and 5 items concerning controversial issues of campus sexual harassment.

The study includes four popular misconception dimensions towards sexual harassment: 1) natural/biological model, which considers sexual harassment as a natural expression of sexual attraction of men towards women; 2) anti-power model, which rejects that sexual harassment is an extension of power inequality between men and women; 3) trivialization of sexual harassment, which trivializes the consequence of sexual harassment on the victim; and 4) victim blame, which attributes the responsibility to women as precipitating sexual harassment.

Items in the natural/biological model include: "A lot of what people call sexual harassment is just normal flirtation between men and women," "People should not be so quick to take offense when someone expresses a sexual interest in them," and "It is only natural for a man to make sexual advances to a woman he finds attractive." Items in the power-stratification dimension include: "Sexual harassment has lots to do with power," and "Women who complain of sexual harassment are more often punished than the men who harass them."
Items in the trivialization model include "People can usually stop unwanted sexual attention verbally," and "Few women are actually forced to change jobs or classes because of sexual harassment." Items in the victim blame dimension include: "Encouraging a professor's or a supervisor's sexual interest is often used by women to get special favors at school or at the workplace," and "People who are sexual harassed usually invite it."

Items concerning controversial issues of campus sexual harassment include: "UH policy should prohibit consensual sexual relationships between professors and their current students," "UH should release the names and sanctions of the faculty/staff members who have been found guilty of sexual harassment," "Faculty members who sexually harass student can easily get away with it," and "Students who falsely accuse faculty of sexual harassment can easily get away with it."

b) Scale Reliability

Reliability analysis was performed on each of the attitudinal scales to examine the relationship between scale items. Satisfactory inter-item correlation and Cronbach Alpha were produced for each scale, which assures the reliability of the measurement.

Sex roles attitudes scale is a 20-item measurement, derived from Spence, Helmreich and Stapp's (1973) AWS,


Attitudes towards sexual harassment scale is composed of 14 items,9 derived from Lott et al. (1982), Beauvais's (1986) Sexual Harassment Attitude Survey, and Tangri, Burt and Johnson's (1982) Attitudes towards Sexual Harassment questionnaire, with a mean inter-item correlation = .25 and Alpha = .83.

c) Construct Validity

T-test was performed to examine gender differences on attitudes towards sex roles, sexual harassment and rape myths to test the construct validity of each scale. Compared to males, female students expressed more rejection on sex role stereotypes, on the misconceptions of sexual harassment and on rape myths.

The gender differences on the three attitudinal scales replicate most of the previous findings, which indicate that

9. Due to the low inter-item correlation, item # 10 was dropped from the factor analysis.
women are less sex role stereotyped, less tolerant of sexual harassment, and less supportive of rape myths (Barnett and Feild, 1977; Beere, et al., 1984; Burczyk and Standing, 1989; Burt, 1980; Feild, 1978; Howells et al., 1984; Margolin et al., 1989; Marrone and Rutnik, 1987; Rao and Rao, 1985a, 1985b). This replication assures the construct validity of each attitudinal measurement in this study.

2. Perception of Severity Scale

Perception of severity refers to the respondent's evaluation of severity on each of six forms of unwanted sexual attention and advances, initiated by authority and equal-status offenders, respectively. The study lists five acts of sexual harassment and one act of sexual assault, and asks the respondent to indicate his (her) perception of severity on each of the acts on a six-point scale, ranging from 0 "Not Serious At All" to 5 "Extremely Serious". As the scaling design implies, the higher the score on severity perception, the more serious a particular form of sexual aggression is perceived by the respondent.

3. Sexual Victimization: Exposure and Experience

Encounter with sexual victimization includes network exposure to, and personal experience of, sexual victimization. The respondent's exposure to sexual victimization through social network was measured by two indicators: 1) the number of known persons experiencing sexual victimization; and 2) the incident count of sexual
victimization experienced by known people. The experience with sexual victimization was measured by the frequency of receiving any form of sexual assault and harassment in a one-year period and since age 14.

The study maintains that sexual assault and sexual harassment represent two major categories of sexual victimization, each of which covers a variety of unwanted/unwelcomed sexual attention and advances considered intrusive, offensive, or harassing by the recipient. Sexual victimization is perceived as composed of a continuum of severity, with the least form of sexual harassment at one end and the most severe sexual assault at the other end. To be more specific, sexual harassment refers to six lesser forms of unwanted/unwelcomed sexual attention/advances. They are 1) unwanted sexual looks and/or gestures; 2) unwanted sexual jokes and/or remarks; 3) unwanted pressure for date; 4) unwanted sexual materials and/or phone calls; 5) unwanted deliberate touching and/or physical closeness; and 6) unwanted pressure for sexual activities (Fitzgerald et al., 1988; Johnson and Shuman, 1983; Ryan and Kenig, 1991). Sexual assault refers to three types of sexual advances as legally defined sexual offenses in the State of Hawaii. They are 1) unwanted sexual contact but not intercourse; 2) unwanted attempted sexual intercourse; and 3) unwanted sexual intercourse.
4. Measurement of Issue Attentiveness

This section was designed to measure the degree of attentiveness to the issue of sexual assault and sexual harassment. The study employs three indicators to quantify the degree of issue attentiveness: interest, knowledge, and information seeking behavior. The interest indicator measures the intensity of personal interest in the issues of sexual harassment and assault. The knowledge indicator measures self-perceived knowledge of sexual victimization issues, including knowledge in 1) legal definition of, 2) investigation procedure, and 3) policy formation on sexual harassment and/or sexual assault. The last indicator measures the intensity of information seeking pattern on the issue of sexual victimization, including 1) the consumption of general and campus-specific news media; 2) the pursuit of issue-specific information, e.g., reading about educational materials on sexual harassment/assault issues; 3) interpersonal exchange of information, e.g., talking about the issues; and 4) participation in collective activities, e.g., attending seminar/workshop and advocacy groups.

Each indicator was measured on a 5-point scale, ranging from 0 "Not at All" to 4 "A Great Deal". As the scaling design implies, the higher the score on each issue attentiveness indicator, the higher the degree of issue attentiveness on the corresponding indicator.
C. Data Collection

An in-class questionnaire survey was employed to collect data for this study. Stratified by class size, disciplines and academic classifications, 43 classes at University of Hawaii-Manoa were selected by the study and approved by the respective instructor to be surveyed.

The questionnaire survey was conducted in the month of April, 1990, when the sexual harassment issue obtained a high publicity via news media. Since 1988, sexual harassment has been a heated issue on the UHM campus. Campus media have been publicized heated debates on the ethics in policing sexual relationship between the faculty and the student. The tension escalated at the beginning of 1990, resulting from anonymous posters naming faculty members as sexual harassers. During the spring semester of 1990 when the survey was conducted, the student at UHM had been well exposed to the controversy on sexual harassment.

The in-class survey was conducted in the month of April, 1990 and 1,459 usable surveys were included in the analysis. Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the study sample. Compared to the student population at UHM in the 1990 spring semester, the study sample contains 8% more females and 7% more undergraduates. Regarding permanent residency and ethnic background, the study sample is representative of the UHM student population (Table 2).
CHAPTER IV. DATA REDUCTION

This chapter discusses data reduction procedure for the study. It provides theoretical rationales with statistical support for deriving three sets of variables as specified in the research framework, including demographic variables (gender and ethnicity), intervening variables (sex role attitudes, severity perception, encounter with sexual victimization, and issue attentiveness) and dependent variables (attitudes towards sexual victimization of women in general).

The data reduction procedure includes indexing the variables of ethnicity, severity perception, encounter with sexual victimization, and issue attentiveness. It also demonstrates the construction of multi-dimensional measures of attitudes towards sex roles, sexual harassment, sexual assault, and sexual victimization of women in general.

A. The Classification of Ethnicity

The study classified ethnicity into five categories: Caucasian, Japanese, Chinese, Filipino and Pacific Islander (Table 1). "Caucasian" refers to those who identified themselves as Caucasian for the primary and secondary ethnic backgrounds and those who designated Caucasian as their sole ethnic background (N = 294). "Japanese" refers to those who identified themselves as Japanese for the primary and
secondary ethnic backgrounds and those who designated Japanese as their sole ethnic background \((N = 384)\).

"Chinese" refers to those who identified themselves as Chinese for the primary and secondary ethnic backgrounds and those who designated Chinese as their sole ethnic background \((N = 143)\).

"Filipino" includes Filipino and part-Filipino \((N = 154)\). Filipino refers to those who identified Filipino as their primary and secondary ethnicities and those who designated Filipino as their sole ethnic background \((N = 83)\). Part-Filipino refers to those who identified Filipino as their primary or the secondary ethnic background \((N = 71)\). A T-test indicated no significant differences between Filipino and part-Filipino on the intervening variables and on the attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. Therefore, the study combined Filipino and part-Filipino into one ethnic group to maximize the utility of this particular category.

"Pacific Islander" includes Pacific Islander and part-Pacific Islander \((N = 102)\). Pacific Islander refers to those whose first and secondary ethnicity were Hawaiian, Samoan, Micronesians, and others, and those who identified Pacific-island as their sole ethnic background \((N = 13)\). Part-Pacific Islander refers to those who identified Pacific-island related background as their primary or secondary ethnicity \((N = 89)\). The Filipino-Pacific Islander
(N = 9) was grouped into the Filipino group for two reasons: 1) there are more Filipino than Pacific-Islander in the UH student population; and 2) the mean scores of Filipino-Pacific Islander on attitudes towards sexual victimization are closer to those of the part-Filipino than those of the part-Pacific Islander.

The study combines other ethnic and/or mixed groups into one category as "other/mix" (N = 103), due to the small sample size associated with each group. This category includes Korean (N = 20), Hispanic (N = 9), Black (N = 11), Japanese-Caucasian (N = 43), Chinese-Japanese (N = 54), Chinese-Caucasian (N = 11), and other possible combinations. The complex composition of this category poses difficulties in interpreting study findings associated this particular group. Therefore, the study focuses the discussion of research findings on the five ethnic groups previously mentioned, with a particular emphasis on the contrast between the Caucasians and Asians.

B. Sex Role Attitudes: a Multi-dimensional Structure

A factor analysis¹⁰ was employed to extract a four-factor solution on the 20-item sex role attitude scale (Table 3). These four factors, accounting for 50.7% of total variance, were labeled "Gender Roles in

---

¹⁰ Both orthogonal and oblique rotations employed in the factor analysis create same grouping among the scale items. As correlations among factors are expected, the study adopts oblique rotation in the final analysis.
Family/Marriage, "Double Standards in Deviant Behaviors," "Gender Inequality in Social/Economic Freedom," and "Courtship Norms," with an eigenvalue of 5.63, 1.62, 1.53, and 1.37, respectively. The results of the factor analysis support the study contention that sex role attitudes are composed of multiple specific dimensions on gender ideologies and stereotypes. For each of the dimensions, the lower the mean score, the stronger the rejection of the corresponding sex role stereotype.

C. Severity Perception

1. On Authority Perpetrator

The study measured the perception of severity on sexual aggression by authority offender on a 6-point scale, ranging from 0 "Not At All Serious" to 5 "Extremely Serious". The degree of severity is defined as the average of the scores assigned to six forms of sexual aggression initiated by an authority offender.

2. On Peer Perpetrator

The study measured the perception of severity on sexual aggression by equal-status offender on a 6-point scale, ranging from 0 "Not At All Serious" to 5 "Extremely Serious". The degree of severity is defined as the average of the scores assigned to six forms of sexual aggression initiated by a peer offender.
3. In General

The study employed two indicators to measure perception of severity in general. One indicator is the severity perception on authority offender and the other is the severity perception on peer offender, as previously discussed.

The analysis indicated a significant correlation between the rating of sexual aggression by authorities and the rating of sexual aggression by peers ($r = .80$, $p < .001$). That is, the more serious an individual perceived sexual aggression by authority offender, the more serious he/she perceived sexual aggression by peer offender (Table 4). Based on this significant correlation, the study decides to employ the average score on the two indicators to represent the degree of severity perceived on sexual aggression in general.

D. Encounter with Sexual Victimization

1. The Degree of Exposure to Sexual Victimization

The degree of exposure to sexual victimization through social network was measured by two indicators: 1) the number of persons the respondent knows who have experienced sexual victimization; and 2) the total number of sexual victimization episodes reported by these people. Based on the reported frequency for each exposure indicator, the respondent was initially classified into one of the three groups: no-exposure group (when the respondent did not know
anyone who experienced sexual victimization), low-exposure group (when the reported frequency fell below the median of the number of persons known who experienced sexual victimization), and high-exposure group (when the reported frequency fell above the median of the number of persons known who experienced sexual victimization).

Based on a significant association between these two indicators (Chi-square = 77.54, p < .001), the study summed up membership to each exposure indicator to represent the degree of exposure to sexual victimization. Based on the summation score, the respondent was further classified into one of the three groups: no-exposure, low-exposure (when the summed score fell below the median), and high-exposure (when the summed score fell above the median).

2. The Degree of Experience of Sexual Victimization

The degree of experience in sexual victimization was measured by the frequency reported in receiving unwanted sexual attention/advances which were considered intrusive, offensive or harassing since age 14. This study includes six forms of sexual harassment and three forms of sexual assault to construct a sexual victimization experience scale. The respondent was asked to indicate how often he/she experienced each form of sexual assault and sexual harassment since age 14.

Based on the reported frequency on each form of unwanted sexual attention/advances, the respondent was
classified into one of the three groups: no-experience group, low-experience group (below the median) and high-experience group (above the median).

Based on the summation of membership to each form of sexual victimization, the respondent was further classified into one of the three groups: no-experience group, low-experience group (when the summed score fell below the median), and high-experience group (when the summed score fell above the medium).

3. The Degree of Encounter with Sexual Victimization

Encounter with sexual victimization includes network exposure to, and personal experience of, sexual victimization. Accordingly, the degree of encounter with sexual victimization is measured by the integrated degree of encounter to and experience of sexual victimization.

The data displayed a significant association between exposure to and experience of sexual victimization (Chi-square = 199.03, p < .001). That is, the more an individual exposed to sexual victimization through social network, the higher the frequency he/she reported experiencing various forms of sexual victimization; and vice versa (Table 5). Based on the significant association, the study decided to employ the summation score of exposure and experience to represent the degree of encounter with sexual victimization. According to the summation of respective membership to exposure and experience measurements, the respondent was
classified into one of the four groups: no-encounter, low-encounter (when the summed score fell below that of the first one-third of the encountered sample), medium-encounter (when the summed score fell between that of the first one-third and that of the two-third of the encountered sample), and high-encounter (when the summed score fell above that of two-third of the encountered sample).

E. Issue Attentiveness

1. The Degree of Interest

The interest indicator measures the intensity of personal interest in the issue of sexual harassment and sexual assault on a 5-point scale, ranging from 0 "not at all" to 4 "a great deal". The degree of interest is indicated by a summation score of the degree of interest in the issue of sexual harassment and of sexual assault, respectively. The summation score ranged from 0 to 8, with the higher the score, the higher the degree of interest in sexual victimization issues.

2. The Degree of Knowledge

The knowledge indicator measures the degree of self-perceived knowledge in the issue of sexual harassment and sexual assault, including knowledge in legal definition of, reporting/investigation procedure, and policy formation on sexual harassment and sexual assault. The degree of knowledge is indicated by a summation score of the degree of
personal knowledge in the legal definition, reporting, investigating, and policy formation procedure on sexual harassment and sexual assault. The summation score ranged from 0 to 16, with the higher the score, the higher the degree of knowledge of sexual victimization issues.

3. The Degree of Informational Seeking

The information seeking indicator measures the degree of information seeking pattern on issue of sexual harassment and sexual assault on a 5-point scale, ranging from 0 "not at all" to 4 "a great deal". It includes the degree of news media consumption, exposure to issue-specific information, and participation in collective activities. The degree of information seeking, accordingly, is indicated by a summation score on the intensity of the above mentioned activities. The summation score ranged from 0 to 16, with the higher the score, the higher the degree of information seeking intensity on sexual victimization issues.

4. The Degree of Issue Attentiveness

The study employs three indicators to quantify the concept of issue attentiveness: interest, knowledge, and information seeking behavior. The interest indicator measures the intensity of personal interest in the issues of sexual harassment and assault. The knowledge indicator measures self-perceived knowledge of sexual victimization issues. The last indicator measures the intensity of
information seeking pattern on the issue of sexual victimization.

The degree of issue attentiveness is indicated by the integrated intensity of interest, knowledge and information seeking. The data indicated statistically significant correlations among the degree of interest, the degree of knowledge, and the degree of information seeking ($r = .31, .45, .28$, respectively, $p < .001$) (Table 6). The study therefore decided to employ the summation score of the three indicators to represent the degree of issue attentiveness. The summation score ranged from 3 to 37, with the higher the score, the higher the degree of issue attentiveness.

**F. Misconceptions on Sexual Harassment: a Multi-dimensional Structure**

The attitude toward sexual harassment scale is composed of 14 survey items to measure the respondent's acceptance of controversial misconceptions on sexual harassment. A factor analysis of these 14 items suggested four dimensions in the sexual harassment attitudes, which accounts for $55.1\%$ of the total variance (Table 7). These four factors were labeled "Natural/biological Model", "(anti) Power Stratification of Sexual Harassment", "Trivialization of Sexual Harassment" and "Victim Blame", with an eigenvalue of

---

11. Both orthogonal and oblique rotations employed in the factor analysis create same grouping among the scale items. As correlations among factors are expected, the study adopts oblique rotation in the final analysis.
4.49, 1.62, 1.53 and 1.37, respectively. For each of the misconception dimensions, the lower the score indicates the stronger the rejection of the corresponding factor.

G. Misconceptions on Sexual Assault: a Multi-dimensional Structure

The attitude towards sexual assault scale is composed of 25 survey items to measure the respondent's acceptance of popular rape myths. A factor analysis\(^\text{12}\) of these items suggested a six-factor solution in the rape myth acceptance scale, accounting for 53.6% of the total variance (Table 8). These factors were labeled "Victim Precipitation", "Low Desirability/Reputation of Rape Victim", "(anti-) Victim Advocate", "Sick Rapist - Psychopathic Explanation", "Sexual Drive - Physiological Model" and "Discrediting Rape Claim", with an eigenvalue of 6.87, 1.62, 1.39, 1.27, 1.23 and 1.01, respectively. For each of the misconception dimensions, the lower the score indicates the stronger the rejection of the corresponding factor.

H. Misconceptions on Sexual Victimization of Women: An Integrated Four-Model Structure

In this study, sexual victimization is perceived as composed of a continuum of severity, with lesser sexual harassment at one end and the most severe sexual assault at

---

\(^{12}\) Both orthogonal and oblique rotations employed in the factor analysis create same grouping among the scale items. As correlations among factors are expected, the study adopts oblique rotation in the final analysis.
the other end. The study contends that sexual harassment and sexual assault represent two major types of sexual victimization of women, each of which covers a variety of unwanted/unwelcome sexual attention and/or advances considered intrusive, offensive, or harassing by the recipient.

Based upon this contention, the study argues that 1) attitudes towards sexual harassment are consistent with attitudes towards sexual assault, 2) societal attitudes towards sexual harassment share common misconceptions with societal attitudes towards sexual assault, and 3) these common misconceptions characterize societal attitudes towards sexual victimization of women in general.

The data supported the contention that attitudes towards sexual harassment are consistent with attitudes towards sexual assault. The study found many significant correlations between 1) general attitude toward sexual harassment and general attitudes towards sexual assault, and 2) individual misconception of sexual harassment and that of sexual assault (Table 9). That is, the stronger an individual rejected misconceptions on sexual harassment, the stronger he/she rejected misconceptions on sexual assault.

To identify common misconceptions shared in societal attitudes towards sexual harassment and sexual assault, the study paired factors generated from respective scales based on two criteria -- the theoretical similarity and
substantial correlation — to derive integrated misconceptions of sexual victimization of women in general. Four dimensions were created and respectively labeled as "Biological/Natural Model", "Depoliticizing Model", "Social Repression Model" and "Victim-Blame Model."

The dimension of "Biological/Natural Model" is a composite of the factor of "Biological/Natural Explanation of Sexual Harassment" and the factor of "Physiological Explanation of Sexual Assault", with $r = .39$, $p < .001$. The dimension of "Depoliticizing Model of Sexual Victimization" is a composite of the factor of "Anti-Power Element in Sexual Harassment" and the factor of "Anti-Victim Advocacy" in rape myth, with $r = .43$, $p < .001$. The dimension of "Social Repression Model" is composed of "Trivialization of Sexual Harassment" and "Discrediting Rape Claims", with $r = .41$, $p < .001$. The dimension of "Victim Blame and Precipitation" is composed of "Victim Blame for Sexual Harassment" and "Victim Precipitation for Sexual Assault", with $r = .64$, $p < .001$) (Table 10). For each of the integrated dimensions, the lower the score indicates the stronger the rejection of the corresponding dimension.

These four dimensions were further integrated to create a grand measurement of attitudes towards sexual victimization of women in general. This grand scale is a composite of four misconception dimensions on sexual victimization of women: "Biological/Natural Model", "Depoliticizing Model", "Social Repression Model", and "Victim-Blame Model."
"Depoliticizing Model", "Social Repression Model" and "Victim Blame/Precipitation". The lower the score on the grand measure, the stronger the rejection of general misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women.\footnote{See Appendix B for the construction of the four-model misconception structure and of the grand measurement of general misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women.}
CHAPTER V. DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter presents study findings with statistical results in the following sequence: 1) attitudes towards misconceptions on sexual victimization of women; 2) the effects of gender and ethnicity on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women; 3) the effects of gender and ethnicity on the intervening variables, including sex role attitudes, severity perception, encounter with sexual victimization and issue attentiveness; 4) the effects of intervening variables on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women; and 5) the relative effects of gender, ethnicity, sex role stereotypes, severity perception, encounter with sexual victimization and issue attentiveness on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women in general.

A. Attitudes towards Sexual Victimization of Women
1. Percentage Distribution on Individual Items
   a) On Misconceptions about Sexual Harassment

   The majority of surveyed students recognized the political/power element of sexual harassment (Table 12). Eighty-four percent of the students endorsed that sexual harassment and sexual assault are forms of sexual victimization (item #11). About three-fourths of the students said that sexual harassment issues have lots to do
with power (item #9) and that sexual harassment is a form of sexual discrimination (item #1). Sixty-eight percent of the respondents expressed sympathy for the victim of sexual harassment who is more often punished than the harasser if she complains (item #8).

The majority of the respondents objected to attributing responsibility to the victim of sexual harassment. About two-thirds of the students disagreed with the statement that "People who are sexually harassed usually invite it," (item #15) and "Once a woman becomes involved in a sexual relationship, she can't accuse her partner of sexual harassment." (item #6) Nevertheless, only 40% of the respondents disagreed that women often encourage sexual interest to get ahead in school and at work (item #14).

A substantial percentage of surveyed students did not reject natural and biological explanations of sexual harassment. Half of the students did not object to the statement that "People should not be so quick to take offense when someone expresses a sexual interest in them." (item #4) About 42% of the respondents did not object to the statement that "It is natural for a men to make sexual advances to a woman he finds attractive." (item #12)

A substantial portion of the respondents did not object to the trivialization of sexual harassment. About half of the students did not really think women are actually forced to change jobs or classes because of sexual harassment (item
About 47% of the respondents did not oppose to the statement that people can usually stop unwanted sexual attention verbally (item #7).

On issues specific to the UH campus, the surveyed students expressed strong support for student victim of sexual harassment by the professor. 83% of the 1459 respondents did not reject the statement that "Faculty members who sexually harass students can easily get away with it" (item #16); while only 17% agreed that "Students who falsely accuse faculty of sexual harassment can easily get away with it." (item #17)

Furthermore, the students showed strong support for a more rigid campus policy on sexual harassment. Seventy percent of the respondents supported releasing names and sanctions of faculty/staff members who have been found guilty of sexual harassment (item #20). Only one-fifth (21%) of the students disapprove a policy to prohibit consensual sexual relationships between professors and their current students (item #18).

The study observes gender differences on some specific issues. Men and women perceived the nature of sexual harassment very differently: men were more likely than women to interpret sexual harassment as something natural, normal and non-offensive. Forty-two percent of 548 male students and only 15% of 879 female students agreed with the statement that people should not be so quick to take offense
when someone express sexual interest in them (item #4). Thirty-five percent of male students and only 17% of female students considered sexual advances of men to women found attractive is only natural (item #12). More than one-fourth of male students and only 14% of female students agreed that so-called sexual harassment is just normal flirtation between men and women (item #3).

Furthermore, men were more likely than women to hold a neutral position on the consequence of sexual harassment to women victims. Forty percent of male students while only 27% of their female counterparts were neutral on the statement that few women are actually forced to change jobs or classes because of sexual harassment (item #5). Thirty-four percent of men while only 19% of women were unsure of the statement that women complaining of sexual harassment are more often published than the male harasser (item #8).

Men were more likely than women to attribute the blame to the victim of sexual harassment. More than one-third of the male students agreed and 42% were unsure of, that women often encourage their supervisors' sexual interest to get special favors at school and/or workplace (item #14), compared to only one-fifth (21%) of the female students endorsing and 11% uncommitted to the same statement.

b) On Misconceptions about Sexual Assault

The majority of the surveyed students rejected the idea of victim precipitation (Table 13). Eighty-five percent of
the respondents disagreed that most women secretly want to be raped (item #3); 81% objected that women put themselves in a rape-prone situation (item #23); 71% disagreed that women should be responsible for rape if they "lead" men on (item #5). However, forty percent of the respondents did not exclude the possibility that women provoke rape through their appearance and/or behavior (item #9).

The majority of students supported victim advocacy. About half of 546 male students and four-fifth of 878 female students endorsed that "A woman's past sexual history or reputation should have nothing to do with the question of rape," (item #4) "Marital rape should be considered a crime," (item #16) "Any woman can be raped against her own will," (item #21) and "Power/control is the primary motivation for rape." (item #24)

However, the surveyed students showed ambivalence towards creditability of rape claims. About half of the students held neutral position on statements that "Women often engage in token resistance to sex," (item #18) and "Many women claim 'rape' if they have consented to sexual relations but changed their minds afterwards."(item #20) The same percentage of students did not object the statement that "Accusation of rape made by bar-girls or prostitutes should be viewed with suspicion." (item #7)

One-fourth of the respondents believed that sex is the primary drive for rape (item #22). The majority considered
most rapists are psychologically abnormal (item #12). Forty percent of the respondents agreed that "Most men think that a raped woman is less desirable." (item #10)

Responses differed by gender on some of the items. Forty-two percent of 546 male students and only 18% of 878 female students agreed with the statement that accusations of rape by bar-girls or prostitutes should be viewed with suspicion (item #7). Twice as many men as women (38% vs. 19%) agreed that women often provoke rape through their appearance and/or behavior (item #9).

2. Mean Score of Individual Dimensions

a) On Misconceptions about Sexual Harassment

The surveyed students (N = 1459) mildly rejected the general misconceptions regarding sexual harassment (mean = 2.22) (Table 14). Among the four misconception dimensions, depoliticizing of sexual aggression received the strongest rejection (mean = 1.96). The victim-blame/precipitation model and natural/biological explanation were mildly rejected (mean = 2.21 and 2.25, respectively). Trivialization and discrediting of sexual harassment was the least rejected misconception on sexual harassment (mean = 2.69).

b) On Misconceptions about Sexual Assault

The surveyed students (N = 1459) mildly rejected the rape myths in general (mean = 2.24) (Table 14). Among the six dimensions of misconceptions about sexual assault, the
notion of victim precipitation received the strongest rejection (mean = 1.78), followed by anti-victim advocacy (mean = 1.91), discrediting rape claims (mean = 2.36), and sexual motivation for rape (mean = 2.40).

The least rejected misconception was low desirability of rape victim (mean = 3.04), followed by psycho-pathetical explanation of the rapist (mean = 3.03).

c) On Misconceptions about Sexual Victimization of Women

The surveyed students mildly rejected general misconceptions on sexual victimization of women (mean = 2.20) (Table 14). The most rejected misconception was the depoliticizing of sexual victimization (mean = 1.93), followed by victim-blame/victim-precipitation (mean = 2.00).

The least rejected misconception about sexual victimization of women was the social repression model, which trivializes and discredits women's claim of sexual victimization (mean = 2.53). The next least rejected misconception was the natural/biological explanation of sexual aggression against women (mean = 2.33).

B. The Effects of Demographic Variables on Attitudes towards Sexual Victimization of Women

Table 15 presents significant effects of gender and ethnicity on the attitude towards each of the misconceptions concerning sexual victimization of women, with significant
interaction effect on the dimensions of depoliticizing, social repression, and the general attitudes.

The ANOVA reported significant gender effect on attitudes towards the four misconceptions and the general attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. Female students rejected more strongly than their male counterparts the natural/biological explanation, the depoliticizing of sexual aggression, the trivialization/discrediting of victim's claim, the victim-blame/precipitation model, and the general misconceptions about sexual victimization of women.

The ANOVA indicated significant ethnicity effect on the attitudes towards the four misconceptions and the general attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. The Caucasians most strongly rejected the natural/biological explanation of sexual aggression, followed by Japanese, Pacific Islander, and Filipino, with Chinese the least rejecting group. The Caucasians also most strongly rejected the victim-blame/victim-precipitation model, followed by Japanese, Filipino, and Pacific Islander, with Chinese the least rejecting group.

The interaction of gender and ethnicity was significant on attitudes towards depoliticizing, social repression models, and the general misconceptions. Among females, the Caucasian most strongly rejected the depoliticizing model, followed by Japanese, Pacific Islander, and Filipino, with
Chinese the least rejecting group. On the social repression model, the Caucasian expressed strongest rejection, followed by Pacific Islander, Japanese and Chinese, with Filipino the least rejecting group. On the general misconceptions, the Caucasian expressed strongest rejection, followed by Pacific Islander, Japanese and Filipino, with Chinese the least rejecting group.

Among males, the Filipino most strongly rejected the depoliticizing model, followed by Caucasian, Japanese and Pacific Islander, with Chinese the least rejecting group. On the trivialization/discrediting model, the Caucasian expressed the strongest rejection, followed by Japanese, and Filipino, with Chinese and Pacific Islander the equally least rejecting groups. On the general misconceptions, the Caucasian expressed strongest rejection, followed by Japanese, Filipino and Pacific Islander, with Chinese the least rejecting group.

C. The Effects of Demographic Variables on the Intervening Variables

1. On Sex Roles Attitudes
   a) Percentage Distribution on Individual Items

   The majority of the surveyed students supported social and economic equality between men and women (Table 16). Ninety-four percent of the students agreed that "Women should have completely equal opportunities as men in getting jobs and promotions" (item #7); 84% agreed that women should
have right to control her body in reproduction (item #13); 71% agreed that "Women should have as much sexual freedom as men." (item #11)

The majority of respondents rejected traditional sex roles in marriage and family. Ninety-two percent of the students disagreed that sons should be more encouraged than daughter to go to college (item #14); 86% disagreed that "A woman's place is in the home looking after her family rather than following a career of her own" (item #8); 79% disagreed that "In general, the father should have more authority than the mother in bringing up the children," (item #10) and that "Women should worry less about being equal with men and more about becoming good wives and mothers." (item #9)

A substantial percentage of the respondents did not object to double standards of deviant behaviors. About half of the students did not object to statements that discriminating against women in conducting socially deviant behaviors, e.g., getting drunken, having multiple sexual partners, etc. (item #17 to #20).

The student respondents were in conflicting opinions regarding courtship norms. Twenty-eight percent of the students agreed that "The initiative in dating should come from the man," (item #1) while only 9% agreed that "The initiative in sex should come from the man." (item #16) Nevertheless, more than half of the students agreed that
women earning as much as their dates should share the expense (item #15).

b) Mean Score of Individual Dimensions

The surveyed students mildly rejected sex role stereotypes in general (mean = 2.04) (Table 17). The most strongly rejected dimension was the gender inequality of social and economic freedom (mean = 1.87), followed by traditional sex role in family and marriage (mean = 1.92).

The least rejected dimension in sex role stereotypes was the courtship norms (mean = 2.37). The next least rejected dimension was the double standards on deviant behaviors (mean = 2.27).

c) The Effects of Gender and Ethnicity on Sex Role Attitudes

Table 18 presents significant main effects of gender and ethnicity, but no significant interaction effect, on the four dimensions of sex role stereotypes and the general sex role attitudes.

The ANOVA reported significant gender effect on attitudes towards family/marriage obligation, double standards on deviant behaviors, gender inequality in social/economic freedom, and the general sex role stereotypes. Female students indicated stronger rejection than male students on the three dimensions of sex role stereotype and the general attitudes towards sex role. Male
and female respondents did not differ significantly on the attitudes towards courtship norms.

The ANOVA indicated significant ethnicity effect on attitudes towards family/marriage obligation, double standards on deviant behaviors, gender inequality in social/economic freedom, courtship norms, and the general sex role stereotypes. On the dimension of double standard and courtship norms as well as the general sex role stereotypes, the Caucasian expressed the strongest rejection, followed by Pacific Islander, Japanese, and Filipino, with Chinese expressing the least rejection. On the dimension of gender stereotyping of marriage/family roles, the Caucasian indicated the strongest rejection, followed by Pacific Islander, Filipino, and Japanese, with Chinese the least rejecting. On the gender inequality in social/economic arena, the Caucasian again exhibited the strongest rejection, followed by Japanese, and Pacific Islander; Chinese and Filipino equally expressed the least rejection.

2. On Severity Perception of Sexual Victimization

   a) Mean Score of Severity Perception

Table 19 presents mean score of severity perception of six forms of sexual aggression initiated by authority and peer perpetrator, respectively. In general, sexual aggression, as presented by six specific types of unwanted sexual attention/advances, was perceived relatively serious
by the respondents. On a six-point scale with 0 for "Not At All Serious" and 5 for "Extremely Serious", sexual aggression was rated at an average of 3.96 when initiated by authority perpetrator, and 3.54 when initiated by peer perpetrator. Each form of sexual aggression was rated more severely when precipitated by authority than by peer. That is, the students perceived sexual aggression by authority perpetrator as more serious than by peer perpetrator.

In general, regardless the status of perpetrator, unwanted sexual contact was rated the most serious, followed by unwanted pressure/request for sexual activities, unwanted deliberate touching/closeness, unwanted sexual materials/calls, and unwanted pressure/request for date, with unwanted sexual looks/remarks the least serious.

b) The Effects of Gender and Ethnicity on Severity Perception

Table 20 presents significant main effects of gender and ethnicity, but no significant interaction effect, on the perception of severity regarding six forms of sexual aggression initiated by authority and by peer precipitators.

The ANOVA indicated significant effect of gender on the perception of severity ($F = 210.10, p < .001$). Female students (mean = 4.09) perceived sexual aggression as more serious than their male counterparts (mean = 3.23). This pattern applied to sexual aggression initiated by authority as well as by peer precipitators.
The ANOVA indicated a significant effect of ethnicity on the perception of severity ($F = 5.33, p < .001$). In general, sexual aggression was perceived as the most serious by the Filipino (mean = 3.88), followed by Pacific Islander, Caucasian, Japanese, with the Chinese as the least serious (mean = 3.31). To be specific, sexual aggression initiated by authority offender was perceived as the most serious by Caucasian and Filipino (mean = 4.09), followed by Japanese (mean = 4.03), Pacific Islanders (mean = 4.01), and Chinese (mean = 3.52). Sexual aggression initiated by peer offender was perceived as the most serious by Pacific Islanders (mean = 3.74), followed by Filipino (mean = 3.67), Japanese (mean = 3.61), Caucasian (mean = 3.51) and Chinese (mean = 3.10).

In addition, the study found that, regardless of gender and ethnic differences, the respondents perceived sexual aggression by an authority offender (mean = 3.98) as more serious than by a peer offender (mean = 3.54).

3. On Encounter with Sexual Victimization

a) Sexual Victimization Experience

Almost one out of every two surveyed students experienced some form of sexual victimization since age 14. About forty-eight percent of the responding students

14. The study allows the respondent to report multiple victimization experiences when applicable. Thus, this section reported sexual victimization rate based on the specific act of sexual aggression. Percentage did not add up to 100 due to the multiple reporting of victimization experiences.
(N = 1431) indicated that they have experienced unwanted sexual attention and/or advances since age 14. Among all of the respondents, slightly less than half (44%) experienced some form of sexual harassment and more than one-fifth (22%) experienced some form of sexual assault since age 14 (Table 21).

On sexual harassment experience since age 14, 32% of the respondents reported experiencing unwanted sexual looks/gestures, 27% experiencing unwanted sexual jokes/remarks, 26% experiencing unwanted touching/physical closeness, 22% experiencing unwanted pressure for a date, 19% experiencing unwanted sexual materials/telephone calls, and 18% experiencing unwanted pressure for sexual activities.

On sexual assault experience since age 14, 12% of the respondents reported experiencing unwanted sexual contact, about 11% unwanted attempted intercourse and 7% unwanted sexual intercourse.

(1) Among Female Students

(a) Rate and Type

About two-thirds (62%) of female respondents (N = 882) experienced sexual victimization since age 14 (Table 21). Among the female respondents, more than half (58%) experienced some form of sexual harassment and about one-third (31%) experienced some form of sexual assault since age 14.
On sexual harassment experience since age 14, 44% of the female respondents reported experiencing unwanted sexual looks/gestures and 39% jokes/remarks, 35% touching/closeness, 31% pressure for date, 27% sexual material/phone calls, and 25% pressure for sexual activity.

On sexual assault experience since age 14, 16% of the respondents reported experiencing unwanted sexual contact, 15% attempted intercourse and 10% sexual intercourse since age 14.

(b) Ethnic Variations

The study found significant differences among ethnic groups on the rate of female sexual victimization (Table 22). In general, Caucasian women reported the highest rate of sexual victimization since age 14, followed by Filipino, Pacific Islander, Japanese, and Chinese women. To be specific, 82% of the Caucasian, 66% of the Filipino, 61% of the Pacific Islander, 51% of the Japanese, and 50% of the Chinese reported experiencing unwanted sexual attention/advances since age 14.

On the experience of sexual harassment, 79% of the Caucasian, 60% of the Filipino, 55% of the Pacific Islander, 49% of the Chinese and Japanese reported experiencing some form of sexual harassment since age 14. Among Caucasian women, about two-third (62%) experienced unwanted sexual looks/gestures, more than half (55%) experienced unwanted touching/physical closeness and one half experienced
unwanted pressure for sexual activities since age 14. Among the Filipino, less than one half experienced unwanted sexual looks/gesture, 40% unwanted touching/closeness, and more than one-fourth unwanted pressure for date and sexual materials/calls, respectively. Among the Pacific Islanders, around 40% experienced unwanted sexual looks/gesture, about one-third unwanted touching/closeness, and more than one-fourth experienced unwanted pressure for date and sexual materials/obscene phone calls, respectively. Among the Japanese and Chinese, less than one-third experienced unwanted sexual looks/gesture, more than one-fourth experienced unwanted touching/closeness, pressure for date, and sexual materials/calls, respectively.

On the experience of sexual assault since age 14, Caucasian women reported the highest rate of sexual assault (58%), followed by Pacific Islander (30%), Japanese (17%), Chinese (15%) and Pacific Islander (14%).

Among the Caucasians, more than one-fourth (29%) experienced unwanted sexual contact and attempted rape, respectively, and a little less than one-fourth (23%) experienced completed sexual assault since age 14. Among the Pacific Islanders, more than one-tenth experienced each form of sexual assault since age 14. About 15% of the Filipino, about one-tenth of the Japanese, and less than one-tenth of the Chinese experienced unwanted sexual contact and attempted rape since age 14.
(c) Relationship with Perpetrator

The study classified victim's relationship with the perpetrator into eight categories: stranger, authority, equal-status, client/customer, intimate, date, friend/acquaintance, family-related, and social-related. Stranger was the most frequent initiator for some lesser forms of sexual harassment. Among the incidents of sexual harassment experienced by female students since age 14, more than one-third (36%) of the unwanted sexual looks/gestures, and more than half (61%) of the unwanted sexual material/obscene phone calls were most frequently initiated by a stranger to the victim (Table 24).

Friend/acquaintance was reported to be the most frequent offender in more serious forms of sexual harassment. Among the incidents of sexual harassment experienced by female students since age 14, 41% of the unwanted pressure for date, one-fourth (25%) of the unwanted pressure for sexual activities, and more than one-fourth

15. These categories include:
1). Stranger: unknown person;
2). Authority: professor, teacher, chairman, adviser, TA; boss, supervisor, landlord; physician, clergy, police officer, etc.;
3). Equal-status acquaintance: class/school mate, co-worker, roommate, business associate, etc.;
4). client/Customer;
5). Intimate: (ex) spouse (ex) boyfriend (ex) fiance etc.;
6). Date;
7). Friend: friend, peer, social acquaintance, etc.;
8). Family-related: (step) parents siblings, uncle, auntie, cousin, other relatives, etc.;
9). Social-related: friend's family, co-worker's family/friend, etc.
(28%) of the unwanted sexual jokes/remarks were most frequently initiated by a friend/acquaintance to the victim.

Friend/acquaintance was also one of the most frequent offenders in sexual assault. Among the incidents of sexual assault experienced by female students since age 14, more than one-fifth (22%) of the unwanted sexual contact, about one-third (32%) of the attempted rape, and one-fourth (25%) of the completed rape were perpetrated by a friend/acquaintance to the victim.

Intimate was one of the most frequent offender for attempted rape and rape. Among the incidents of sexual assault experienced by female students since age 14, more than one-fourth of the attempted rapes, and 38% of the rape were perpetrated by an intimate to the victim.

In contrast to the popular myth of rape by a stranger, the study found relatively few incidents of sexual assault were perpetrated by a stranger to the victim. Among incidents of sexual assault experienced by female students since age 14, only 9% of the unwanted sexual contact, 8% of the attempted rape, and 13% of the completed rape were most frequently perpetrated by a stranger to the victim.

The authority was to a lesser degree mentioned as the most frequent offender than the previous categories. Among the incidents of sexual harassment since age 14, 14% of 345 women experiencing unwanted sexual jokes/remarks, 13% of 298 women receiving unwanted touching/closeness, 12% of 376
women receiving unwanted sexual looks/gesture, and 9% of 214 women experienced unwanted pressure for sexual activities from a perpetrator who has authority over the victim. Among the incidents of sexual assault experienced by female students since age 14, 8% of unwanted sexual contact, 5% of attempted rape and 3% of rape were perpetrated by an authority over the victim.

(2) Among Male Students

(a) Rate and Type

Almost one out of every four male respondents (N = 549) experienced sexual victimization since age 14 (Table 22). Among the male respondents, more than one-fifth (21%) experienced some form of sexual harassment and slightly less than one-tenth (8%) some form of sexual assault since age 14.

On sexual harassment experience since age 14, 14% of the respondents reported experiencing unwanted sexual looks/gestures, 10% jokes/remarks, 13% touching/closeness, 8% pressure for date, 6% sexual material/phone calls and pressure for sexual activity, respectively.

On sexual assault experience since age 14, more than 5% of the respondents reported experiencing unwanted sexual contact, more than 3% attempted intercourse and about 2% sexual intercourse since age 14.
(b) **Ethnic Variations**

The study found significant differences among ethnic groups on the rate of male sexual victimization (Table 23). In general, Caucasian men reported the highest rate of sexual victimization since age 14, followed by Pacific Islander, Filipino, Chinese, and Japanese. To be specific, 35% of the Caucasians, 31% of the Pacific Islanders, 26% of the Filipino, 18% of the Chinese, and 15% of the Japanese reported experiencing unwanted sexual attention/advances since age 14. The same pattern applied to rates of sexual harassment and sexual assault among male respondents in the study sample.

On the experience of sexual harassment, Caucasian men reported the highest rate (31%), followed by Pacific Islander (26%), Filipino (22%), Chinese (14%) and Japanese men (13%). Among Caucasian men, about one-fifth experienced unwanted sexual looks/gestures and touching/closeness respectively. More than one-tenth experienced unwanted sexual jokes/remarks, pressure for sexual activities and date, respectively. Among the Pacific Islanders, more than one-fourth experienced unwanted sexual looks/gesture, 16% unwanted pressure for sexual activities, and about one-fifth unwanted sexual jokes/remarks and touching/closeness, respectively. Among the Filipino, less than one-fifth experienced unwanted sexual looks/gesture, and around one-
tenth experienced unwanted sexual jokes/remarks and touching/closeness, respectively.

On the experience of sexual assault since age 14, Caucasian men reported the highest rate of sexual assault (16%), followed by Pacific Islander (10%), Filipino (6%) Japanese and Chinese (2%).

Among Caucasian men, one-tenth (10%) experienced unwanted sexual contact and about 5% experienced attempted rape and completed rape, respectively. Among Pacific Islanders, one-tenth experienced unwanted sexual contact, 7% attempted rape and 3% completed rape. Among the Filipinos, 6% experienced attempted rape, 4% unwanted sexual contact and 2% completed rape.

(c) Relationship with Perpetrator

Stranger was reported to be the most frequent initiators of various forms of sexual harassment for male victims. Among the incidents of sexual harassment experienced by male students since age 14, more than one-third (36%) of the unwanted sexual material/calls, 31% of the unwanted sexual looks/gestures, and 29% of the unwanted touching/closeness and pressure for sexual activities were most frequently initiated by a stranger to the victim (Table 24).

Equal status and friend/acquaintance were other most frequent perpetrators of sexual harassment for male victims. Among incidents of sexual harassment experienced by male
students since age 14, more than one-fourth (28%) of unwanted sexual looks/gesture, around one-third of unwanted sexual jokes/remarks, more than one-fourth of unwanted touching/closeness and pressure for date and sexual activities were initiated from an equal status perpetrator or a friend/acquaintance to the victim. Friend/acquaintance was particularly predominant in pressing for date among male victims: almost one out of every two incidents involving unwanted pressure for date was initiated by a friend/acquaintance.

Equal-status and friend/acquaintance were also the predominant perpetrators of sexual assault to male students. Among incidents of sexual assault experienced by male students since age 14, 31% of unwanted sexual contact, one-fourth of attempted rape, and one out of every two completed rapes were committed by an equal-status perpetrator. About one-third (35%) of unwanted sexual contact, 31% of attempted rape, and 13% of rape were perpetrated by a friend/acquaintance to the victim. Among incidents of sexual assault on male students, one-fifth of the unwanted sexual contact and attempted rape, respectively; and one-fourth of the rape were perpetrated by a stranger to the victim.

The authority was to a lesser degree mentioned as the most frequent offender than the previous categories. Among the incidents of sexual harassment experienced by male
students since age 14, 13% of the unwanted sexual jokes/remarks, 9% of the unwanted closeness/touching, 6% of the pressure for sexual activities, and 5% of the unwanted sexual looks/gestures and unwanted pressure for date were initiated by an authority over the victim. Among the incidents of sexual assault experienced by male students since age 14, 4% of the unwanted sexual contact, and 6% of the attempted rape were perpetrated by an authority over the victim.

b) The Effects of Gender and Ethnicity on Encounter with Sexual Victimization

Table 25 presents significant main effects of gender and ethnicity but no significant interaction effects on the degree of encounter with sexual victimization.

The Chi-square test indicated a significant association between gender and encounter with sexual victimization ($F = 103.60, p < .001$). Female students were more likely than male students to have high degree of encounter with sexual victimization (30% vs. 8%). Male students were more likely than female students to have no encounter with sexual victimization (55% vs. 32%).

The Chi-Square test reported a significant association between ethnicity and the degree of encounter with sexual victimization ($F = 103.15 , p < .001$). The Caucasian (39%) was most likely to report high degree of encounter with sexual victimization, followed by Pacific Islander (25%),
Filipino (21%), and Japanese (13%), with the Chinese the least likely (10%). The Chinese (58%) was most likely to report no encounter with sexual victimization, followed by Japanese (52%), Filipino (41%), and Pacific Islander (33%), with the Caucasian the least likely (21%).

The study employed a loglinear analysis to test the interaction effect of gender and ethnicity on encounter with sexual victimization. Loglinear models are useful for uncovering the potential complex relationships among categorical variables in a multiple cross-tabulation (Norusis, 1988). The hierarchical loglinear analysis indicated no significant association among gender, ethnicity and the degree of encounter with sexual victimization. That is, gender and ethnicity had no significant interactive effect on the degree of encounter among the student sample.

4. On Issue Attentiveness

Table 26 presents significant effect of ethnicity on the degree of issue attentiveness. The main effect of gender and the interaction effect between gender and ethnicity was not significant.

The ANOVA indicated that gender had no significant effect on the degree of issue attentiveness. That is, male and female students did not differ significantly on the degree of attentiveness on the sexual victimization issues. However, they differed significantly on the degree of interest: female students expressed higher interest than
male students in the issues of sexual victimization ($F = 50.93, p < .001$).

The ANOVA reported significant ethnicity effect on the degree of issue attentiveness ($F = 2.52, p < .05$). the Caucasians reported the highest degree of issue attentiveness on sexual victimization of women, followed by Filipinos, Pacific Islanders, and Japanese, with Chinese as the least attentive group.

D. The Effects of Intervening Variables on Attitudes towards Sexual Victimization

1. The Effect of Sex Role Attitudes

Table 27 presents significant positive correlations between 1) general sex role attitudes and general attitudes towards sexual victimization of women; and 2) each dimension of sex role attitudes and each dimension of attitudes towards sexual victimization of women.

The study found significant effect of sex role attitudes on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. In general, the stronger an individual rejected sex role stereotypes, the stronger he/she rejected various misconceptions about sexual victimization of women ($r = .63, p < .001$). To be more specific, the stronger an individual rejected: 1) traditional sexual division of labor in family, 2) the double standards applied to deviant behavior, 3) the gender inequality in social, economic freedom, and 4) the traditional courtship norms, the stronger he/she rejected:
1) the natural/biological explanation of sexual aggression against women, 2) depoliticizing the cause of sexual aggression, 3) trivialization and discrediting of women's claims of sexual victimization, and 4) blaming the victim for precipitating sexual victimization.

Sex role stereotypes in family/marriage obligations was most highly correlated with the general attitudes toward sexual victimization (r = .57, p < .001), followed by double standards of deviant behaviors, gender inequality in social/economic freedom, and courtship norms (r = .48, .44 and .31, p < .001, respectively). The same correlation pattern applied to the attitudes towards natural/biological explanation of sexual aggression, trivialization of sexual victimization and victim blame.

Family/marriage roles and social freedom were equally correlated with the attitudes towards depoliticizing of sexual victimization (r = .38, p < .001), followed by double standards and courtship norms (r = .27 and .20, respectively, p < .001).

2. The Effect of Severity Perception

Table 28 presents significant negative correlations between 1) general severity perception and general attitudes towards sexual victimization of women; 2) general severity perception and various misconceptions of sexual victimization, 3) severity perception on authority offender and various misconceptions of sexual victimization, and 4)
severity perception on peer offender and various misconceptions of sexual victimization.

The analysis indicated a significant effect of severity perception on the attitude towards four misconceptions of sexual victimization of women. In general, the more serious an individual perceived various forms of sexual aggression, the stronger he/she rejected general misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women ($r = -.40, p < .001$). The severity perception was most highly correlated with the attitudes towards victim blame ($r = -.37, p < .001$), followed by natural/biological explanation of sexual aggression, trivialization of sexual victimization, and depoliticizing of sexual victimization ($r = -.35, -.33, \text{ and } -.27, p < .001, \text{ respectively}$).

Furthermore, the study found that severity perception on sexual aggression initiated by peer had higher correlation with attitudes towards each dimensions as well as the general misconceptions of sexual victimization than severity perception on sexual aggression initiated by authority.

3. The Effect of Encounter with Sexual Victimization

Table 29 presents a significant effect of encounter with sexual victimization on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. In general, the higher the degree an individual encountered sexual victimization, the stronger
he/she rejected various misconceptions of sexual victimization of women.

The Oneway ANOVA with Scheffe test reported significant difference among none-, medium- and high-encounter groups on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women ($F = .58 \cdot 97, p < .001$). On the general misconceptions of sexual victimization of women, the none-encounter group expressed ambivalent attitudes (mean = 2.43) while the high-encounter group expressed strong rejection (mean = 1.87) with the low- and medium-encounter groups mild rejection (mean = 2.17 and 2.18). The same effect pattern of encounter with sexual victimization applied to each dimension of misconceptions.

4. The Effect of Issue Attentiveness

Table 30 presents significant effect of issue attentiveness on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. In general, the higher the degree an individual attended sexual victimization issues, the stronger he/she rejected various misconceptions of sexual victimization of women ($r = -.26, p < .001$).

Among the three indicators of issue attentiveness, the degree of interest in sexual victimization issues exhibited the highest relevance to the attitudes towards sexual victimization of women ($r = -.39, p < .001$), followed by knowledge and information seeking pattern ($r = -.14$ and $-.10, p < .001$). The same relevance pattern applied to each
dimension of misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women.

E. The Relative Effects of Demographic and Intervening Variables on Attitudes towards Sexual Victimization

1. Among All Students

Table 31 presents relative effects of sex role attitudes, severity perception, encounter with sexual victimization, issue attentiveness, gender and ethnicity on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women among all respondents (N = 1113). A multiple regression analysis was employed to determine the net effect of each variable after the effects of other included variables were taken into consideration. The study found that sex role attitude (Beta = .43, p < .001) was most effective in predicting attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. Gender (Beta = .20, p < .001), severity perception (Beta = -.17, p < .001), encounter with sexual victimization (Beta = -.12, p < .001), issue attentiveness and ethnicity (Beta = -.11, p < .001) represented moderate effects on the attitudes towards sexual victimization of women.

In the order of study variables' respective contribution to the multiple regression analysis: the stronger the rejection of sex role stereotyping, being female, perceiving sexual aggression as more serious, having encountered sexual victimization, more attentive to sexual victimization issues, and being Caucasian or Japanese, then,
the stronger the rejection on general misconceptions regarding sexual victimization of women (adjusted $R^2 = .52$, $p < .001$).

On the attitudes towards natural/biological explanation of sexual aggression, sex role attitudes represented the most predictive effect ($\text{Beta} = .41$, $p < .001$), followed by severity perception ($\text{Beta} = -.17$, $p < .001$), gender ($\text{Beta} = .13$, $p < .001$), encounter with sexual victimization ($\text{Beta} = -.09$, $p < .001$), ethnicity ($\text{Beta} = -.07$, $p < .01$), and issue attentiveness ($\text{Beta} = -.06$, $p < .05$). That is, in the order of study variables' respective contribution to the multiple regression analysis: the stronger the rejection of sex role stereotyping, perceiving sexual aggression as more serious, being female, having encountered sexual victimization, being Caucasian, not being Filipino, and more attentive to sexual victimization issues, then, the stronger the rejection of natural/biological explanation of sexual aggression against women (adjusted $R^2 = .38$, $p < .001$).

On the attitudes towards depoliticizing of sexual victimization of women, sex role attitudes represented the most predictive effect ($\text{Beta} = .27$, $p < .001$), followed by gender ($\text{Beta} = .21$, $p < .001$), issue attentiveness ($\text{Beta} = -.15$, $p < .001$), encounter with sexual victimization ($\text{Beta} = -.13$, $p < .001$), severity perception and ethnicity ($\text{Beta} = -.06$, $p < .05$). That is, in the order of study variables' respective contribution to the multiple regression: the
stronger the rejection of sex role stereotyping, being female, more attentive to sexual victimization issues, having encountered sexual victimization, perceiving sexual aggression as more serious, and not being Chinese, then, the stronger the rejection of depoliticizing of sexual victimization of women (adjusted $R^2 = .29, p < .001$).

On the attitudes towards trivialization of sexual victimization of women, sex role attitudes represented the most predictive effect ($Beta = .31, p < .001$), followed by severity perception ($Beta = -.18, p < .001$), encounter with sexual victimization, gender ($Beta = -.12, p < .001$), ethnicity ($Beta = -.10, p < .001$), and issue attentiveness ($Beta = -.08, p < .01$). That is, in the order of study variables' respective contribution to the multiple regression: the stronger the rejection of sex role stereotyping, the more serious the perception of sexual aggression, having encountered sexual victimization, being female, being Caucasian or Japanese, and more attentive to sexual victimization issues, then, the stronger the rejection of trivialization/discrediting of sexual victimization of women (adjusted $R^2 = .32, p < .001$).

On the attitudes towards victim blame/victim precipitation, sex role attitudes represented the most predictive effect ($Beta = .42, p < .001$), followed by gender ($Beta = .20, p < .001$), severity perception ($Beta = -.15, p < .001$), ethnicity ($Beta = .09., p < .001$), issue
attentiveness (Beta = -.07, p < .05), and encounter with sexual victimization (Beta = -.05, p < .05). That is, in the order of study variables' respective contribution to the multiple regression: the stronger the rejection of sex role stereotyping, being female, perceiving sexual aggression as more serious, being not Chinese and Pacific Islander, being Caucasian, more attentive to sexual victimization issues, and having encountered sexual victimization, then, the stronger the rejection of victim blame and precipitation (adjusted $R^2 = .44, p < .001$).

2. Among Female Students

Table 32 presents relative effects of sex role attitudes, severity perception, encounter with sexual victimization, issue attentiveness, and ethnicity on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women among female students ($N = 652$). A multiple regression analysis was employed to determine the net effect of each variable after the effects of other included variables were taken into consideration. In general, sex role attitude (Beta = .42, p < .001) was the most effective variable in predicting attitudes towards sexual victimization of women, followed by severity perception (Beta = -.24, p < .001), and encounter with sexual victimization (Beta = -.16, p < .001). Ethnicity (Beta = -.09 and .08, p < .01) and issue attentiveness (Beta = -.08, p < .01) posed marginal effects on the attitudes towards sexual victimization of women.
That is, in the order of study variables' respective contribution to the multiple regression analysis: the stronger the rejection of sex role stereotyping, perceiving sexual aggression as more serious, having encountered sexual victimization, being Caucasian, being not Chinese, and more attentive to sexual victimization issues, then, the stronger the rejection on misconceptions regarding sexual victimization of women (adjusted $R^2 = .42$, $p < .001$).

On the attitudes towards natural/biological explanation of sexual aggression, sex role attitudes represented the most predictive effect ($\beta = .41$, $p < .001$), followed by severity perception ($\beta = -.21$, $p < .001$), encounter with sexual victimization ($\beta = -.13$, $p < .001$), and ethnicity ($\beta = -.10$, $p < .01$). That is, in the order of respective contribution to multiple regression analysis: the stronger the rejection of sex role stereotyping, the more serious the perception of sexual aggression, having encountered sexual victimization, and being Caucasian, then, the stronger the rejection of natural/biological explanation of sexual aggression against women (adjusted $R^2 = .33$, $p < .001$).

On the attitudes towards depoliticizing of sexual victimization of women, sex role attitudes represented the most significant effect ($\beta = .24$, $p < .001$), followed by encounter with sexual victimization ($\beta = -.19$, $p < .001$), issue attentiveness ($\beta = -.13$, $p < .001$), and severity perception ($\beta = -.11$, $p < .01$). That is, in the order of
study variables' respective contribution to the multiple regression analysis: the stronger the rejection of sex role stereotyping, having encountered sexual victimization, the higher the degree of issue attentiveness, and the more serious the perception of sexual aggression, then, the stronger the rejection of depoliticizing of sexual victimization of women (adjusted $R^2 = .18$, $p < .001$).

On the attitudes towards trivialization/discrediting of sexual victimization of women, sex role attitudes presented the most substantial effect ($\text{Beta} = .26$, $p < .001$), followed by severity perception ($\text{Beta} = -.21$, $p < .001$), encounter with sexual victimization ($\text{Beta} = -.14$, $p < .001$), ethnicity ($\text{Beta} = -.11$, $p < .01$), and issue attentiveness ($\text{Beta} = -.09$, $p < .05$). That is, in the order of study variables' respective contribution to the multiple regression analysis: the stronger the rejection of sex role stereotyping, the more serious the perception of sexual aggression, having encountered sexual victimization, being Caucasian, more attentive to sexual victimization issues, and not being Filipino, then, the stronger the rejection of trivialization and discrediting of sexual victimization of women (adjusted $R^2 = .25$, $p < .001$).

On the attitudes towards victim blame/precipitation, sex role attitudes represented the most substantial effect ($\text{Beta} = .41$, $p < .001$), followed by severity perception ($\text{Beta} = -.21$, $p < .001$), ethnicity ($\text{Beta} = .12$, $p < .001$),
and encounter with sexual victimization (Beta = -.09, p < .01). That is, in the order of study variables' respective contribution to the multiple regression analysis: the stronger the rejection of sex role stereotyping, the more serious the perception of sexual aggression, not being Chinese, and having encountered sexual victimization, then, the stronger the rejection of victim blame and precipitation (adjusted R² = .30, p < .001).

3. Among Male Students

Table 33 presents relative effects of sex role attitudes, severity perception, encounter with sexual victimization, issue attentiveness, and ethnicity on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women among male students (N = 461). A multiple regression analysis was employed to determine the net effect of each variable after the effects of other included variables were taken into consideration. In general, sex role attitude (Beta = .52, p < .001) was the most single effective variable in predicting attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. Issue attentiveness, ethnicity and severity perception (Beta = -.15, -.14 and -.12, p < .001) presented moderate effects on the attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. Encounter with sexual victimization posed marginal effect (Beta = -.08, p < .05).

In the order of study variables' respective contribution to the multiple regression analysis: the
stronger the rejection of sex role stereotyping, higher issue attentiveness, being Caucasian or Japanese, perceiving sexual aggression as more serious, not being Pacific Islander, and having encountered sexual victimization, then, the stronger the rejection on general misconceptions regarding sexual victimization of women (adjusted $R^2 = .44$, $p < .001$).

On the attitudes towards natural/biological explanation of sexual aggression, sex role attitudes presented the most substantial effect ($\beta = .46$, $p < .001$), followed by issue attentiveness ($\beta = -.14$, $p < .001$), severity perception ($\beta = -.13$, $p < .001$), and ethnicity ($\beta = .10$ and .09, $p < .001$). That is, in the order of study variables' respective contribution to the multiple regression analysis: the stronger the rejection of sex role stereotyping, higher degree of issue attentiveness, perceiving sexual aggression as more serious, and being not Filipino or Pacific Islander, then, the stronger the rejection of natural/biological explanation of sexual aggression (adjusted $R^2 = .29$, $p < .001$).

On the attitudes towards depoliticizing of sexual victimization of women, sex role attitudes represented the most substantial effect ($\beta = .32$, $p < .001$), followed by issue attentiveness ($\beta = -.21$, $p < .001$), and ethnicity ($\beta = -.16$, -.15, and -.12, $p < .001$). That is, in the order of study variables' respective contribution to the
multiple regression analysis: the stronger the rejection of sex role stereotyping, the higher the degree of issue attentiveness, being Japanese, Filipino or Caucasian, then, the stronger the rejection of depoliticizing on sexual victimization of women (adjusted $R^2 = .22$, $p < .001$).

On the attitudes towards trivialization and discrediting of sexual victimization of women, sex role attitudes represented the most substantial effect (Beta = .41, $p < .001$), followed by ethnicity (Beta = -.15, $p < .001$), severity perception, and encounter with sexual victimization (Beta = -.13, $p < .01$). That is, in the order of study variables' respective contribution to the multiple regression analysis: the stronger the rejection of sex role stereotyping, being caucasian, not being Pacific Islander, perceiving sexual aggression as more serious, and having encountered sexual victimization, then, the stronger the rejection of trivialization and discrediting of sexual victimization of women (adjusted $R^2 = .27$, $p < .001$).

On the attitudes towards victim blame and precipitation, sex role attitudes represented the most predictive effect (Beta = .50, $p < .001$), followed by ethnicity (Beta = -.15, $p < .001$), severity perception, and issue attentiveness (Beta = .11, $p < .001$) and . That is, in the order of study variables' respective contribution to the multiple regression analysis: the stronger the rejection of sex role stereotyping, being Caucasian or Japanese, not
being Pacific Islander, perceiving sexual aggression as more serious, and having encountered sexual victimization, then, the stronger the rejection of victim blame and precipitation (adjusted $R^2 = .38, p < .001$).

**F. Summary of Study Findings**

The study identifies four popular misconceptions towards sexual harassment: "Natural/biological Model," "(anti-) Power Stratification in Sexual Harassment," "Trivialization of Sexual Harassment" and "Victim Blame."


The study found many significant correlations between attitudes towards sexual harassment and attitudes towards sexual assault on each dimension and in general. That is, the stronger the rejection on each misconception of sexual harassment, the stronger the rejection of each misconception on sexual assault; and the stronger the rejection on general misconceptions of sexual harassment, the stronger the rejection of general misconceptions on sexual assault.

The study integrated common misconceptions associated with sexual harassment and sexual assault into a four-model structure of misconceptions towards sexual victimization of
women in general. These integrated misconceptions were: 1) Natural/biological model, which attributes sexual aggression to natural and biological causes; 2) Depoliticizing model, which overlooks the power stratification in gender relations; 3) Social repression model, which trivializes and discredits the woman's claim of sexual victimization; and 4) Victim-precipitation model, which blames the woman for her sexual victimization.

The study found that, in general, the surveyed students mildly rejected various misconceptions on sexual victimization of women. Among the four dimensions of misconceptions, the depoliticizing of sexual victimization received the strongest rejection, followed by victim blame/victim precipitation. Trivialization of sexual victimization received the least rejection, followed by natural/biological explanation of sexual aggression.

As hypothesized, the study found significant correlation of the intervening variables to attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. That is, sex role attitudes, perception of severity, encounter with sexual victimization, and issue attentiveness were significantly correlated with the attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. To be specific, the stronger the rejection of sex role stereotypes, the more serious the perception of sexual aggression, the more the encounter with sexual victimization, and the higher the issue attentiveness, then,
the stronger the rejection on general and each dimension of misconceptions about sexual victimization of women.

As hypothesized, the study found significant gender effect on both intervening and dependent variables. Compared to male students, female students more strongly rejected sex role stereotypes, perceived sexual aggression as more serious, reported more encounter with sexual victimization, and indicated higher attentiveness to sexual victimization issues. Furthermore, female students expressed stronger rejection than male students of various misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women.

The gender difference on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women could be accounted for by gender differences on sex role attitudes, severity perception, encounter with sexual victimization and issue attentiveness. As women displayed more liberal attitudes towards sex roles, perceived sexual aggression as more serious, encountered more sexual victimization, and more attentive to sexual victimization issues than their male counterparts, women expressed less support than men for various misconceptions about sexual victimization of women.

As hypothesized, the study found significant ethnic effect on both intervening and dependent variables. Compared to the Asian, the Caucasian was less sex role stereotyped, reported more encounter with sexual victimization, and indicated higher issue attentiveness.
Furthermore, Caucasian students expressed stronger rejection than Asians on various misconceptions on sexual victimization of women.

The ethnic difference on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women could be accounted for by ethnic differences on sex role attitudes, encounter with sexual victimization and issue attentiveness. As the Caucasians displayed more liberal attitudes towards sex roles, encountered more sexual victimization, and more attentive to sexual victimization issues than their Asian counterparts, the Caucasians expressed less support than the Asians of various misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women.

Gender and ethnicity did not significantly interact with each other on their effects on sex role attitudes, severity perception, encounter with sexual victimization, and issue Attentiveness. Nevertheless, a significant interaction effect between gender and ethnicity was observed on the attitude towards depoliticizing of sexual aggression, trivialization of sexual victimization, and general misconceptions on sexual victimization of women. On the depoliticizing model, Caucasian women expressed the strongest rejection, followed by Japanese, Pacific Islander, and Filipino, with Chinese women the least rejecting. On the trivialization of sexual victimization, Caucasian women expressed the strongest rejection, followed by Pacific
Islander, Japanese and Chinese, with Filipino women the least rejecting group. On the general misconceptions, Caucasian women expressed the strongest rejection, followed by Pacific Islander, Japanese and Filipino women, with Chinese women the least rejecting group.

Among male students, the Filipino most strongly rejected the depoliticizing of sexual victimization, followed by Caucasian, Japanese and Pacific Islander, with Chinese the least rejecting group. On the trivialization of sexual victimization, Caucasians expressed the strongest rejection, followed by Japanese, and Filipino, with Chinese and Pacific Islander the equally least rejecting groups. On the general misconceptions, Caucasians expressed strongest rejection, followed by Japanese, Filipino and Pacific Islander, with Chinese the least rejecting group.

A multivariate analysis indicated that, among all students, sex role attitude was most effective in predicting attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. Gender, severity perception, encounter with sexual victimization, and ethnicity represented moderate effects on the attitudes towards general misconceptions of sexual victimization.

Among female students, sex role attitude was the most effective predictor to the attitudes towards misconceptions on sexual victimization of women. The second most effective predictor was severity perception, followed by encounter with sexual victimization. Issue attentiveness and
ethnicity represented marginal effects on the attitudes towards sexual victimization.

Among male students, the sex role attitude was the most effective predictor of the attitude towards sexual victimization of women. The second most effective predictor was issue attentiveness, followed by severity perception and ethnicity. Encounter with sexual victimization represented a marginal effect on the attitudes towards sexual victimization.

The effectiveness of study variables in predicting attitudes towards sexual victimization differed for male and female students. In general, sex role attitude was the most effective predictor, followed by severity perception, for both male and female students. Additionally, while women were more influenced by their encounter with sexual victimization, men were more affected by ethnic socialization and issue attentiveness in evaluating the validity of various misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women.
CHAPTER VI. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This chapter is composed of two sections: discussion of study findings and conclusion with recommendations. The first section discusses findings 1) on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women, 2) on the effects of gender and ethnicity and their interactions, 3) on the effects of sex role attitudes, severity perception, encounter with sexual victimization and issue attentiveness, and 4) on the relative effects of study variables, on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. It also discusses the prevalence of sexual victimization and of peer perpetrators among the surveyed students.

The second section presents conclusions and recommendation of the study. This section first summaries the present study with original contributions and limitations associated with the study. It also discusses various implications for future research and recommends policy formation for the higher education.

A. Discussion of Study Findings

1. Attitudes towards Sexual Victimization of Women

Sexual assault and sexual harassment, as two major categories of sexual victimization of women, have been associated with various misconceptions. These popular misconceptions, when internalized among men and women,
justify male aggression against women and jeopardize the victim's recovery from sexual victimization trauma. In addition, these misconceptions, as prevailing in the mass media and public opinion, have contributed to the insensitive treatment of the victim by the criminal justice system.

The study considers recognition of specific components in societal attitudes towards sexual victimization of women important. The study, therefore, identifies four commonly-held misconceptions towards sexual harassment: "Natural/biological Model," "Depoliticizing of Sexual Harassment," "Trivialization of Sexual Harassment" and "Victim Blame." On sexual assault, the study identifies six popular misconceptions: "Victim Precipitation," "Low Desirability/Reputation of Rape Victim," "(anti-) Victim Advocacy," "Sick Rapist - Psychopathic Explanation," "Sexual Drive - Physiological Model" and "Discrediting Rape Claim."

As hypothesized, the study found attitudinal consistency towards sexual harassment and sexual assault among the students. That is, the stronger the students reject each misconception of sexual harassment, the stronger they reject each misconception on sexual assault.

Examining the specific misconception components, the study identifies four common misconceptions associated with sexual harassment and sexual assault. As sexual harassment and sexual assault constitute two major categories of sexual
victimization of women, the study contends that the common misconceptions towards sexual harassment and sexual assault characterize general societal attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. The study develops a four-model integrated misconceptions on sexual victimization of women as follows: 1) Natural/biological model, which attributes sexual aggression against women to natural and biological causes; 2) Depoliticizing model, which dismisses the power stratification in gender relations; 3) Social repression model, which represses the consequences of sexual victimization by trivializing and discrediting the woman's claim of sexual victimization; and 4) Victim-blame model, which attributes the responsibility to the victim for precipitating her sexual victimization.

In general, the surveyed students mildly rejected various misconceptions on sexual victimization of women. Among the four dimensions of misconceptions, the depoliticizing of sexual victimization received the strongest rejection, followed by victim blame/victim precipitation. Trivialization of sexual victimization received the least rejection, followed by natural/biological explanation of sexual aggression.

The multi-dimensional construct in attitudes towards sexual victimization of women serves to signify the dynamic attitudes held by the surveyed students in this regard. The different degrees of rejection towards various
misconceptions seem to suggest a built-in contradiction in students' attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. On one hand, the students recognize the power element in sexual victimization of women; on the other hand, they are ambivalent about the sexual motivation in sexual assault and harassment. Similarly, on one hand, the students express sympathy with the victim; on the other hand, they are ambivalent about the severity of sexual victimization for women.

The apparent contradiction in the students' attitudes towards sexual victimization of women may present an intellectual struggle in attitude formation process. The exposure to the popular misconceptions about sexual victimization forms stereotyping knowledge about sexual aggression and the victim. The exposure to various educational campaigns on these heated issues may provide the students with a totally different picture to the popular misconceptions. The dynamics in the students' attitudes towards sexual victimization of women seem to signify a conscious effort on the student's part in adopting new information to existing knowledge which stereotypes sexual aggression and sexual victims. As indicated by the findings, the educational campaign on sexual victimization of women is most successful in politicizing the issue and soliciting sympathy for the victim. Nevertheless, trivialization of sexual victimization for women and
attributing biological cause to sexual aggression seem to be the most lingering misconceptions at least among the student population.

2. The Effects of Gender

As hypothesized, the study found significant effect of gender on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women, on sex role attitudes, on severity perception, on encounter with sexual victimization, and on issue attentiveness. Compared to male students, female students more strongly rejected various misconceptions and stereotypes on sexual victimization of women and sex roles. Female students perceived various forms of sexual victimization as more severe than male students. They also reported higher degree of encounter with sexual victimization and more interest in sexual victimization issues than their male counterparts.

Female students expressed stronger rejection than male students on each of the four misconceptions about sexual victimization of women. Particularly on the misconceptions of victim blame and natural/biological cause, women's rejections were substantially stronger than men's.

On the sex role attitudes, female students more strongly rejected gender stereotypes in marriage/family and double standards on social/sexual norms than male students. They expressed stronger support than their male counterparts for gender equality in the social/economic arena.
On the severity perception, female students perceived each form of sexual aggression as more severe than male students. Nevertheless, both male and female students shared a consensus that sexual aggression by an authority offender was more severe than by a peer offender.

On the encounter with sexual victimization, female students reported substantially more exposure to and experience of sexual victimization than male students. One out of every two female students reported experiencing some form of sexual harassment since age 14 while only one out of every five male students said so. Thirty-one percent of the female students indicated experiencing some form of sexual assault since age 14 while only eight percent of male students said so.

On issue attentiveness, female students expressed significantly higher degree of interest than their male counterparts on the issue of sexual victimization. However, female and male students did not differ substantially on their knowledge of and information seeking pattern on sexual victimization issues.

These findings are consistent with the majority of current literature. Although gender effect is inconclusive among previous research, the majority suggests that women are less supportive of misconceptions about sexual victimization of women, less sex role stereotyped, more
vulnerable to sexual victimization, and more attentive on sexual victimization issues than men.

The gender difference found in the present study could be explained with Shaver's (1970) theory of self-defense. Because women represent the disadvantaged group in traditional sex role ideology, they are more likely than men to reject sex role stereotyping. Because women have a higher probability than men of becoming victims of sexual aggression, they are more likely to perceive sexual aggression as serious, to be attentive to sexual victimization issues, and thereby, more strongly reject misconceptions on sexual victimization of women (Feild, 1978). The present study confirms that gender difference in affecting sex role attitudes, severity perception, encounter with sexual victimization and issue attentiveness distinguishes women from men in the acceptance of misconceptions on sexual victimization of women.

3. The Effects of Ethnicity
a) Caucasian vs. Asian:

As hypothesized, the study found significant effect of ethnicity on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women, on sex role attitudes, on severity perception, on encounter with sexual victimization, and on issue attentiveness. Compared to Asian students, Caucasian students were found to be less sex role stereotyped, to perceive sexual aggression more seriously, to encounter more
sexual victimization, and to indicate higher degree of issue attentiveness, and therefore, expressed less support of various misconceptions on sexual victimization of women than their Asian counterparts.

To be specific, compared to Asian students, Caucasian students expressed stronger rejection on the misconception of natural/biological explanation of sexual aggression, depoliticizing of sexual aggression, trivialization of sexual victimization, and victim precipitation/blame. On the sex role attitudes, Caucasian students more strongly rejected gender stereotypes in marriage/family and double standards in social/sexual norms than their Asian counterparts.

On encounter with sexual victimization, Caucasians were more likely than Asians to report high degree of encounter with sexual victimization. Caucasian students also indicated higher degree of issue attentiveness on sexual victimization: they reported higher interest in and more knowledge about the issue of sexual victimization than their Asian counterparts.

Nevertheless, on severity perception, Filipino and Pacific Island students perceived sexual aggression as more severe than Caucasian and Japanese students while Chinese perceive it the least severe.

These findings are consistent with previous studies. Although ethnicity effect is inconclusive among previous
studies, the majority of the literature suggest that Caucasians are less supportive of misconceptions about sexual victimization of women, less sex role stereotyped, and more attentive towards sexual victimization issues than non-Caucasian minorities (Belk et al., 1989; Canter and Ageton, 1984; Field, 1978; Fischer, 1987; Giacopassi and Dull, 1986; Williams and Holmes, 1982). However, the ethnic pattern among Asians has not been well established due to the lack of sufficient research (Engel, 1985; Engel and Dickson, 1985).

As Western culture is more individual-oriented than Asian, there is a wider variation on perception and opinion on controversial issues such as sexual aggression and victimization. The sexual revolution of the sixties and seventies further facilitates open discussion on issues related to gender and sexuality. Caucasian students have been socialized in a relatively liberal climate, and may therefore acquire liberal and open attitudes towards sexual aggression and victimization. As indicated by the findings, Caucasian students were more liberal towards sex roles, perceived sexual aggression as more severe, encountered with more sexual victimization, and attended more to sexual victimization issues than their Asian counterparts. These attributes all contribute to Caucasian students' liberal/feminist attitudes towards sexual victimization of women.
In contrast, Asian culture is characterized with Confucian-patriarchy which stresses male-domination and female chastity (Staecy, 1983). This ideology has resulted in a hostile and discriminatory attitude toward the victim of sexual aggression and often lead to the deprivation of personal dignity and family support to the victim (Ng, 1987). Students with Asian ancestry have been socialized in this unique cultural content and may therefore acquire less liberal/feminist attitudes towards sexual aggression and sexual victims. As indicated by the findings, Asian students were more supportive of misconceptions on sexual victimization of women than their Caucasian counterparts. The relative acceptance of misconceptions among the students of Asian Ancestry might be accounted for by their acceptance of sex role stereotypes, lower severity perception, less encounter with sexual victimization, and lower degree of issue attentiveness.

b) Japanese, Filipino and Chinese

However, the Asian culture is not homogeneous. The study found a consistent pattern on ethnic variation within Asian culture: Japanese were found to be the most liberal while Chinese were the least liberal, with Filipino in between. In general, compared to Japanese and Filipino, Chinese students were found to be more sex role stereotyped, to perceive sexual aggression less seriously, to encounter less with sexual victimization, and to attend less to sexual
victimization issues, and therefore, expressed more support of various misconceptions on sexual victimization of women.

The study provides the following observations to interpret this attitudinal pattern among Asian groups:

1) Population size: There are more Japanese in Hawaii than any other Asian groups (State of Hawaii Data Book, 1990). The larger the group, the more diversified the group members are in their social attitudes and behaviors. As such, the Japanese community is characterized with more diversified attitudes than other Asian communities. This diversification may result into attitudinal deviation from the traditional Asian culture.

2) Cultural assimilation: The Japanese in Hawaii has assimilated with the mainstream culture to the extent that Americans of Japanese Ancestry are considered intensely American middle-class (Rogers and Izutsu, 1980). The cultural assimilation of the Japanese to the Caucasian is reflected in the study finding that, on various attitudinal measurement, the Japanese were located closer to the Caucasian than to other Asian groups.

In contrast, the Chinese of Hawaii are one of the smallest ethnic groups in the islands (Char et al., 1980). The small size of Chinese community serves to better preserve the Confucian patriarchate tradition. Furthermore, the Chinese community in Hawaii is characterized by new immigrants from Taiwan and Hong-Kong. These recently-
arrived Chinese immigrants tend to be more influenced by the traditional Asian culture (Char et al., 1980) than earlier immigrants of other Asian groups.

4. The Interactive Effects of Gender and Ethnicity

A significant interaction effect between gender and ethnicity was observed on the attitude towards depoliticizing of sexual aggression, trivialization of sexual victimization, and general misconceptions on sexual victimization of women. Among female students, Caucasians expressed the strongest rejection on the misconceptions, followed by Pacific Islander, Japanese and Filipino, with Chinese women the least rejecting. Among male students, Caucasians expressed the strongest rejection on the misconceptions, followed by Japanese, Filipino and Pacific Islander with Chinese least rejecting group. However, Filipino males most strongly rejected the depoliticizing of sexual victimization, followed by Caucasian, Japanese and Pacific Islander, with Chinese the least rejecting group.

The interaction between gender and ethnicity highlighted female Pacific Islanders as more liberal/feminist than Asian women. It is interesting to note that, when disregarding gender difference, the Pacific Islanders were close to the Filipino in their attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. When separating women from men, the female Pacific Islanders stood out as the most liberal group next to Caucasian women.
The interaction also indicated Filipino men as the most liberal group among all male students on the depoliticizing model. It is interesting to note that when combining men and women in one group, Filipinos were less liberal than Caucasians and Japanese; while separating women from men reveals the Filipino men as more liberal than their Caucasian and Japanese counterparts.

5. The Effects of Intervening Variables on Attitudes towards Sexual Victimization of Women

As hypothesized, sex role attitudes, perception of severity, encounter with sexual victimization, and issue attentiveness significantly correlated with the attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. The study finds that 1) the stronger the rejection of sex role stereotypes; 2) the more serious the perception of sexual aggression; 3) the more the encounter with sexual victimization; and 4) the more the issue attentiveness, the stronger the rejection on each dimension of misconceptions about sexual victimization of women.

a) The Effects of Sex Role Attitudes

The study finds that the surveyed students mildly rejected sex role stereotypes. Among the four dimensions of sex role ideology, the gender inequality of social/economic freedom received strongest rejection and the gender norms in courtship interaction the least rejection from the students. These findings seem to suggest that the students are more
liberal on public issues such as equal employment/economic opportunity than on personal issues such as double standards on sexual and courtship norms.

As hypothesized, the study found that a significant correlation between sex role attitudes and attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. That is, the stronger an individual rejects sex role stereotypes, the stronger he/she rejects each misconception on sexual victimization of women.

Among the four dimensions of sex role ideology, gender stereotyping in family/marriage was most relevant to attitudes towards sexual victimization of women, followed by double standards of sexual/social norms, gender inequality, and courtship norms. The study further observes that sex role attitudes were particularly relevant to misconceptions of victim blame and natural/biological explanation of sexual aggression. That is, the less sex role stereotyped, the less acceptance of blaming the victim and attributing sexual aggression to natural/biological cause.

The study findings support feminist contention that the attitude towards sexual victimization of women is an extension of patriarchal ideology (Burt, 1980; Check and Malamuth, 1983; Williams and Holmes, 1982). An individual's acceptance of various misconceptions on sexual victimization is substantially related with his/her acceptance of various dimensions of sex role stereotypes. Sex role attitudes, as a general orientation towards male-female relationship,
effectively predict attitudes towards a specific dimension of gender relationship -- sexual aggression and victimization. Attitudes towards sexual victimization of women, therefore, present a logical extension of sex role socialization (Burt, 1980; Clark and Lewis, 1977; Diamond, 1980; Russell, 1975; Weis and Borges, 1973).

b) The Effects of Perception of Severity

The study found that, in general, the student respondents perceived sexual aggression as relatively serious. In the order of severity among the lesser forms of sexual aggression, the students perceived unwanted sexual contact as the most serious, followed by unwanted pressure/request for sexual activities, unwanted touching/closeness, unwanted sexual materials/calls, and unwanted pressure/request for date, with unwanted sexual looks/remarks the least serious. This finding is consistent with previous studies which suggested that physical aggression was perceived more serious than nonphysical aggression (Kenig and Ryan, 1986; Ryan and Kenig, 1991).

The students rated sexual aggression by authority perpetrator as more serious than by peer perpetrator. Each form of sexual aggression was rated more serious when initiated by an authority perpetrator than by peer perpetrator. This finding is consistent with the literature (Lester et al., 1986; Livingston, 1982; Tangri et al., 1982; Reilly et al., 1982; Weber-Burdin and Rossi, 1982).
As hypothesized, the study found a significant correlation between severity perception of, and attitudes towards, sexual victimization of women. That is, the more serious an individual perceived various forms of sexual aggression, the stronger he/she rejected each misconception on sexual victimization of women.

The study observes that severity perception was of particular relevance to the misconception of victim blame, biological explanation and trivialization of sexual victimization. That is, the more serious an individual perceived sexual aggression, the less accepting he/she was of blaming the victim, attributing sexual aggression to biological cause, and trivializing sexual victimization to women.

The study findings are consistent with previous research. As suggested by the literature, the perception of severity on sexual aggression serves as an anchor in the evaluation of sexual victimization of women. It is only when various forms of sexual aggression are taken seriously that various misconceptions of sexual victimization of women could be dismissed. Thus, severity perception of sexual aggression provides a reference point for social evaluation of various misconceptions attached to sexual victimization of women.
c) The Effects of Encounter with Sexual Victimization

As hypothesized, the study found a significant correlation between encounter with sexual victimization and attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. That is, the more an individual encountered sexual victimization, the stronger he/she rejected each misconception on sexual victimization of women.

The study findings lend support to the literature which suggests a close relationship between encounter with sexual victimization and attitudes towards sexual victimization of women (Barnett, 1984, 1987; Deitz, et al., 1982; Jensen and Gutek, 1982; Konrad and Gutek, 1984, 1986; Krebs, 1975; Krulewitz, 1982; Stotland and Dunn, 1963). As indicated by attitude theories, both direct and indirect experience with attitude objects/situations, in determining the degree of ego-involvement, contributes to the formation of attitudes towards the corresponding objects/situations. Individuals with exposure to and/or experience of sexual victimization have a higher degree of self-involvement in the issue of sexual victimization, and therefore, tend to be more rejecting of the misconceptions and more sympathetic with the victim (Barnett, 1984, 1987; Deitz et al., 1982; Krebs, 1975; Krulewitz, 1982; Stotland and Dunn, 1963).

d) The Effects of Issue Attentiveness

As hypothesized, the study found a significant correlation between issue attentiveness and attitudes
towards sexual victimization of women. That is, the more an individual attended to sexual victimization issues, the stronger he/she rejected each misconception on sexual victimization of women.

The study observes that issue attentiveness was particularly relevant to the endorsement of power stratification in sexual victimization of women. It seems intuitively understandable that the respondents with high degree of issue attentiveness become more "aware" and "educated" than those with low degree of issue attentiveness on the power dimension of sexual aggression against women, since the latter receives the most coverage and publicity in both mass media and educational campaigns.

Furthermore, the study observes that, among three indicators of issue attentiveness, interest was of particular relevance to the attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. That is, the more interested an individual was in the issue of sexual victimization, the less accepting he/she was of each misconception on sexual victimization of women. It is somewhat surprising that the other indicators -- knowledge and information seeking pattern -- correlated with attitudes towards sexual victimization only to a marginal degree. The lack of substantial relationship between information seeking pattern and attitudes towards sexual victimization of women presents
a new challenge to studies on mass media effect on attitude formation.

6. The Relative Effects of Study Variables on Attitudes towards Sexual Victimization of Women

For all the respondents, sex role attitude was most effective in predicting attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. Gender, severity perception, encounter with sexual victimization, issue attentiveness and ethnicity represented moderate effects on the attitudes towards sexual victimization of women.

Regardless of gender and ethnicity differences, students with liberal attitudes towards sex roles tend to exhibit feminist attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. That is, the less an individual subscribed to sex role stereotyping, the less he/she endorsed misconceptions on sexual victimization of women.

The relatively significant effectiveness of sex role attitudes in predicting attitudes towards sexual victimization empirically supports feminist claim that acceptance of misconceptions on sexual victimization of women is part of a patriarchal ideology (Burt, 1980; Check and Malamuth, 1983; Williams and Holmes, 1982). Attitudes towards sexual victimization of women, as a particular component in a more general orientation towards gender relationship, could be well predicted by attitudes towards sex roles.
In addition to sex role attitudes, perception of severity on sexual aggression was another common effective variable for both men and women in predicting attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. As literature suggested, perception of severity provides a reference point in evaluating a social situation/object. Both male and female students evaluated the validity of popular misconceptions based on how severe they perceived various forms of sexual aggression.

The effectiveness of other study variables varies between male and female students in predicting attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. Encounter with sexual victimization was most effective among female students, while ethnicity and issue attentiveness were most effective among male students.

Encounter with sexual victimization determines the degree of self-involvement for female students in their evaluation of the misconception. Nevertheless, encounter with sexual victimization did not make substantial difference on attitudes towards sexual victimization among male students. This could very well be due to the lack of substantial encounter with sexual victimization among male students.

Different from female students, male students' attitudes towards sexual victimization could be effectively predicted by their ethnic backgrounds and issue
attentiveness. Male students with Caucasian or Japanese background were more rejecting of misconceptions than those with other ethnic backgrounds. Also, male students with high degree of issue attentiveness were more rejecting of misconceptions than those with low issue attentiveness.

7. Students' Experience with Sexual Victimization

a) Prevalence of Sexual Victimization

Although it is often difficult to compare studies on prevalence of sexual victimization, sexual victimization of university women has been recognized as an acute social problem among major campuses (Berger et al., 1986). The wide range of estimates on the incidents of sexual victimization results from varying theoretical definition of sexual victimization as well as varying methodologies in data collection. However, despite the variance in rate estimates, prevalence studies consistently reveal a high incidence of sexual victimization among university women.

In allowing for reporting of multiple victimization experiences since age 14, the present study found relatively high prevalence rate of sexual victimization among UH students. According to self-reported sexual victimization experience, one out of two students surveyed experienced some form of sexual aggression since age 14. Among all of the respondents, 44% experienced some form of sexual harassment and 22% experienced some form of sexual assault since age 14.
The gender effect on sexual victimization experience found in the study is consistent with the literature, which indicates sexual aggressive behaviors are primarily directed to women (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1988; Ryan and Kenig, 1991). About two-thirds (62%) of female respondents experienced sexual victimization since age 14. Among the female respondents, more than half (58%) experienced some form of sexual harassment and about one-third (31%) experienced some form of sexual assault since age 14. Almost one out of every four male respondents experienced sexual victimization since age 14. Among the male respondents, more than one-fifth (21%) experienced some form of sexual harassment and slightly less than one-tenth (8%) some form of sexual assault since age 14.

The study found significant differences among ethnic groups on the rate of sexual victimization. Among female students, the Caucasian reported the highest rate of sexual victimization since age 14, followed by Filipino, Pacific Islander, Japanese, and Chinese. Among male students, the Caucasian reported highest rate of sexual victimization since age 14, followed by Pacific Islander, Filipino, Chinese, and Japanese.

Compared to Asian students, Caucasians reported higher rate of sexual victimization since age 14. The rate difference might result from either one or a combination of the following scenarios: 1) Caucasians are indeed at higher
risk of sexual victimization than Asians; and 2) Caucasians are more sensitized than Asians in responding to sexual aggression.

The first scenario that Caucasians are more vulnerable than Asians to sexual victimization is in contrast to the literature which suggests minority groups are at higher risk of sexual victimization (Cole and Boyle, 1986; U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981, 1988; Tangri, Burt, and Johnson, 1982; Fain and Anderton, 1987). However, the ethnic status of Caucasian in Hawaii is quite different from that in U.S. mainland. To an extreme, Caucasians are even considered ethnic "minority" in Hawaii. Thereby, there might be some validity to the first scenario.

The second scenario suggests that Caucasians report higher rate of sexual victimization than Asians due to their sensitized consciousness towards sexual victimization. This scenario is partially supported by the study finding. As Caucasian students expressed less support of misconceptions on sexual victimization, and perceived sexual aggression as more serious than the Asian, they might be more assertive in defining certain sexual aggressive behaviors as harassment and/or assault, and less hesitant to reveal such experience to the study.

b) Prevalence of Peer Perpetrator

The study found that, in general, non-stranger was the most frequent perpetrator for more serious forms of sexual
aggression among university students. Although stranger was a primary perpetrator for some lesser form of sexual harassment, the study found relatively few incidents of sexual assault were perpetrated by a stranger to the victim.

This finding is in contrast to the popular misconception of "classic rape" (Weis, and Borges, 1973; Williams, 1984) but consistent with current literature. The prevalence of sexual victimization by non-stranger among university women has been well documented (BJS, 1990; Kanin 1957; Kirkpatrick and Kanin 1957; Kanin and Parcell 1977; Koss, Gidycz and Wisniewski, 1987; Levine, and Kanin, 1987). Accumulated evidence indicates that, during the last 30 years, a rapid increase in the sexual victimization of college women by dates and acquaintances has occurred (Levine, and Kanin, 1987).

Nevertheless, the literature is in disagreement on the prevalence of peer vs. authority perpetrator. Some studies found that female workers experienced more social-sexual behaviors from co-workers than from boss or supervisor (Livingston, 1982: Tangri et al., 1982), while other found higher incidents of sexual harassment initiated by higher-status than by equal- or lower-status personnel (Little-Bishop et al., 1982). The present study found that substantially more peer perpetrators (e.g., friend/acquaintance, date, intimate and other equal-status offender) than authority perpetrators (e.g., supervisor,
professor, advisor, TA) were reported in engaging sexual harassment and assault on university women.

Sexual aggression against university women by peer perpetrators has been a hidden problem until very recently. Date rape/acquaintance rape is emerging as one of the most serious social problem among major campuses in the States. Nevertheless, women charge that date rape is the hidden crime; men complain it is hard to prevent a crime they can't define (Time, June 3, 1991:48).

As feminist theorists contend, sexual aggression against women is both culturally normative and learned through the process of traditional gender role socialization and sexual learning (Weis and Borges, 1973; Foa, 1977; Jackson, 1978; Griffin, 1979; MacKinnon, 1983). Particularly in the case of peer perpetrator, which is void of sensational power/authority component, sexual victimization of university women often went unreported, or even unnoticed. The high prevalence of sexual victimization of UH students by peer perpetrator, as indicated by the study finding, requires equivalent amount of attention from the administration to rectify this problem.

However, due to the recent media coverage on sexual harassment of university women by authority perpetrator, the UH administration has focused on preventions and remedies of exploitative sexual relationship between the faculty and the student. Higher education needs to allocate more resources
to rectify this "everyday" problem of peer sexual aggression, which would otherwise escalate into a campus epidemic.

B. Conclusions and Implications

1. Summary of the Study

The present study examines university students' attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. Sexual victimization is perceived as composed of a continuum of severity, with lesser degree sexual harassment at one end and the most severe sexual assault at the other end. Sexual assault and sexual harassment represent two major categories of sexual victimization, each of which covers a variety of unwanted/unwelcomed sexual attention and advances considered intrusive, offensive or harassing by the recipient. The severity scale of sexual victimization is illustrated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Victimization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. unwanted sexual looks/gestures
2. unwanted sexual remarks/jokes
3. unwanted request/pressure for date
4. unwanted sexual material/obscene phone calls
5. unwanted deliberate touching/closeness
6. unwanted request/pressure for sexual activities
7. unwanted sexual contact
8. attempted rape
9. rape

(Continuum of Severity)
Societal attitudes towards sexual victimization of women are surrounded by various misconceptions, which prevail in mass media, legal system and public opinion. Widespread misconceptions result in justifying sexual aggression against women, creating a hostile climate to the victim in the criminal justice system, and prolonging a victim's recovery process from the traumatic experience. Therefore, the study considers it theoretically important to identify specific misconceptions associated with sexual victimization of women.

Sexual victimization of university women has been a major social problem in higher education during the last decade. The internalization of various misconceptions on sexual aggression against women has contributed to the makeup of "innocent" perpetrator and "hidden" victims among university students. The study considers it educationally imperative to investigate university students' attitudes towards sexual victimization of women.

The study adopts an interdisciplinary approach to explore the dynamic relationship of demographic characteristics, sex role socialization, severity perception, sexual victimization experience, and issue attentiveness, with the attitude toward sexual victimization of women. As illustrated below, the study contends that an individual's gender and ethnicity, intervened by his/her sex role attitudes, severity perception, encounter with sexual
victimization, and issue attentiveness, determine his/her attitude towards sexual victimization of women.

An in-class questionnaire survey was employed to collect data for this study. Stratified by class size, disciplines and academic classifications, 43 classes at University of Hawaii-Manoa were selected by the study and approved by the respective instructors to be surveyed.

The questionnaire survey was conducted in the month of April, 1990, and 1,459 usable surveys were included in the analysis. The study sample is representative of the UHM student population on permanent residency and ethnic background with slightly more female and undergraduate students.

In this study, attitudes towards sexual victimization were measured by the degree of acceptance/rejection on popular misconceptions commonly associated with sexual harassment and sexual assault. The study identified four popular misconceptions on sexual victimization of women as
follows: 1) Natural/biological model, which attributes sexual aggression against women to natural and biological causes; 2) Depoliticizing model, which dismisses the power stratification in gender relations; 3) Social repression model, which represses the consequences of sexual victimization by trivializing and discrediting woman's claim of sexual victimization; and 4) Victim-blame model, which attributes the responsibility to the victim for precipitating her sexual victimization.

In general, the surveyed students mildly rejected misconceptions on sexual victimization of women. In addition, the students mildly rejected sex role stereotyping, perceived sexual aggression as relatively serious, reported relatively high degree of encounter and indicated moderate degree of issue attentiveness.

The study found significant gender and ethnicity effects on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. As hypothesized, female students more than male students, and Caucasians more than Asians, reject various misconceptions on sexual victimization of women.

The study found significant correlation between sex role attitudes, severity perception, encounter with sexual victimization, and issue attentiveness with attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. That is, the less sex role stereotyped, the more serious the perception of sexual aggression, the more the encounter with sexual
victimization, and the higher degree of issue attentiveness; the stronger the rejection of misconceptions on sexual victimization of women.

The study findings confirm intervening effects of sex role attitudes, severity perception, encounter with sexual victimization, and issue attentiveness between demographic characteristics and attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. Compared to male students, female students were less sex role stereotyped, perceived sexual aggression as more serious, encountered with more sexual victimization, attended more to sexual victimization issues, and therefore, expressed less support of misconceptions on sexual victimization of women. Compared to Asian students, Caucasian students were less sex role stereotyped, perceived sexual aggression as more serious, encountered more with sexual victimization, attended more to sexual victimization issues, and therefore, expressed less support of misconceptions on sexual victimization of women.

The study findings are consistent with the majority of literature. The findings also lend support to the theoretical orientation of the study. That is, gender and ethnicity, as structural and cultural determinants, affect sex role orientation, perception of severity, encounter with sexual victimization, and issue attentiveness, which further affect the attitudes towards sexual victimization of women.
The significant effect of sex role attitudes in predicting attitudes towards sexual victimization of women confirms feminist contention that attitudes towards sexual victimization of women are an extension of sex role socialization. Logically, sex role liberation becomes the prerequisite to dismiss popular misconceptions on sexual victimization of women.

Another common effective predictor for men and women is the severity perception of sexual aggression. The perception of severity on sexual aggressive behavior serves as a reference point in evaluating the validity of various misconceptions associated with sexual aggression against women.

The effectiveness of other study variables in predicting attitudes towards sexual victimization of women varies between female and male students. While women were more influenced by their encounter with sexual victimization in responding to misconceptions on sexual victimization, men were more affected by ethnic socialization and issue attentiveness. The varying effect of study variables seems to suggest a gender-specific approach in reducing students' subscription of misconceptions on sexual victimization of women.

2. Original Contributions

The study presents five theoretical and methodological original contributions to the literature on attitudes
towards sexual victimization of women, as discussed in the following:

a) Multi-dimensional structure of attitude towards sexual victimization of women:

Fishbein (1967) views attitudes as hierarchically organized: general attitudes are predicted from specific ones in a summation fashion. The identification of specific dimensions in societal misconceptions on sexual victimization of women provides an attitudinal hierarchy in understanding the dynamics of social attitudes towards sexual victimization.

Current literature shows some successful efforts in establishing a multi-dimensional structure on the attitudes towards sexual assault. However, no such effort is evident on the attitudes towards sexual harassment, let alone on the generic attitudes towards sexual victimization of women.

To explore attitudinal dynamics towards sexual victimization of women, the study first identified four specific components in attitudes towards sexual harassment and six specific components in attitudes towards sexual assault. The study further integrated common misconceptions associated with sexual harassment and sexual assault into a four-model misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women in general.

This effort contributes to 1) identifying specific components in the attitudinal hierarchy towards sexual
victimization of women, and 2) providing methodological justification for future research to simplify the scale construction on attitude toward sexual victimization of women.

b) Misconceptions on sexual victimization of women:

Sexual victimization of women has been viewed with ambivalence and skepticism throughout human history and cultures. Almost invariably, societal attitudes towards sexual victimization of women have been surrounded with various misconceptions. These misconceptions often contribute to justifying sexual aggression against women, depriving the victim of fair treatment in criminal justice system, and jeopardizing the recovery process from sexual victimization trauma.

The study contends that sexual harassment and sexual assault constitute two major forms of sexual victimization of women. A review of the current literature on social attitudes towards sexual victimization of women reveals that, although extensive research has been conducted on rape attitudes, no effort was made to expand existing literature to other forms of sexual victimization of women, such as sexual harassment. Furthermore, with available literature on sexual assault and sexual harassment, no empirical study has been attempted to establish theoretical linkage between these two major categories of sexual victimization of women.
To fill this gap, the present study established misconception communality and attitudinal consistency on sexual harassment and sexual assault; and constructed synthesized misconceptions on sexual victimization of women by integrating misconceptions on sexual harassment and misconceptions on sexual assault.

This effort contributes to facilitating the interchange of well-established literature on rape attitudes to a less developed area of sexual harassment. Furthermore, it legitimizes this synthesized misconception models in representing societal attitudes towards sexual victimization of women in general.

c) Ethnic variations on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women among Caucasian, Asian and Pacific Islander:

Current literature has focused on ethnic differences among the Caucasian, the Black, and the Hispanic. Very little attention has been directed to the difference between the Caucasian and the Asian on social attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. Furthermore, the ethnic variation within the Asians (e.g., Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, etc.) has not been explored in the literature.

The shortcoming in current literature results from limited ethnic groups for studies conducted on the mainland. Hawaii, as "a place where a primitive Polynesian background furnishes the matrix on which the Eastern and Western
cultures are mixed and blended" (Dyke and Ronck, 1982:23), provides an ideal site for studies concerning ethnic and culture variations between the East and West.

The present study takes advantage of the ethnic-cultural diversification in Hawaii to explore the cultural variations on attitudes towards sexual victimization between the East and the West. The study includes Caucasian, Japanese, Chinese, Filipino and Pacific Islander groups in the analysis to compare ethnic difference 1) among the Caucasian, the Asian and the Pacific Islander; and 2) within the Asian groups of Japanese, Chinese and Filipino.

This effort contributes to 1) filling in the gap of a underrepresentation of Asians among previous studies on this particular topic, and 2) expanding current knowledge of the cultural difference between the East and West as well as ethnic variations within the Asian culture.

d) The effect of issue attentiveness on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women:

Information integration theory contends that an individual's attitude system can be affected by information that is received and integrated into the attitude information system. Elaboration likelihood theory maintains that personal relevance of an issue predicts the central route for information processing, and, thereby, solicits relatively permanent attitude changes. Social judgment
theory suggests the degree of ego-involvement as an attitude determinant in the judgement process.

Public opinion research lends support to the claim of attitude literature. Literature on public opinion suggests that an individual's interest in, knowledge of, and information seeking pattern on a particular issue affect his/her opinion of, and attitude towards, that particular issue.

Current literature has not examined the effect of issue attentiveness on attitude toward sexual victimization of women. This study considers attentiveness to sexual victimization issues indicative of 1) the degree of ego involvement in sexual victimization in, and 2) the degree of effectiveness in information integration in, the formation of attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. Accordingly, the present study includes issue attentiveness as an intervening variable between demographic characteristics and attitude towards sexual victimization. This approach presents an integration of communication theories with sociological inquiry of attitude formation towards sexual victimization of women. The examination of the relationship between issue attentiveness and attitudes towards sexual victimization provides new mechanisms to strengthen education programs concerning popular misconceptions on sexual victimization of women among university students.
e) Behavior-specification of sexual victimization:

It has been difficult, if not impossible, to compare sexual victimization rate of college students among prevalence studies. Differing theoretical definitions and methodological approaches employed by previous studies on sexual victimization have generated incompatible data and results in the attempt to estimating the prevalence of sexual victimization in student population.

The present study avoids this dilemma by soliciting and reporting sexual victimization data with a behavior-specific design. Instead of predefining sexual harassment and sexual assault for the respondents, the study presents nine behavior-specific statements to cover a variety of sexual victimization experiences. The behavior-specific design serves two purposes: 1) minimizing victim-labeling effect on responses to sexual victimization experience; and 2) facilitating meaningful comparisons with other prevalence studies on campus sexual victimization.

3. Limitations of the Study

The study is limited in the following aspects:

a) Study sample: The study focuses on the student population to examine attitude formation on sexual victimization of women. The employment of student sample limits the applicability of study findings to other social groups. In addition, the voluntary participation from the
students might reflect a self-selection process, which could introduce sample bias to the study.

b) Survey timing: The questionnaire survey was conducted during a period of time when sexual harassment issue received the highest publicity in campus media. The particular timing, on one hand, increased the responding rate among the students; on the other hand, it increased the likelihood for "socially correct" response from the participants.

c) Ethnic variation: The study was unable to include other ethnic groups, e.g., Black and Hispanic, into the analysis to examine cultural variation among the Caucasian, Asian, Black and Hispanic. Due to the ethnic composition of the University of Hawaii, the study was unable to recruit sufficient respondents of Black or Hispanic background to serve as comparison groups against the Caucasian and Asian groups on attitudes towards sexual victimization of women.

d) Causal relationship: Due to the nature of the methodology employed by the study, it is not possible to establish causal relationship among the study variables.

e) Intercorrelations among intervening variables: The study notices an overlapping effect among the four intervening variables in predicting attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. The Intercorrelations among sex role attitudes, severity perception, encounter with and issue attentiveness of sexual victimization suggests that
the intervening variables are not independent from each other, and therefore presenting overlapping effects on attitudes towards sexual victimization.

4. Research Implications

a) Misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women

The study contends that sexual harassment and sexual assault represent two major types of sexual victimization of women, and therefore, share common misconceptions associated with sexual victimization of women in general. The study findings lend support to this contention by illustrating misconception communality and attitudinal consistency between sexual harassment and sexual assault.

This confirmation suggests a promising approach to study social attitudes towards sexual victimization of women. In integrating common themes of popular misconceptions on sexual harassment and assault, the study presents a four-model structure of misconceptions on sexual victimization of women in general. Future research may adopt the approach and/or the model of this study to investigate societal attitudes towards sexual victimization of women.

Furthermore, this endeavor demonstrates a synthesized approach in theorizing and methodology. That is, theoretically, social attitudes towards sexual harassment share common misconceptions with those towards sexual assault; and methodologically, the underdeveloped study area
of attitudes towards sexual harassment could benefit from the well-established literature on rape attitudes by applying the theoretical and methodological orientations of the latter.

b) The representativeness issue in survey study

Current literature is at debate on the representativeness issue in survey study on the prevalence of sexual victimization. Some studies suspect that the reporting of sexual victimization experience is a result of a sensitized attitude toward sexual victimization. The ideological commitment affects the perception of certain social behaviors in the direction that leads to exaggerating the prevalence of sexual victimization among survey studies (Barnett et al., 1986, 1987; Konard and Gutek, 1984, 1986; Krulewitz, 1982; Jensen and Gutek, 1982; Powell, 1983).

Other studies demonstrate an independent relationship between the victimization status and the attitude toward sexual victimization, and thereby conclude that the rate of self-reported sexual victimization is a factual reflection of reality, instead of a product of psychological perception (Koss, 1985; Mazer and Percival, 1989; Ryan and Kenig, 1991). According to these studies, the respondent's position on the "ideological" variables, such as perception of, and attitudes towards sexual harassment, appears to be neither a cause for, nor a consequence of, reporting experiences of sexual victimization. This independence of
experience from attitudes and perceptions is suggested to alleviate some concerns about the representativeness of samples in survey research on harassment.

The present study found significant correlation between encounter with and attitudes towards sexual victimization. That is, the stronger the rejection of misconceptions on sexual victimization of women, the higher the reported degree of encounter with sexual victimization. This finding lends support to the literature which suggests a relationship between reporting of sexual victimization experience and sensitized ideology towards sexual victimization of women.

The confirmation of a relationship between ideology and experience of sexual victimization compounds the representativeness issue of survey study on sexual victimization experience. Without a solution to this controversy, prevalence studies based on self-reported sexual victimization experience will always be viewed with reservation. More empirical research is needed to clarify these important methodological issues.

5. Social Implications

a) Implication for Sexual Interaction

In addition, as suggested by the findings, ethnic socialization and issue attentiveness provides additional mechanisms to reduce male students' subscription to the misconceptions. Since men are the potential perpetrator on
Empirical studies support the feminist contention by providing a remarkably consistent relationship between rape-myth acceptance and sexual aggression (Check and Malamuth, 1985; Koss and Leonard, 1984; Muehlenhard and Linton, 1987; Peterson and Franzese, 1987). Check and Malamuth (1985) reported that beliefs in rape myths were linked to acts of aggression against women. Peterson and Franzese (1987) observed a positive relationship of the tendency to sexually abuse women with the acceptance of rape myths and the downplaying of sexual assault as a problem. Muehlenhard and Linton's (1987) study on date rape concluded that men's acceptance of rape myths constituted a risk factor for date rape. Briere and Malamuth (1983) maintained that a variety of rape supportive attitudes and beliefs predicted the likelihood to rape and to use sexual force.

As discussed in the study findings, the surveyed sexual victimization of women, it is imperative for educational campaign to examine male students' ethnic orientation towards sexual aggression, and to encourage male students to become attentive to issues related to sexual victimization of women.

c) Implication for Campus Sexual Victimization

As suggested by the study findings, the most prevalent sexual aggression against university women was perpetrated by peers, including friend/acquaintance, date, intimate, and other equal-status acquaintance. Date/acquaintance rape is emerging as one of the most serious campus problems among
Empirical studies support the feminist contention by providing a remarkably consistent relationship between rape-myth acceptance and sexual aggression (Check and Malamuth, 1985; Koss and Leonard, 1984; Muehlenhard and Linton, 1987; Peterson and Franzese, 1987). Check and Malamuth (1985) reported that beliefs in rape myths were linked to acts of aggression against women. Peterson and Franzese (1987) observed a positive relationship of the tendency to sexually abuse women with the acceptance of rape myths and the downplaying of sexual assault as a problem. Muehlenhard and Linton's (1987) study on date rape concluded that men's acceptance of rape myths constituted a risk factor for date rape. Briere and Malamuth (1983) maintained that a variety of rape supportive attitudes and beliefs predicted the likelihood to rape and to use sexual force.

As discussed in the study findings, the surveyed major universities across the nation. The higher education system needs to focus more on the prevention and remedies of peer sexual aggression against university women.

As sexual harassment of college students by an authority perpetrator became an overwhelming issue, peer harassment and/or assault, which is void of power/authority sensation, are often overlooked and unattended by the public and the administration. Furthermore, because sexual aggression against women has evolved from traditional gender role socialization and acquired culturally normative status in gender interaction, many "innocent" perpetrators and
Empirical studies support the feminist contention by providing a remarkably consistent relationship between rape-myth acceptance and sexual aggression (Check and Malamuth, 1985; Koss and Leonard, 1984; Muehlenhard and Linton, 1987; Peterson and Franzese, 1987). Check and Malamuth (1985) reported that beliefs in rape myths were linked to acts of aggression against women. Peterson and Franzese (1987) observed a positive relationship of the tendency to sexually abuse women with the acceptance of rape myths and the downplaying of sexual assault as a problem. Muehlenhard and Linton's (1987) study on date rape concluded that men's acceptance of rape myths constituted a risk factor for date rape. Briere and Malamuth (1983) maintained that a variety of rape supportive attitudes and beliefs predicted the likelihood to rape and to use sexual force.

As discussed in the study findings, the surveyed "hidden" victims have gone unnoticed by the society at large and the educational administration in particular. Thus, the administration of higher education needs to undertake initiatives to address the "everyday" problem in order to provide the students with a safe learning environment. Based on the empirical findings, the study suggests that the administration launch educational programs to combat certain courtship norms which are inductive to sexual aggression against women, and initiate sex role re-socialization to promote healthy attitudes among the students towards gender relationship.
Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Study Sample (N=1459)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 and under</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 thru 25</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 thru 30</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 thru 35</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 thru 40</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 and above</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing date</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Program</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Student</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Post-Graduate</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated/divorced</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA - Mainland</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA - Hawaii</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>83.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Country</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing date</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Background (N=1314)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Filipino</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(part) Pacific Islander</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a The distribution is based on valid percentage.
Table 2. A Comparison of Percentage Distribution on Ethnic Background among UHM Student Population, the Primary Ethnic Identity, and a Consolidated Ethnic Classification for the Study Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UHM^a</th>
<th>1st Ethnicity^b</th>
<th>Pure^c &amp; Part^d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>22.6%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part-Filipino</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(part)Pac-Islander</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a UHM — the spring enrollment for 1990 at the University of Hawaii-Manoa;  
^b 1st Ethnicity: the primary ethnic identity of the respondent;  
^c "Pure": refers to an uniform ethnic identity for both primary and secondary ethnic backgrounds of the respondent; for example, "Chinese" refers to both primary and secondary ethnicity are Chinese or non specification on the secondary ethnicity;  
^d "Part": refers to either primary or secondary ethnic identity. That is, "part-Filipino" refers to either primary or secondary ethnic identity is Filipino, and "part-Pacific Islander" refers to either primary or secondary ethnic identity is Pacific Islander.  

* The distribution is based on valid percentage.
Table 3. Oblique Rotated Factor Structure of Attitudes towards Sex Roles Scale with Factor Loadings on Scale Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Item Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1 - Traditional Gender Roles in Family/Marriage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.76</td>
<td>Women’s place is in the home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.67</td>
<td>Becoming good wives/mothers should be Women’s major concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.65</td>
<td>Women should give higher priority to marriage/family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.64</td>
<td>Father should have more authority in bringing up the children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.59</td>
<td>Sons should be more encouraged to go to college than daughter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.59</td>
<td>Husband should have more financial responsibility than wife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50</td>
<td>Men should give higher priority to career.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2 - Double Standards for Deviant Behaviors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.89</td>
<td>It’s less acceptable for single women to have multiple partners simultaneously than single men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.84</td>
<td>It’s less acceptable for the wife to engage in extramarital affairs than for the husband.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.73</td>
<td>It’s worse to see a drunken woman than a drunken man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.62</td>
<td>It’s all right for men to tell dirty jokes but not for women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3 - Social/Sexual Equality/Freedom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.71</td>
<td>*Women should be able to go wherever men go and to do whatever men do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.63</td>
<td>*Women should have equal opportunities as men in getting jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.62</td>
<td>*Women should be as free as men to propose marriage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.57</td>
<td>*Women should have as much sexual freedom as men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50</td>
<td>*Economic/social freedom is worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of femininity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.42</td>
<td>*Women has right to control her own body in reproduction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4 - Traditional Courtship Norms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.68</td>
<td>The initiative in dating should come from the man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.55</td>
<td>*Women earning as much as their date should share the expense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50</td>
<td>The initiative in sex should come from the man.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Item was reversely scored.
Table 4. Correlation Coefficients\textsuperscript{a} between Indicators of Severity Perception on Authority Perpetrator and Peer Perpetrator (N=1354)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Peer</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} All the correlation coefficients are significant at \( p < .001 \).

\textsuperscript{b} "General" refers to the average severity perception on both authority and peer perpetrators.
Table 5. Percentage Association between Exposure to and Experience of Sexual Victimization (N=1205)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Exposure</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 199.03***

*** p < .001
Table 6. Correlation Coefficients\textsuperscript{a} between Indicators of Issue Attentiveness and Issue Attentiveness (N=1354)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Inform. Seeking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform. Seeking</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Attend.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} All the correlation coefficients are significant at \( p < .001 \).
Table 7. Oblique Rotated Factor Structure of Attitudes towards Sexual Harassment Scale with Factor Loadings on Scale Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Scale Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 1 - Natural/Biological Model</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.73</td>
<td>Sexual harassment is just normal flirtation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.68</td>
<td>Some women can’t take a joke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.65</td>
<td>Expression of sexual interest shouldn’t be offensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.61</td>
<td>The issue of sexual harassment has been exaggerated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.55</td>
<td>It is a man’s nature to make sexual advances to woman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 2 - Power Element in Sexual Harassment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.79</td>
<td>*Sexual harassment has lots to do with power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.65</td>
<td>*Sexual harassment/assault are forms of sexual victimization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.65</td>
<td>*Women who complain of sexual harassment are more often punished than the men who harass them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.43</td>
<td>*Sexual harassment is a form of sexual discrimination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 3 - Trivialization of Sexual Harassment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.79</td>
<td>People can usually stop unwanted sexual attention verbally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.73</td>
<td>Few women are actually forced to change jobs or classes because of sexual harassment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 4 - Victim Blame</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.75</td>
<td>Women often encourage sexual interest to get special favors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.60</td>
<td>Women can’t accuse her partner of sexual harassment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.59</td>
<td>People who are sexual harassed usually invite it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Item was reversely scored.
Table 8. Oblique Rotated Factor Structure of Attitudes towards Sexual Assault with Factor Loadings on Scale Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Item Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1 - Victim Precipitation</td>
<td>.77 Most women secretly want to be raped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.69 Women put themselves in rape-prone situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.62 Women should be responsible for rape if they &quot;lead men on&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.61 Sexual violence is sexually stimulating for many women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.52 Physical force is the only way to turn a cold woman on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.52 A wife cannot be &quot;raped&quot; by her husband.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.46 Women often provoke rape through their appearance or behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2 - Low Desirability/Reputation of Rape Victim</td>
<td>.88 Most men think a raped woman is less desirable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.87 A raped woman’s reputation is ruined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3 - Victim Advocate</td>
<td>.70 *Any woman can be raped against her will.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.60 *Marital rape should be considered a crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.57 *Power/control is the primary motivation for rape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.35 *Victim’s past sexual history should have nothing to do with rape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4 - Psycho-pathetical Model (Sick Rapist)</td>
<td>.78 Normal men do not commit rape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.77 Most rapists are sick, psychologically disturbed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5 - Physiological Model (Sexual Drive)</td>
<td>.72 Rape is motivated by men’s uncontrollable sexual drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.71 Sex is the primary motivation for rape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.50 Rape is usually an unplanned, impulsive act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.42 Rape case should be decided on the resistance of the victim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 6 - Discrediting Rape Claim</td>
<td>.80 Women often engage in token resistance to sex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.79 Women claim rape on consented sex when they change their minds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.68 Women often claim rape to protect their reputation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.59 Women often say &quot;NO&quot; to sex when they actually mean &quot;YES&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.46 Bar girl’s accusation of rape should be viewed with suspicion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.45 A healthy woman can fight off rapists if she really tries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Item was reversely scored.
Table 9. Correlation Coefficients of Factor Subscales of Sexual Harassment Attitudes with Factor Subscales of Sexual Assault Attitudes (N=1229)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes towards Sexual Harassment</th>
<th>Natural Model</th>
<th>Depolit.</th>
<th>Trivialization of Harassment</th>
<th>Victim Blame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vtm. Precipit.</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.64***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesirability</td>
<td>.10***</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>.11***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Vtm. Advocacy</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.40***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick Rapist</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>.11***</td>
<td>.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Drive</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.40***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discredit Claim</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.61***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01  *** p < .001
Table 10. An Outline for the Integrated Misconception Dimensions in Sexual Victimization of Women, as Derived from Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Assault</th>
<th>r&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Victimization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Model</td>
<td>Sexual Drive</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>Natural/Biological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Model</td>
<td>Vtm Advocacy</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>Anti-Power Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trivialization</td>
<td>Discrediting</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>Social Repression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vtm Blame</td>
<td>Vtm Precipitate</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>Vtm Blame/Precipitating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> All of the correlation coefficients are significant at p < .001.
Table 11. Correlation Coefficient Matrix of Misconception Dimensions among Sexual Harassment, Sexual Assault and Sexual Victimization of Women (N = 1459)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Natural Model</th>
<th>Depli. Model</th>
<th>Trivial. Model</th>
<th>Victim S.V.</th>
<th>S.V. Attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Model</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Inequality</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trivialization</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Blame</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape Myth Acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vtm Precipitation</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Desirability</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vtm Vulnerability</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick Rapist</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Motive</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discredit Rape</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.V. Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Model</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Model</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trivialization</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vtm. Blame</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^a \) All the correlation coefficients are significant at \( p < .001 \), unless otherwise specified.
Table 12. Percentage Distribution on Attitudes towards Sexual Harassment by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number(^a)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M F T</td>
<td>M F T</td>
<td>M F T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.***(^b)</td>
<td>17 11 13</td>
<td>19 14 16</td>
<td>64 75 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.***</td>
<td>62 85 77</td>
<td>22 9 14</td>
<td>15 6 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.***</td>
<td>41 69 58</td>
<td>31 17 22</td>
<td>28 14 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.***</td>
<td>28 65 51</td>
<td>30 19 24</td>
<td>42 15 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.***</td>
<td>33 49 43</td>
<td>40 27 32</td>
<td>27 24 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.***</td>
<td>61 80 73</td>
<td>19 11 14</td>
<td>21 9 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.***</td>
<td>42 60 53</td>
<td>19 11 14</td>
<td>39 29 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.***(^b)</td>
<td>11 6 8</td>
<td>34 19 24</td>
<td>55 76 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.***(^b)</td>
<td>8 6 7</td>
<td>25 15 19</td>
<td>67 79 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.**</td>
<td>18 24 22</td>
<td>31 28 29</td>
<td>51 48 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.***(^b)</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td>19 11 14</td>
<td>79 87 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.***</td>
<td>42 68 58</td>
<td>23 15 18</td>
<td>35 17 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.***</td>
<td>47 76 65</td>
<td>36 17 24</td>
<td>18 7 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.***</td>
<td>24 50 40</td>
<td>42 29 34</td>
<td>34 21 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.***</td>
<td>55 84 73</td>
<td>29 11 18</td>
<td>15 6 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.***(^b)</td>
<td>19 15 17</td>
<td>38 29 32</td>
<td>44 56 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.***</td>
<td>33 49 43</td>
<td>43 39 40</td>
<td>24 12 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.n.s.</td>
<td>24 19 21</td>
<td>25 26 26</td>
<td>51 55 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.n.s.</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>62 57 59</td>
<td>34 39 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.n.s.</td>
<td>14 13 13</td>
<td>18 17 17</td>
<td>69 71 70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01  *** p < .001

\(^a\) Please refer to Appendix A for item content.

\(^b\) Item score was reversed to be consistent with other items on the direction of acceptance/rejection.
Table 13. Percentage Distribution on Attitudes towards Sexual Assault by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.***</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.***</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.***b</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.***</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.***</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.***</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.***</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.***</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.***</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.**</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.n.s.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.***</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.***</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.**</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.***b</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.***b</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.***</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.***</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.***</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.***b</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.***b</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.**</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.***b</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.***b</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01 *** p < .001

a Please refer to Appendix A for item content.

b Item scores was reversed to be consistent with other items on the direction of acceptance/rejection.
Table 14. Mean Score of Individual Dimensions (N = 1459\textsuperscript{a})

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Misconceptions</th>
<th>Mean\textsuperscript{b}</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Model</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Inequality</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trivialization</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Blame</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape Myth Acceptance</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vtm Precipitation</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Desirability</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vtm Vulnerability</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick Rapist</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Motive</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discredit Rape Claim</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General S.V. Attitudes</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Model</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depoliticizing Model</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trivialization</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vtm. Blame</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Missing data were substituted by mean score.

\textsuperscript{b} The lower the mean score, the stronger the rejection of the corresponding misconception.
Table 15. The Effects of Gender and Ethnicity on Attitudes towards Sexual Victimization of Women (N=1305): ANOVA with F-value\(^a\) and Mean\(^b\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Natural Model</th>
<th>Power Model</th>
<th>Repress Model</th>
<th>Victim Blame</th>
<th>S.V. Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>41.05(^a)</td>
<td>42.35</td>
<td>38.50</td>
<td>62.65</td>
<td>72.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined (1305)</td>
<td>2.30(^b)</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender(^a)</td>
<td>150.55</td>
<td>192.93</td>
<td>136.05</td>
<td>253.17</td>
<td>289.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (807)</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (498)</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity(^a)</td>
<td>17.01</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>21.12</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauc. (296)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jap. (386)</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chn. (141)</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(part) Fil. (153)</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(part) Pac. (102)</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/mix (227)</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Ethnicity</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>4.31**</td>
<td>3.83**</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>3.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauc. (196)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jap. (227)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chn. (79)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(part) Fil. (99)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(part) Pac. (70)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/mix (136)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauc. (100)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jap. (159)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chn. (62)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(part) Fil. (54)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(part) Pac. (32)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/mix (91)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) All of the F values are significant at p < .001 unless otherwise specified.

\(^b\) The lower the mean score, the stronger the rejection of the corresponding misconception.
### Table 16. Percentage Distribution on Attitudes towards Sex Roles by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M F T</td>
<td>M F T</td>
<td>M F T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.*** 44 44 44 36 25 29 21 32 28
2.*** 46 67 59 29 17 22 25 16 20
3.*** 45 60 54 20 14 17 35 25 29
4.***b 25 14 18 16 12 14 59 74 68
5.***b 11 12 12 13 19 17 75 70 72
6.***b 9 8 8 50 27 36 41 65 56
7.***b 5 2 3 5 2 3 91 97 94
8.*** 76 92 86 15 4 8 10 4 6
9.*** 68 85 78 19 9 13 13 7 10
10.***b 66 87 79 21 6 13 13 6 8
11.***b 13 7 9 22 19 20 66 75 71
12.*** 62 81 74 23 11 16 15 8 11
13.***b 12 7 9 12 5 8 76 88 84
14.*** 85 96 92 10 2 5 6 2 3
15.n.s.b 12 13 13 31 29 30 56 59 58
16.* 61 64 63 31 26 28 7 10 9
17.*** 52 66 60 28 19 22 29 16 17
18.*** 44 60 54 27 18 21 28 23 25
19.*** 36 60 48 27 20 23 37 24 29
20.*** 66 81 75 20 12 15 14 7 10

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

a Please refer to Appendix A for item content.

b Item score was reversed to be consistent with other items on the direction of acceptance/rejection.
Table 17. Mean Score of Individual Dimensions on Sex Role Attitudes (N = 1459$^a$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex Role Stereotypes</th>
<th>Mean$^b$</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family/Marriage</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Std.</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Freedom</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtship Norm</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Role Attitudes</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Missing data were substituted by mean score.

$^b$ The lower the mean score, the stronger the rejection of the corresponding dimension.
Table 18. The Effects of Gender and Ethnicity on Attitudes towards Sex Roles (N=1305): ANOVA with F-value\textsuperscript{a} and Mean\textsuperscript{b}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Family/ Marriage Std.</th>
<th>Double Inequality</th>
<th>Social Inequality</th>
<th>Courtship Norms</th>
<th>Sex Roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects\textsuperscript{a}</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined (1305)</td>
<td>36.88\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>20.98</td>
<td>23.64</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>37.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (807)</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (498)</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauc. (296)</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jap. (386)</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chn. (141)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(part)Fil. (153)</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(part)Pac. (102)</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/mix (227)</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Ethnicity n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} All of the F values are significant at p < .001 unless otherwise specified.

\textsuperscript{b} The lower the mean score, the stronger the rejection of the corresponding dimension.
Table 19. Mean Score on Severity Perception of Sexual Aggression by Authority and Peer Perpetrator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th></th>
<th>Peer</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual look/remark</td>
<td>2.89a</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure for date</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual material/call</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touching/closeness</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure for sex</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual contact</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Aggression^b</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Score ranges from 0 "not serious at all" to 5 "extremely serious".

^b The average severity score on the six forms of sexual aggression.
Table 20. The Effects of Gender and Ethnicity on Perception of Severity on Sexual Victimization by Authority, Peer offender and In general (N=1305): ANOVA with F-value$^a$ and Mean$^b$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Peer</th>
<th>In General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects$^a$</strong></td>
<td>30.64$^a$</td>
<td>42.55</td>
<td>40.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined (1305)</td>
<td>3.98$^b$</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender$^a$</strong></td>
<td>150.63</td>
<td>225.10</td>
<td>210.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (807)</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (498)</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity$^a$</strong></td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauc. (296)</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jap. (386)</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chn. (141)</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(part)Fil. (153)</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(part)Pac. (102)</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/mix (227)</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender x Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ All of the F values are significant at $p < .001$ unless otherwise specified.

$^b$ The higher the score, the more serious the corresponding form of sexual aggression is rated.
Table 21. The Effect of Gender on Type of Sexual Victimization (N=1431)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Sexual Victimization</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Victimization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since Age 14</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(882)</td>
<td>(549)</td>
<td>(1431)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Harassment Experience</strong></td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(882)</td>
<td>(549)</td>
<td>(1431)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted sexual looks/</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gestures</td>
<td>(747)</td>
<td>(511)</td>
<td>(1258)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted sexual jokes/</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remarks</td>
<td>(748)</td>
<td>(512)</td>
<td>(1260)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted touching/</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical closeness</td>
<td>(772)</td>
<td>(512)</td>
<td>(1284)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted pressure for date</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(777)</td>
<td>(516)</td>
<td>(1293)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted sexual material/</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phone calls</td>
<td>(781)</td>
<td>(521)</td>
<td>(1302)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted pressure for sexual activity</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(782)</td>
<td>(516)</td>
<td>(1298)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Assault Experience</strong></td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(882)</td>
<td>(549)</td>
<td>(1431)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted sexual contact</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(792)</td>
<td>(521)</td>
<td>(1313)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted attempted intercourse</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(799)</td>
<td>(523)</td>
<td>(1322)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted sexual intercourse</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(804)</td>
<td>(523)</td>
<td>(1327)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reporting of multiple sexual victimization was allowed.

* Number in the parentheses represents the base for percentage calculation; Base numbers are inconsistent due to missing data.
Table 22. The Effects of Ethnicity on Type of Sexual Victimization Among Female students (N=795)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cauc.</th>
<th>Jap.</th>
<th>Chn.</th>
<th>Fil.</th>
<th>Pac.</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S.V. Since Age 14</strong></td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(193)(^b)</td>
<td>(222)</td>
<td>(78)</td>
<td>(97)</td>
<td>(70)</td>
<td>(135)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Harassment</strong></td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(183)(^b)</td>
<td>(216)</td>
<td>(76)</td>
<td>(87)</td>
<td>(67)</td>
<td>(126)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looks/gestures</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jokes/remarks</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touch/closeness</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure for date</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material/calls</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure for sexual activity</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Assault</strong></td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(184)(^b)</td>
<td>(217)</td>
<td>(76)</td>
<td>(92)</td>
<td>(67)</td>
<td>(128)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual contact</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted rape</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Reporting of multiple sexual victimization was allowed.

\(^b\) Number in the parentheses represents the base for percentage calculation; Base numbers are inconsistent due to missing data.
Table 23. The Effects of Ethnicity on Type of Sexual Victimization Among Male Students (N=492)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cauc.</th>
<th>Jap.</th>
<th>Chn.</th>
<th>Fil.</th>
<th>Pac.</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. V. Since Age 14</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,4</td>
<td>(99)</td>
<td>(156)</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>(32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looks/gestures</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jokes/remarks</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touch/closeness</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure for date</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material/calls</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure for sexual activity</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Assault</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual contact</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,9</td>
<td>(97)</td>
<td>(154)</td>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>(52)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted rape</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Reporting of multiple sexual victimization was allowed.

b Number in the parentheses represents the base for percentage calculation; Base numbers are inconsistent due to missing data.
Table 24. The Effects of Gender on Perpetrator Relationship by Type of Sexual Victimization Since Age 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Sexual Harassment</th>
<th>Relationship with Perpetrator</th>
<th>Strng</th>
<th>Auth</th>
<th>Equil</th>
<th>Clnt</th>
<th>Int</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Frnd</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Look/Gesture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (376)</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (78)</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Joke/Remark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (345)</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (56)</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Mat'l/Obscene Phone call</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (228)</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (33)</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure for Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (257)</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (43)</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touching/Closeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (298)</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (66)</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure for Sexual Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (214)</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (35)</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Sexual Assault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (136)</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (26)</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Rape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (129)</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (16)</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (96)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (8)</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Reporting of multiple sexual victimization was allowed.
b Number in the parentheses represents the base for percentage calculation; Base numbers are inconsistent due to missing data.
c "Other" includes the categories of family-related and social-related.
Table 25. The Effects of Gender and Ethnicity on Encounter with Sexual Victimization (N=1196): Percentage and Chi-Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encounter with Sexual Victimization</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>ChiSqu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For all groups</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1196)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>103.60***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (701)</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (495)</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (1115)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>103.15***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauc. (228)</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jap. (348)</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chn. (126)</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(part)Fil. (127)</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(part)Pac. (84)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/mix (202)</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Ethnicity x Encountera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .001

a A hierarchical loglinear analysis indicates no significant third-order effect among gender, ethnicity and the degree of encounter with sexual victimization.
Table 26. The Effects of Gender and Ethnicity on Issue Attentiveness (N=1218): ANOVA with F-value and Mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Inform.</th>
<th>Iss.Attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td>13.40***</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>2.79*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined (1218)</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>17.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (752)</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>17.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (466)</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>12.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauc. (274)</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>18.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jap. (356)</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>17.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chn. (130)</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>16.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(part) Fil. (149)</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>17.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(part) Pac. (96)</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>17.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/mix (213)</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>17.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender x Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

a The higher the score, the higher the degree of issue attentiveness on the particular indicator.
Table 27. Correlation Coefficients\(^a\) of Sex Role Attitudes with Attitudes towards Sexual Victimization of Women (\(N = 1459\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Natural Model</th>
<th>Deplit. Model</th>
<th>Repress Model</th>
<th>Victim Blame</th>
<th>S.V. Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family/Marriage</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Std.</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Freedom</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtship Norm</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Role Attitude</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) All the correlation coefficients are significant at \(p < .001\).
Table 28. Correlation Coefficients$^a$ of Perception of Severity with Attitudes towards Sexual Victimization of Women ($N = 1459$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Perception</th>
<th>Natural Model</th>
<th>Deplit. Model</th>
<th>Repress Model</th>
<th>Victim Blame</th>
<th>S.V. Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>by Auth.</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Peer</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In General</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ All the correlation coefficients are significant at $p < .001$. 
Table 29. The Effect of Encounter with Sexual Victimization on Attitudes towards Sexual Victimization of Women (N=1205): Oneway ANOVA with mean$^a$ and F-value$^b$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encounter with Sexual Victimization</th>
<th>Natural Model</th>
<th>Deplit. Model</th>
<th>Repress Model</th>
<th>Victim Blame</th>
<th>S.V. Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None (509)</td>
<td>2.58$^a$</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low* (241)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium* (209)</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (246)</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Ratio$^b$</td>
<td>39.44</td>
<td>41.99</td>
<td>39.91</td>
<td>34.96</td>
<td>58.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^*$ Scheffe test indicates every pair of groups significantly different at .50 level except for the pair of Low and Medium.

$^a$ The lower the score on sexual victimization attitudes, the stronger the rejection of misconceptions towards sexual victimization of women.

$^b$ All of the F values are significant at $p < .001$. 
Table 30. Correlation Coefficients\(^a\) of Issue Attentiveness with Attitudes towards Sexual Victimization of Women (N=1354)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Natural Model</th>
<th>Deplit. Model</th>
<th>Repress Model</th>
<th>Victim Blame</th>
<th>S.V. Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform. Seeking</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Attend.</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) All the correlation coefficients are significant at \(p < .001\).
Table 31. For Entire Population: The Relative Effects of Gender, Ethnicity, Sex Role Attitudes, Perception of Severity, Encounter with Sexual Victimization and Issue Attentiveness on Attitudes towards Sexual Victimization of Women (N=1113): Stepwise Regression with Standardized Regression Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Natural Model</th>
<th>Depolit. Model</th>
<th>Repress Model</th>
<th>Victim Blame</th>
<th>S.V. Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Roles</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity</td>
<td>-.17***</td>
<td>-.06*</td>
<td>-.18***</td>
<td>-.15***</td>
<td>-.17***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encounter</td>
<td>-.09***</td>
<td>-.13***</td>
<td>-.12***</td>
<td>-.05*</td>
<td>-.12***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentive.</td>
<td>-.06*</td>
<td>-.15***</td>
<td>-.08**</td>
<td>-.07**</td>
<td>-.11***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.13***</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.12***</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.20***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>-.07**</td>
<td>-.10***</td>
<td>-.06*</td>
<td>-.11***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.07*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.09**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>.06**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pac-Islander</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² (adj.)</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ratio</td>
<td>99.05***</td>
<td>76.05***</td>
<td>67.25***</td>
<td>108.14***</td>
<td>173.23***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  ** p < .01  *** p < .001
Table 32. For Female Students: The Relative Effects of Sex Role Attitudes, Perception of Severity, Encounter with Sexual Victimization and Issue Attentiveness on Attitudes towards Sexual Victimization of Women (N=652): Stepwise Regression with Standardized Regression Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Natural Model</th>
<th>Depolit. Model</th>
<th>Repress Model</th>
<th>Victim Blame</th>
<th>S.V. Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Roles</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.42***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity</td>
<td>-.21***</td>
<td>-.11**</td>
<td>-.21***</td>
<td>-.21***</td>
<td>-.24***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encounter</td>
<td>-.13***</td>
<td>-.19***</td>
<td>-.14***</td>
<td>-.09**</td>
<td>-.16***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentive</td>
<td>-.13***</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>-.09**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>-.10**</td>
<td>-.11**</td>
<td>-.09**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pac-Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² (adj.)</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ratio</td>
<td>80.35***</td>
<td>36.80***</td>
<td>37.52***</td>
<td>71.05***</td>
<td>79.74***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  ** p < .01  *** p < .001
Table 33. For Male Students: The Relative Effects of Sex Role Attitudes, Perception of Severity, Encounter with Sexual Victimization and Issue Attentiveness on Attitudes towards Sexual Victimization of Women (N=461): Stepwise Regression with Standardized Regression Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Natural Model</th>
<th>Depolit. Model</th>
<th>Repress Model</th>
<th>Victim Blame</th>
<th>S.V. Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Roles</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.52***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>-.11**</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encounter</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.08*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentive.</td>
<td>-.14***</td>
<td>-.21***</td>
<td>-.11**</td>
<td>-.15***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.15***</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>-.16***</td>
<td>-.15***</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>-.14***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>-.15***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pac-Islander</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² (adj.)</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ratio</td>
<td>38.55***</td>
<td>26.71***</td>
<td>35.72***</td>
<td>47.71***</td>
<td>52.32***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  ** p < .01  *** p < .001
Appendix A: Survey Questionnaire

PERSONAL OPINION ABOUT SEX ROLES

Please circle the number on the right to indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements:

5 = Strongly Agree (SA)
4 = Mildly Agree (MA)
3 = Neutral/Unsure (N)
2 = Mildly Disagree (MD)
1 = Strongly Disagree (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The initiative in dating should come from the man</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Women should give higher priority to marriage or family over a career</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The husband should have more responsibility than the wife to financially support the family</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A woman should be able to go everywhere a man does, or do everything a man does, such as going to bars alone</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Women should be as free as men to propose marriage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Economic and social freedom is worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of femininity which has been set up by men</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Women should have completely equal opportunities as men in getting jobs and promotions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. A woman’s place is in the home looking after her family, rather than following a career of her own</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Women should worry less about being equal with men and more about becoming good wives and mothers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in bringing up children</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Women should have as much sexual freedom as men</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Men should give their career a higher priority over marriage and family</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. A woman — whether she is married or not — has a right to control her own body and to decide whether or not to have a child</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Women earning as much as their male dates should share expenses equally when they go out together</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The initiative in sex should come from the man</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. It is less acceptable for the wife to engage in extramarital affairs than for the husband</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. It is less acceptable for a single woman to have multiple sexual partners simultaneously than a single man</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. It is worse to see a drunken woman than a drunken man</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. It is all right for men to tell dirty jokes, but not for women</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. How interested are you in the issue of sexual harassment?  
   0. Not At All 1. A Little 2. Somewhat 3. Quite a Bit 4. A Great Deal

2. How interested are you in the issue of sexual assault?  
   0. Not At All 1. A Little 2. Somewhat 3. Quite a Bit 4. A Great Deal

3. Do you know the legal definition of sexual harassment?  
   0. No 1. Unsure 2. Yes

4. Do you know the legal definition of sexual assault?  
   0. No 1. Unsure 2. Yes

5. How well do you know the reporting procedures of sexual harassment at UH?  

6. How well do you know the investigating procedures of sexual harassment at UH?  

7. How closely have you followed the policy making process at UH regarding campus sexual harassment?  
   0. Not At All 1. A little 2. Somewhat 3. Quite Closely 4. Very Closely

8. How many days per week have you watched national or local news on TV?  
   0. None 1. One - Two 2. Three - Four 3. Five - Six 4. Everyday

9. On an average, how many issues of *Ka Leo O Hawaii* (the campus newspaper) per week have you read? About _____ issues per week.

10. When you saw headlines on sexual harassment/assault in *Ka Leo*, how many out of every ten articles did you read? About _____ out of ten.

11. Have you talked about the issue of sexual harassment or sexual assault with friends, classmates, or other people?  
    0. No 1. Yes  
    (IF YES)  
    b. How much have you talked about it?  

12. Have you ever read educational materials, e.g. brochures, booklets, etc. on sexual harassment or sexual assault?  
    0. No 1. Yes  
    (IF YES, Please specify the materials/sources: ___________________________ )

13. Have you ever attended talks/seminars/workshops on sexual harassment or sexual assault?  
    0. No 1. Yes  
    (IF YES) a. How many times on sexual harassment? _____  
       b. How many times on sexual assault? _____

14. Have you ever participated in any group dealing with sexual harassment/assault issues?  
    0. No 1. Yes  
    (Group name: ___________________________ )  
    (IF YES) How often have you participated in its activities?  
       1. Rarely 2. Sometimes 3. Most of the time 4. Always/Every time
PERSONAL OPINION ABOUT SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Please circle the number on the right to indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree (SA)</th>
<th>Mildly Agree (MA)</th>
<th>Neutral/Unsure (N)</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree (MD)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sexual harassment is a form of sexual discrimination...</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>One of the problems with sexual harassment is that some women can’t take a joke.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A lot of what people call sexual harassment is just normal flirtation between men and women.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>People shouldn’t be so quick to take offense when someone expresses a sexual interest in them.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Few women are actually forced to change jobs or classes because of sexual harassment.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Once a woman becomes involved in a sexual relationship, she can’t accuse her partner of sexual harassment.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>People can usually stop unwanted sexual attention by telling the offender to stop.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Women who complain of sexual harassment are more often punished than the men who harass them.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The sexual harassment issue has lots to do with power.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Women in power are just as likely as men in power to sexually harass their subordinates.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sexual harassment and sexual assault are forms of sexual victimization with varying degrees of severity.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>It is only natural for a man to make sexual advances to a woman he finds attractive.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The issue of sexual harassment has been exaggerated — most incidents are simply normal sexual attraction between people.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Encouraging a professor’s or a supervisor’s sexual interest is often used by women to get special favors at school or at the workplace.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>People who are sexually harassed usually invite it.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Faculty members who sexually harass students can easily get away with it.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Students who falsely accuse faculty of sexual harassment can easily get away with it.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>UH policy should prohibit consensual sexual relationships between professors and their current students.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The investigating procedures at UH are intimidating for student victims of sexual harassment.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>UH should release the names and sanctions of the faculty/staff members who have been found guilty of sexual harassment.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Rape is usually an unplanned, impulsive act</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The extent of the women's resistance should be the major factor in determining if a rape has occurred</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Most women secretly want to be raped</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A woman's past sexual history or reputation should have nothing to do with the question of rape</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Any woman who is a &quot;tease&quot; or &quot;leads a man on&quot; should be responsible for the rape</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sexual violence is sexually stimulating for many women</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Accusations of rape by bar girls or prostitutes should be viewed with suspicion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. A wife cannot be &quot;raped&quot; by her husband</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Women often provoke rape through their appearance and/or behavior</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Most men think that a raped women is less desirable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Once a woman has been raped, her reputation is ruined as far as men are concerned</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Most rapists are sick, psychologically disturbed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Sometimes the only way a man can get a cold woman turned on is to use force</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Normal men do not commit rape</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Sex is the primary motivation for rape</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Marital rape should be considered a crime</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. A healthy woman can successfully resist an unarmed rapist if she really tries</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Women often engage in token resistance to sex</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Women often say NO to sex when they actually mean YES</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Many women claim &quot;rape&quot; if they have consented to sexual relations but changed their minds afterwards</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Any woman can be raped against her will</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Rape is motivated by men's uncontrollable sexual drive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Women put themselves in situations in which they are likely to be raped because they have an unconscious wish to be raped</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Power/control is the primary motivation for rape</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Women often claim &quot;rape&quot; to protect their reputation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. How serious a problem would it be for you if you experienced the following behavior from your BOSS/SUPERVISOR/PROFESSOR OF THE OPPOSITE SEX? Please rate the degree of seriousness on a six-point scale of severity, ranging from "0 = Not Serious At All" to "5 = Extremely Serious."

**FROM YOUR BOSS/SUPERVISOR/PROFESSOR OF THE OPPOSITE SEX:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Not Serious At All</th>
<th>Extremely Serious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unwanted sexually suggestive looks/remarks</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unwanted pressure/requests for dates</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Unwanted letters/phone calls of a sexual nature</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Unwanted deliberate closeness/touching/pinching</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Unwanted pressure/requests for sexual activities</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Unwanted sexual contact but not intercourse</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. How serious a problem would it be for you if you experienced the following behavior from an EQUAL-STATUS CO-WORKER/CLASSMATE/FRIEND OF THE OPPOSITE SEX? Please rate the degree of seriousness on a six-point scale of severity, ranging from "0 = Not Serious At All" to "5 = Extremely Serious."

**FROM YOUR EQUAL-STATUS CO-WORKER/CLASSMATE/FRIEND OF THE OPPOSITE SEX:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Not Serious At All</th>
<th>Extremely Serious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unwanted sexually suggestive looks/remarks</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unwanted pressure/requests for dates</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Unwanted letters/phone calls of a sexual nature</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Unwanted deliberate closeness/touching/pinching</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Unwanted pressure/requests for sexual activities</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Unwanted sexual contact but not intercourse</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Among the people you know, has anyone ever experienced UNWANTED SEXUAL ATTENTION/ADVANCES, which he/she considered intrusive, offensive or harassing? 0. No 1. Yes (IF YES, Please complete a and b)

a. Please write in the number of people you know who have experienced unwanted sexual attention/advances in any form: _____

b. In total, how many incidents of unwanted sexual attention/advances have occurred to people you know in the past 12 months? _____
D. **IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS,** have you ever experienced UNWANTED SEXUAL ATTENTION/ADVANCES, which you considered intrusive, offensive or harassing?

0. No (IF NO, Please go to section E)

1. Yes (IF YES, Please complete this section)

**IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS,**

a. How many times in total have you experienced each of the following?

b. What was the sex of the offender? If more than one offender, what was the sex of the most frequent offender? (Please circle M or F)

c. What was the relationship of that particular person to you? (Please specify the relationship, e.g. stepfather, cousin, boss, professor, TA, date, boyfriend, classmate, customer, stranger, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total # of times</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Relationship to you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unwanted sexually suggestive looks/gestures.....</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unwanted sexual teasing/jokes/remarks............</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Unwanted pressure/requests for dates.............</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Unwanted letters/phone calls of a sexual nature.</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Unwanted deliberate closeness/touching/pinching.</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Unwanted pressure/requests for sexual activities</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Unwanted sexual contact but not intercourse.....</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Unwanted attempted sexual intercourse............</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Unwanted sexual intercourse........................</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. **SINCE AGE 14 (EXCLUDING THE PAST 12 MONTHS),** have you ever experienced UNWANTED SEXUAL ATTENTION/ADVANCES, which you considered intrusive, offensive, or harassing?  

0. No (IF NO, Please go to section F)

1. Yes (IF YES, Please complete this section)

**SINCE AGE 14 (EXCLUDING THE PAST 12 MONTHS)**

a. How many times in total have you experienced each of the following?

b. What was the sex of the offender? If more than one offender, what was the sex of the most frequent offender? (Please circle M or F)

c. What was the relationship of that particular person to you? (Please specify the relationship, e.g. stepfather, cousin, boss, professor, TA, date, boyfriend, classmate, customer, stranger, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total # of times</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Relationship to you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unwanted sexually suggestive looks/gestures.....</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unwanted sexual teasing/jokes/remarks............</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Unwanted pressure/requests for dates.............. ___ M / F __________
4. Unwanted letters/phone calls of a sexual nature. ___ M / F __________
5. Unwanted deliberate closeness/touching/pinching. ___ M / F __________
6. Unwanted pressure/requests for sexual activities ___ M / F __________
7. Unwanted sexual contact but not intercourse..... ___ M / F __________
8. Unwanted attempted sexual intercourse............ ___ M / F __________
9. Unwanted sexual intercourse..................... ___ M / F __________

F. IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE, have you ever experienced UNWANTED SEXUAL ATTENTION/ADVANCES, which you considered intrusive, offensive or harassing?

0. No (IF NO, please go to page 9: Personal Information)
1. Yes (IF YES, Please complete this section)

a. Please briefly describe what happened in THE MOST SERIOUS INCIDENT of unwanted sexual attention/advances you have experienced in your entire life:

b. When did it happen? In the year of 19_____; At the age of ________.

c. PRIOR-INCIDENT RELATIONSHIP
1. The offender's sex? _____; and relationship to you? __________
2. If the offender was not a stranger to you, how long had you known this person before the incident? _____ years _____ months _____ days

d. POWER RELATIONSHIP
For each of the following aspects, how important and/or influential was this person to you prior to the incident? (please rate the degree of importance/influence on a six-point scale, ranging from "0 = not at all" to "5 = extremely important/influential")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Job security/promotion............. 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Income/salary/stipend............... 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Degree program/academic grading..... 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professional knowledge/skills........ 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social status........................ 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social/emotional support............... 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Companionship/friendship............. 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e. REPORTING

1. Did you complain or report this incident to the authorities? 0. No 1. Yes

2. IF NO, what was the reason(s)? (Please circle ALL that applied.)
   1. Tried to avoid thinking and/or dealing with the issue
   2. Didn’t feel that you could tell anyone about the incident
   3. Too embarrassed to reveal the incident to others
   4. Did not want to embarrass the offender or hurt his/her feelings
   5. Did not want to confront the offender
   6. Did not want to be labeled as "troublemaker"
   7. Afraid of reprisals/retaliation from the offender
   8. Afraid of losing job or lowering grade as a result of the reporting
   9. Afraid that the complaint/report would not be taken seriously
  10. Did not think anything could be done to the offender
  11. Did not feel comfortable with the reporting/investigation procedures
  12. The situation improved (Please explain how/why)

f. IMMEDIATE EMOTIONAL RESPONSES TO THE INCIDENCE

Did you experience any of the following as a result of the incident? (Please rate the degree of intensity on a six-point scale, ranging from "0 = Not At All" to "5 = Extremely")

1. Feelings of intimidation/humiliation.......................... 0 1 2 3 4 5
2. Feelings of anger at yourself................................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
3. Feelings of anger at the offender............................ 0 1 2 3 4 5
4. Feelings of disgust.............................................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
5. Feelings of sadness.............................................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
6. Feelings of fear.................................................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
7. Feelings of confusion............................................ 0 1 2 3 4 5
8. Feelings of helplessness/powerlessness............... 0 1 2 3 4 5
9. Feelings of isolation............................................ 0 1 2 3 4 5
10. Self-blame/guilt................................................ 0 1 2 3 4 5
11. Shame/embarrassment.......................................... 0 1 2 3 4 5
12. Loss of self-confidence in academic/job performance. 0 1 2 3 4 5
13. Loss of trust/respect in male faculty/supervisor....... 0 1 2 3 4 5
14. Worsened quality of school work/job performance..... 0 1 2 3 4 5

PERSONAL INFORMATION

SEX: 1. Male 2. Female

ACADEMIC CLASSIFICATION:

   B. 1. Part-time student 2. Full-time student

ACADEMIC MAJOR/DISCIPLINE: Please specify ________________________________
CURRENT MARITAL STATUS: (Circle ALL that apply)
1. Single (Never married) 2. Cohabiting (w/o marriage) 3. Married
4. Separated 5. Divorced 6. Widowed 7. Other (Specify ____________)

PERMANENT RESIDENCE: Where is your permanent residence?
1. Hawaii 2. US mainland 3. Foreign country 4. Other (Specify: ____________)

FAMILY INFORMATION: Please provide requested information for your father, mother, yourself and your current spouse (if married), respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FATHER</th>
<th>MOTHER</th>
<th>YOURSELF</th>
<th>SPOUSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Country of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Years Lived in USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| C. Ethnic Backgrounds (e.g. Black, Hawaiian, Irish, Japanese, Spanish, etc.)
  1. Primary | | | |
  2. Secondary | | | |
| D. Educational Level (Highest Degree) | | | |
| E. Job Title/Position for the Longest-held Job (e.g. professional, managerial, clerical, craft, laborer, business owner, homemaker, military, etc.) | | | |

F. Employment Status: Please mark appropriate blank for the longest-held job

1. Private wage/salary worker
2. Government worker
3. Self-employed worker
4. Unpaid family worker

G. Family Income: Your parents' combined income before taxes in 1989?
1. Under $15,000 2. $15,000 to $34,999 3. $35,000 to $44,999
4. $45,000 to $59,999 5. $60,000 to $74,999 6. $75,000 or over

H. Your personal income, if any, before taxes in 1989? $ ____________

EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCES:
A. Have you ever held on-campus employment in the UH system? 0. No 1. Yes
  1. (IF YES, FOR THE JOB HELD LONGEST) 1. Part-time or 2. Full-time?
  2. For how long? _______ years _______ months

B. Have you ever been employed off-campus? 0. No 1. Yes
  1. (IF YES, FOR THE JOB HELD LONGEST) 1. Part-time or 2. Full-time?
  2. For how long? _______ years _______ months
Appendix B: The Construction of Multi-dimensional Misconceptions towards Sexual Victimization of Women

Step One: Four-Model Misconceptions towards Sexual Victimization of Women

Sexual Victimization = Harassment + Assault

Natural/Biological Model = Natural Model + Sexual Drive
Depoliticizing Model = Power Element + Victim Advocacy
Social Repression Model = Trivialization + Discrediting
Victim Blame/Precipitation = Vtm Blame + Vtm Precipitation

I. Natural/Biological Model = Natural Model + Sexual Drive
   Sexual Harassment Factor 1 - Natural/Biological Model
   1. Sexual harassment is just normal flirtation.
   2. Women can’t take a joke.
   3. Expression of sexual interest shouldn’t be offensive.
   4. The issue of sexual harassment has been exaggerated.
   5. It is a man’s nature to make sexual advances to woman.
      Rape Myth Factor 5 - Physiological Model (Sexual Drive)
   6. Rape is motivated by men’s uncontrollable sexual drive.
   7. Sex is the primary motivation for rape.
   8. Rape is usually an unplanned, impulsive act.
   9. Rape case should be decided on the resistance of the victim.

II. Depoliticizing Model = Power Stra. + Victim Advocacy
   Sexual Harassment Factor 2 - Power Stratification
   1. Sexual harassment has lots to do with power.
   2. Sexual harassment/assault are forms of sexual victimization.
   3. Women who complain of sexual harassment are more often punished than the men who harass them.
   4. Sexual harassment is a form of sexual discrimination.
      Rape Myth Factor 3 - Victim Advocate
   5. Any woman can be raped against her will.
   6. Marital rape should be considered a crime.
   7. Power/control is the primary motivation for rape.
   8. Victim’s past sexual history should have nothing to with rape.
III. Social Repression Model = Trivialization + Discrediting
   Sexual Harassment Factor 3 - Trivialization
1. People can usually stop unwanted sexual attention verbally.
2. Few women are actually forced to change jobs or classes because of sexual harassment.
   Rape Myth Factor 6 - Discrediting Rape Claim
3. Women often engage in token resistance to sex.
4. Women claim rape on consented sex when they change their minds.
5. Women often claim rape to protect their reputation.
6. Women often say "NO" to sex when they actually mean "YES".
7. Bar girl's accusation of rape should be viewed with suspicion.
8. A healthy woman can fight off rapists if she really tries.

IV. Vtm Blame/Precipitation = Vtm Blame + Vtm Precipitation
   Sexual Harassment Factor 4 - Victim Blame
1. Women often encourage sexual interest to get special favors.
2. Women can't accuse her partner of sexual harassment.
3. People who are sexual harassed usually invite it.
   Rape Myth Factor 1 - Victim Precipitation
4. Most women secretly want to be raped.
5. Women put themselves in rape-prone situations.
6. Women should be responsible for rape if they "lead men on".
7. Sexual violence is sexually stimulating for many women.
8. Physical force is the only way to turn a cold woman on.
9. A wife cannot be "raped" by her husband.
10. Women often provoke rape through their appearance or behavior.

Step Two: The General Misconceptions towards Sexual Victimization of Women

General Misconceptions towards Sexual Victimization of Women

= Natural/Biological Model + Depoliticizing Model +
  Social Repression Model + Victim Blame/Precipitation

= Natural Model + Sexual Drive + Power Element
  + Victim Advocacy + Trivialization + Discrediting
  + Victim Blame + Victim Precipitation
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