UC Santa Barbara
UC Santa Barbara Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

"I usually believe the victim, but…": The Effect of Survivor Race and Observer Gender on Perceptions of Sexual Assault

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2865g0gs

Author

David, Jennifer

Publication Date

2022

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Santa Barbara

"I usually believe the victim, but…": The Effect of Survivor Race and Observer Gender on
Perceptions of Sexual Assault

A Thesis submitted in partial satisfaction of the
requirements for the degree Master of Arts
in Sociology

by

Jennifer Miranda Samson David

Committee in charge:
Professor Tristan Bridges, Co-Chair
Professor Catherine Taylor, Co-Chair
Professor Sarah Thébaud

December 2022

The thesis of Jennifer David is approved.

Sarah Thébaud

Catherine Taylor, Committee Co-Chair

Tristan Bridges, Committee Co-Chair

December 2022

"I usually believe the victim, but…": The Effect of Survivor Race and Observer Gender on
Perceptions of Sexual Assault

iii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research is borne out of a seemingly simple question: why are some people taken seriously while others are not? In light of this question, I have been honored to find mentors who take me, and this research, incredibly seriously. Tristan Bridges has encouraged me since the very beginning; his kindness, patience, and tireless mentorship has kept me going even when this work proved difficult in numerous ways. Tristan's generosity with his time and support is boundless, and so, too, is my gratitude for his mentorship. Cate Taylor has given me consistent and compassionate guidance that has helped me overcome every statistical and mental hurdle I faced as this project unfolded (of which there were many). Most significantly, Cate has encouraged me to pursue the academic goals that I otherwise thought impossible. Finally, I am deeply grateful to Sarah Thébaud's insightful, attentive, and detailed feedback at every stage of this work. Every time Sarah touched this project, she made it exponentially better. Together, Tristan, Cate, and Sarah have motivated me, supported me, and raised the standards I set for myself and my work. I am forever indebted to them.

I am grateful to have an expansive academic community, all of whom shaped this project in formal and informal ways. UCSB's Sociology department has been a wonderful and inspiring academic home for me. I thank the members of the Gender and Sexualities Workshop for their thoughtful feedback, as well as my colleagues who have reviewed several iterations of this work. I have benefitted from lengthy conversations with Dr. Hannah Wohl, who helped me recognize the broader theoretical and empirical implications of my research. I am grateful to my wonderful research assistant Micaela Gomez, whose careful attention to the coding process was invaluable. Outside of UCSB, I had the pleasure of serendipitously meeting Dr. Dave Wagner, whose hourslong workshops and detailed feedback on early drafts of this work (and other writings) gave me an academic community when I've had to be away from Santa Barbara.

There are many family, friends, and loved ones who make this academic journey possible. First and foremost, I thank my parents, whose unwavering belief in me has anchored me throughout my life. I am here because of their constant support and pride in everything I do. My sister, Lori David, has listened to every paper I've written and every idea I've had since I entered graduate school; her excitement for even the most mundane steps in my academic career is unmatched.

I am also lucky to have the deep friendship and unconditional support of several close friends who are as brilliant as they are kind. In particular, I thank Maya Festinger, Colette Robicheaux, and Tyler Webb.

Most of all, I thank my partner, Ozan Çubukcu. His love, support, and patience has especially buoyed me when this work has been difficult and dark. I am a better person, academic and otherwise, with him by my side.

Finally, I thank the many survivors who have opened up to me over the years. Their stories have inspired and propelled this work. I dedicate this thesis to them.

ABSTRACT

"I usually believe the victim, but…": The Effect of Survivor Race and Observer Gender on Perceptions of Sexual Assault

by

Jennifer David

How does a woman's racial background affect her perceived credibility when she discloses an experience of sexual victimization? Prior research has found women of color report more unsupportive reactions to their disclosures, but studies have not directly examined perceived credibility outside of a legal context. Using an experimental study depicting a hypothetical sexual assault, I test a potential mechanism to explain disbelief in sexual assault survivors: survivor race. In a 1x3 between-subjects vignette study, participants were randomly assigned to read and respond to a hypothetical woman friend who was either Asian, Black, or white. I find that, on average, participants evaluated Black survivors as less credible than non-Black survivors on the qualitative, but not quantitative, measures. I also find that men participants, regardless of whether the survivor was an Asian, Black, or white woman, evaluated the survivor as less credible than women and non-binary respondents did on both qualitative and quantitative measures. Taken together, the present research highlights the impact of survivor race as well as observer gender in evaluations of survivor credibility.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

How does a woman's racial background affect her perceived credibility when she discloses an experience of sexual victimization? Empirical studies have not directly examined credibility as it pertains to women of color outside of the legal context (Powell et al., 2017; Crenshaw, 1991). However, survivors often disclose to, and make sense of their experiences with, their informal support networks before or instead of seeking help from formal services (Jacques-Tiura et al., 2010; Hirsch & Khan, 2020). Importantly, the responses to informal disclosures influence whether survivors pursue institutional reporting (Herman, 2005) and impact survivors' mental and emotional health (Hirsch & Khan, 2020; Ullman et al., 2008; Bryant-Davis et al., 2009). Furthermore, given the frequency of campus sexual assaults of college women (Muehlenhard et al., 2017), it is important to understand how a woman survivor's credibility is evaluated by undergraduate university students – members of a population who likely has heard or will hear a peer survivor's informal disclosure during their time in college (Orchowski & Gidycz, 2012).

I define credibility as the capacity for an individual to inspire belief in their claim of a role, identity, or experience to an evaluative audience in a context of heightened uncertainty. This study examines credibility in a novel context and in a novel way: through an online vignette experiment study, I analyze how a woman survivor's racial identity causally impacts how informal and non-institutional social actors (i.e., hypothetical friends) regard her credibility and her claim. I vary the survivor's race as either Black, white, or Asian (1x3 design), and I examine how participants' assessments of the survivor's perceived credibility, as measured by closed-ended ratings and open-ended short answer responses, differ depending on the survivor's race.

I find that, on average, participants evaluated Black survivors as less credible than non-Black survivors on qualitative, but not quantitative, measures. I also find that men participants, regardless of whether the survivor was a white, Black, or Asian woman, evaluated the survivor as less credible than women and non-binary respondents did on both qualitative and quantitative measures. These findings partially support my hypothesis that Black women survivors will be viewed as less credible than other groups. They also suggest that participants may experience social desirability pressures, such as the desire to appear supportive of Black women survivors, in some measures but not others. Additionally, these findings extend previous research on men's unfavorable attitudes toward sexual assault survivors (Grubb & Harrower 2008; Gravelin et al., 2019) to highlight how men participants' unsupportive attitudes to sexual assault survivors may persist across both quantitative and qualitative measures of credibility.

CREDIBILITY AND STATUS

The importance of credibility has been demonstrated in a range of settings, including law (Tuerkheimer, 2017), medicine (Werner & Malterud, 2003), activism (Epstein, 1995), science (Geiger, 2021), and ethnographic research (Becker, 1967). In cases of sexual assault, a survivor's credibility often consists of their perceived trustworthiness, honesty, blameworthiness, and believability (Powell et al., 2017; Seabrook & Ward, 2019; Tuerkheimer, 2017; Voogt et al., 2019). Many experimental studies that evaluate attitudes towards survivors examine a survivor's believability as either synonymous with or a primary subconstruct of a survivor's credibility (see Voogt et al., 2019 for a review).

Most research on credibility has been conducted in the legal field, and criminal-legal scholars find that women survivors of color are especially vulnerable to discounts of their credibility. Cantalupo (2018) argues that judges, juries, and society in general often disbelieve testimony by people of color, by women when they report sexual harassment, and especially the testimony by women of color who experience sexual harassment. Research suggests that this delegitimization of women survivors of color begins in their childhood. In a content analysis of victim credibility portrayals in child sexual assault trials, Powell, Hlavka, and Mulla (2017) found that defense attorneys exploited cultural narratives and gendered and racialized tropes to discredit adolescents in the cases with Black and Latinx youth. Thus, multiply marginalized individuals such as young women of color are especially vulnerable to credibility discounting when they disclose their sexual victimization.

While credibility hasn't been directly studied in informal settings, status characteristics literature gives us reason to predict that women of color will be disadvantaged in these settings, too. When status characteristics, such as race, gender, or a victim identity, are made

3

effectively salient in evaluative contexts, individuals will be judged and treated accordingly: higher-status individuals are more respected, are believed to be more competent, and are generally perceived to be superior by *both* low status and other high-status individuals (Evans et al., 2022; Berger et al., 1998; Ridgeway & Kricheli-Katz, 2013). While women are generally expected to be less competent and viewed as inferior by both men and women (Berger et al., 1998), in some situations, status differences based on gender may be irrelevant or less relevant compared to other characteristics (e.g., race or class) (Ridgeway & Kricheli-Katz, 2013). This gives us reason to expect that participants in the Black or Asian condition will express disbelief and negative reactions to the survivor, compared to participants who receive the white condition. The present study may also demonstrate that, just as status characteristics research has indicated that those with disadvantaged statuses are perceived to be less competent, they may also be perceived as less credible.

THE USE OF MULTIPLE MEASUREMENTS OF BELIEFS ABOUT WOMEN'S CREDIBILITY

Most experimental studies that evaluate attitudes about sexual violence use quantitative measures of survivor credibility, where participants indicate their responses on numeric ratings with Likert-type scales (e.g., Jimenez & Abreu, 2003; Donovan, 2007; Miller, 2019; Seabrook & Ward, 2019; see Voogt et al., 2019 for a review). While these numeric forms of measurements offer a standardization of participant belief, they are not neutral, objective instruments (Espeland & Stevens, 2008; Rivera & Tilcsik, 2019) – rather, numbers may be imbued with different meanings that quantitative responses alone may fail to capture. For example, in Rivera and Tilcsik's (2019) study of faculty teaching evaluations, respondents using a 10-point scale were less likely to indicate the highest ratings for women instructors'

performances as compared to those using a 6-point scale. However, even when the gender gap between instructors mostly closed in the 6-point scale, it was still reflected in participants' qualitative responses, in which participants described women instructors with superlative terms (e.g., "brilliant") far less often than they used these terms to describe the men instructors. This suggests that respondents' biases, such as those pertaining to gender, may persist even if the quantitative measures of belief could suggest otherwise.

The use of a singular (quantitative) measure of belief, then, is all the more challenging when researchers aim to capture attitudes on sensitive topics, such as gender, race, and sexual assault. Respondents, in fear of being labeled sexist or racist, may aim to project a nonprejudiced self, such as by establishing "moral credentials" which can give them the psychological security to more freely express their prejudiced beliefs at later opportunities (Monin & Miller, 2001; Castilla & Benard, 2010). Moreover, some populations, especially those in relative positions of power, are particularly adept at deploying discursive strategies to obscure their discriminatory beliefs (Bonilla-Silva, 2018) or signal socially desirable values (Khan & Jerolmack, 2013). Thus, multiple measures can work jointly to tell a more complete story of respondents' beliefs about topics prone to social desirability biases.

HOW DOES SURVIVOR RACE IMPACT PERCEIVED CREDIBILITY?

Despite differing rates of sexual victimization by race (Smith et al., 2017), and the growing racial-ethnic diversity in the U.S., most social science research has only studied white women survivors of sexual assault (Armstrong et al., 2018). Furthermore, the few studies that do explore the effect of the survivor's race on perceptions of survivors only focus on white/Black comparisons (e.g., George & Martinez, 2002). This pattern is concerning, since

women of color often face more challenging social and cultural barriers than white women do.

Women of color, at the intersection of sexism and racism (Crenshaw, 1991), routinely confront a society that exoticizes them (Sue et al., 2007; Lewis et al., 2019), harasses them (Berdahl & Moore, 2006), ignores their assaults (Onwuachi-Willig, 2018), and blames them more for their victimization (Lewis et al., 2019) compared to white women. Cultural myths and stereotypes further work to hyper-sexualize women of color: in particular, Black women are portrayed as sexually aggressive "hoochies", while Asian Pacific women are hyper-eroticized and depicted as desiring sexual domination (Collins, 2000; Crenshaw, 1991; Cho, 1997). This sexualized racist discrimination, coupled with societal perceptions that generally question the credibility of sexual assault victims (Tuerkheimer, 2017), suggests that women survivors of color are likely perceived as less credible than white women survivors (Crenshaw, 1991; Goh et al., 2021).

Credibility discounting can psychologically and emotionally harm survivors of sexual assault. Several studies have established that many survivors, in fear of not being believed, are reluctant to tell others that they were assaulted (e.g., Mennicke et al., 2021). Many studies also find that disbelief of survivors is affected by observer race and gender, such that men, as well as Black, Asian, and Hispanic students, express more doubt in survivors compared to women and white students more broadly (e.g., Mori, 1995, Jimenez & Abreu, 2003).

Women survivors of color are especially concerned about experiencing disbelief, blame, and other negative reactions in response to their disclosures (Ullman et al., 2008). While most women disclose to informal support systems like friends (Jacques-Tiura et al., 2010;

Franklin & Garza, 2021), survivors of color are less likely to disclose their assaults to anyone (Ullman et al., 2008). Specifically, Black and Asian women have reported receiving or anticipating receiving less support compared to white women (Wyatt, 1992; Jacques-Tiura et al., 2010; Bryant-Davis et al., 2009). This discrepancy is concerning, since a positive informal disclosure experience provides survivors with crucial emotional support in their everyday lives (Tillman et al., 2010). Moreover, these informal disclosures may ultimately encourage survivors to engage with formal support systems, thus allowing them to access critical resources in their recovery, such as therapy (Tillman et al., 2010). Considering the impact that informal disclosure responses have on a survivor's mental and emotional health, it is important to understand how responses to disclosures are shaped by a victim's race and the perceptions of her credibility.

The Disbelief of Black Women

The historical and contemporary oppression of Black women in the United States has been well-documented. The "Jezebel," whore, or "hoochie" is central to controlling images of Black womanhood (Collins, 2000). Originating during slavery, one of the Jezebel's functions was to categorically characterize Black women as sexually aggressive women, thus providing a rationale for the reports of widespread sexual assaults that white men perpetrated against enslaved Black women (Collins, 2000). Today, Black women continue to be dehumanized and hyper-sexualized (Anderson et al., 2018). Legal scholar Kimberlé Crenshaw argues that the sexualized images of Black people intersect with norms of (white) women's sexuality to uniquely delegitimize Black women victims: "Black women are essentially prepackaged as bad women within cultural narratives about good women who can be raped and bad women who cannot" (Crenshaw, 1991, p. 1271). Similarly, Yarbrough

and Bennett (2000) highlight the "Cassandra curse," used frequently by legal scholars to describe the questioned credibility of female victims of sexual violence who speak out about their attacks, to argue that, given widespread racist stereotypes, Black women are more likely to suffer from the Cassandra curse. As women are "expected to be servile and obedient," Black women are expected to be "servile, lusty and obedient" (Yarbrough & Bennett, 2000). Thus, racist and sexist stereotypes jointly work to undermine Black women survivors who disclose their assaults.

Consistent with Black feminist theoretical scholarship (Crenshaw, 1991; Collins, 2000), empirical research has demonstrated that Black women survivors are disproportionately subjected to higher rates of sexual violence and more negative reactions to their violence compared to women of other racial backgrounds, especially white women (Smith et al., 2017; Bryant-Davis et al., 2009). Although rates of reported sexual victimization varies, the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence study found that 36% of U.S. Black women have reported experiencing some form of sexual violence during their lifetime (Smith et al., 2017). In some cases, this number may be even higher: in Sexual Citizens, Jennifer Hirsch and Shamus Khan's (2020) recent ethnography of campus sexual assault, the authors found that *every single Black woman student* with whom they spoke had experienced unwanted sexual touching. "This becomes part of an unseen burden that Black women bear," the authors conclude (2020, p. 244). "In the interviews, they noted it, only to shrug it off as one more indignity."

Additional research finds that, while Black women informally disclose their assaults at comparable or lower rates than white women do, Black women often report more negative reactions compared to white women survivors (Jacques-Tiura et al., 2010). Experimental

work has similarly found disproportionately negative views and treatment of Black women: compared to rapes of white women, participants view rapes of Black women as less serious (Foley et al., 1995), blame Black women victims more (Lewis et al., 2019; Foley et al., 1995; Willis, 1992), and are less likely to correctly label incidents of rapes against Black victims (Foley et al., 1995). Even before a rape occurs, participants are less likely to intervene to prevent the potential victimization of Black women compared to white women (Katz et al., 2017). These findings suggest that participants in the present study will take the Black woman survivor, and her rape, less seriously compared to the rape of the white woman survivor.

White Women as "Ideal Victims" and Prototypical Women

In the United States, white women survivors benefit from stereotypes of both the prototypical woman (Crenshaw, 1992; Goh et al., 2022; Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008) and the presumed or "ideal victim" of crimes (Christie, 1986), particularly those involving sexual violence (Meyer, 2021). In social cognition literature, the prototypical woman is the woman who comes to mind when the identity category of "woman" is invoked; typically, this woman is white, causing non-white women, as well as others who hold two or more subordinate identities, to experience an "intersectional invisibility" (Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008). In consequence, white women's experiences are centered and presumed to apply to "all women," marginalizing or erasing non-white women's concerns from the cultural consciousness (Crenshaw, 1992). This invisibilizing of non-prototypical women persists in the contemporary #MeToo movement, in which white, middle- to upper-class women have been disproportionately represented, despite the concept originating from a Black woman activist, Tarana Burke (Onwuachi-Willig, 2018).

At the same time, white women benefit from representing stereotypes of the "ideal victim" of crimes (Christie, 1986). Nils Christie's famous concept of the "ideal victim" is the person or category of individuals who, when victimized, is most readily given the legitimate status of a "real" victim and thus engenders public sympathy and support (Christie, 1986, p. 18). Culturally, the ideal victim is constructed as a young, white, middle-class woman, who is stereotypically pretty, feminine, and innocent; this woman is also often constructed as the victim of sexual violence (Cavender et al., 1999; Madriz, 1997; Meyer, 2021).

Together, these frameworks suggest that white women are likely perceived as the most credible victims of sexual assault. If white women are the "prototypical" women and the "ideal" victims of sexual assault, then non-white women victims are challenged with making themselves legible not only as women, but as women victims of a sexual crime. Empirical research has supported the comparatively favorable view that the public has of white women survivors. White women, compared to non-white (typically Black or Brown) women, are more likely to have their sexual victimization recognized and considered a crime (Goh et al., 2021; Foley et al., 1995), are more likely to have their claims of sexual harassment considered credible and harmful (Goh et al., 2021; Foley et al., 1995), and elicit more sympathy for their sexual victimization (Lewis et al., 2019). This literature suggests that the white woman survivor in the present study will be considered more credible and receive more positive and supportive reactions compared to the Black or Asian survivors.

"Honorary Whites": The (Understudied) Case of Asian Women Survivors
Although the United States is rapidly diversifying across racial and ethnic groups, there remains a need for social science research to move beyond a bi-racial framework of analysis. Eduardo Bonilla-Silva posits that a tri-racial system is emerging in the United States

consisting of "traditional" whites at the top, "collective blacks" at the bottom, and (most) Asians occupying an intermediate or "honorary whites" group in the middle (2004, p. 932 - 933). While Asian women may at times benefit from a racialized "honorary whites" status, their subordinated status as women means that they, like Black women, are still subjected to intersecting race and gender-based oppression. Racial and gender stereotypes converge to construct Asian American women as hyperfeminine: passive, submissive, exotic, and compliant "Lotus Blossoms" desirous of sexual domination by (white) men (Cho, 1997; Pyke & Johnson, 2003). These controlling images and cultural myths, like the function of the Jezebel on Black women, serve to undermine and discredit Asian women in dominant narratives, which enables white American women to maintain their racialization as normal and superior women (Pyke & Johnson, 2003). This perception is likely heightened in incidents of sexual violence.

There are few studies focused on sexual violence against Asian American women (Bryant-Davis et al., 2009). Research on Asian Americans' beliefs about rape and sexual violence more broadly finds that Asian Americans generally demonstrate greater rape myth acceptance and more negative attitudes towards rape victims compared to white American participants (Mori et al., 1995). Additionally, one study suggests that Asian victims tend to disclose to and seek help from their informal network, such as friends and family, rather than formal support services (Lee & Law, 2001). To my knowledge, however, no experimental vignette study measuring attitudes about and reactions to sexual violence survivors has included an Asian woman victim of sexual assault.

THE RELEVANCE OF PARTICIPANT GENDER: MEN'S REACTIONS TO SEXUAL VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Perceptions of sexual violence may not only be influenced by the characteristics of the survivor who speaks out about the assault, but also by the observers making the judgments. Many studies across the social sciences have found that men typically react less supportively to sexual violence survivors compared to women (Grubb & Harrower, 2008; Gravelin et al., 2019; Voogt & Klettke, 2017). In experimental survey studies conducted with undergraduate students, college men, compared to women participants, have expressed less sympathy toward the victim (Jimenez & Abreu, 2003), rated the survivor as more responsible and more blameworthy for their victimization than the perpetrator was (Seabrook & Ward, 2019; George & Martinez, 2002), found the victim more promiscuous (Donovan, 2007), and indicated a lower likelihood of referring a victim to additional resources (Franklin & Garza, 2021). Few of these studies, though, vary the survivor race, and of those that do, only Black and white survivors are compared (see Miller, 2019 for an exception). While the studies that do manipulate survivor race generally find men react more favorably to a white rape victim compared to a Black (e.g., George & Martinez, 2002) or Hispanic victim (e.g., Jimenez & Abreu, 2002), the limited research on this makes it difficult to deduce if men are particularly in support of white survivors, or particularly against Black survivors (or both). Additional research on how men respond to survivors of more than white or Black racial backgrounds can shed light on men's reactions to survivors more broadly.

A few studies, however, have found null effects of participant gender on opinions about and reactions to sexual violence (e.g., Viki & Abrams, 2002; Hart, 2019). For example, Miller's (2019) experimental study manipulating both victim and perpetrator race as either white, Black, or Hispanic, found no gender differences in college participants' attributions

of the victim's culpability (measured on a closed-ended rating scale). Further research on the influence of participant gender on assessments of survivor credibility is necessary, particularly when the survivors are women of color.

To investigate these questions, I use an experimental design in the present study. By holding constant the survivor's gender, account, relationship to the participant, and type of assault, I can determine the independent effect of the survivor's race on her perceived credibility. To my knowledge, few empirical studies examining race have compared the beliefs about and attitudes towards sexual assault survivors beyond a bi-racial system of white and Black survivors (Gravelin et al., 2019; but see Lewis et al., 2019 and Miller, 2019 for exceptions), and no experimental study has directly compared how participants respond to survivors of white, Black, or Asian racial backgrounds.

PRESENT RESEARCH

The above-reviewed theoretical and empirical research on race, sexual violence, and credibility suggests the plausibility of my central claim: women of color survivors are perceived as less credible compared to white women survivors. I test this claim using a novel experimental survey design that manipulates the survivor race (Black, white, or Asian; a between-subjects design). Each participant read about and evaluated one survivor. Participants were randomly assigned to one of these three conditions.

Study Purpose and Procedure. Participants were told that the purpose of the study was to understand how college students today react and respond to sexual experiences on college

campuses. Upon completing the study, students received extra credit for their course. For those who did not want to participate, I provided an alternative extra credit assignment.

Participants. I recruited this population from a Sociology of Gender course at a public California university. Participants largely identified as Hispanic (54%) and/or white (18%), were women or nonbinary (72%), and did not have at least one parent with a Bachelor's degree (56%). Although this was a convenience sample and thus, the results are not directly, statistically generalizable to the broader population, there are several reasons why it is fruitful to examine this population's responses to sexual assault survivors. Students enrolled in a sociology college course – and a Sociology of Gender course in particular (Case, 2007; Stake & Hoffman, 2001), living in a progressive, predominantly Democrat state (Pew Research Center, 2015), and attending a left-leaning public university that requires annual completion of multiple interpersonal violence awareness courses, are highly educated on relevant topics to this study: sexism, racism, sexual violence, and the best practices for responding to sexual victimization disclosures. Thus, this population offers a conservative test of my argument: if these student-participants express prejudice towards survivors of sexual violence, this study would provide an underestimation of the magnitude of discrimination against survivors among the broader population.

Experimental Procedure. The experiment was presented as follows: on the online platform Qualtrics, participants first read a short vignette about a hypothetical friend (a Black, white, or Asian woman) who was sexually assaulted. Next, participants completed an anonymous survey in which they assessed the survivor and her disclosure. Upon completing the survey,

participants completed a manipulation check and then a demographics questionnaire. Participants who failed to retain the manipulation (the survivor's race) were dropped from the analysis.

Sexual Assault Vignette. I wrote the vignette for the purpose of this study (see Appendix A), though it is inspired by the date rape vignette in Munsch and Willer's (2012) experiment. It describes a prevalent experience of campus sexual assault in which the perpetrator was known to the victim, both had been drinking, and no other witnesses were present at the time of the incident (Walsh et al. 2021).

The experimental condition was cued at the beginning of the vignette: a college student, Kayla – a Black/white/Asian woman (the manipulation) – is a friend that the participant has known for a couple of years. In the vignette, she describes an incident from the previous night in which her friend, Dan, had sexual intercourse with her after she told him she didn't want to. At the end, she labels the incident as a rape.

Credibility Measures. I employed both quantitative and qualitative measures of credibility to capture potential biases that one measure alone may not reflect (Monin & Miller, 2001; Rivera & Tilcsik, 2019). The survey contained fifteen items: three items were open-ended questions (the qualitative measures) and twelve items were closed-ended numeric rating questions (the quantitative measures). The numeric ratings used a 0-100 scale, with 100 indicating the highest rating of belief or agreement. I draw from the first two closed-ended questions and the three open-ended questions in the present analysis. See Appendix B for the complete survey.

In the quantitative measures, I focus on one subconstruct of credibility: believability (Voogt et al., 2019). This is consistent with previous experimental studies on perceptions of sexual violence survivors that measured believability (e.g., Donovan, 2007). These measures consisted of two closed-ended numeric rating questions in the survey: "Do you believe [the survivor]?" and "Would you say [the survivor] is believable?" Respondents indicated their response on a 0-100 scale. The first question captures the participant's personal belief in the survivor, while the second question captures the participant's perception of the survivor's capacity to be believed.

In the qualitative measures, I expand my analysis to consider credibility more broadly. In line with qualitative research on perceptions of sexual violence survivors, I examine multiple subconstructs of survivor credibility, including believability, trustworthiness, and blameworthiness (e.g., Tuerkheimer, 2017; Powell et al., 2017; Meyer, 2021). These measures included three open-ended questions to which participants could write a short response. In the first two open-ended questions, participants were asked to explain their (numeric rating) answers to the aforementioned quantitative measures of credibility ("Do you believe [the survivor]?" and "Would you say [the survivor] is believable?"). The final open-ended question asked participants to narratively share their imagined response to the survivor: "After [the survivor] shares this with you, what do you imagine you would say or do in response?" These questions capture participants' attitudes toward and imagined interactional response to the survivor.

Analytic Strategy. Content analysis proceeded in two stages. First, I developed a codebook for categorizing supportive and unsupportive reactions to survivor disclosures based on

interview studies of survivors (Ahrens et al., 2007; Brooks-Hay, 2020; Patterson & Campbell, 2010; Herman, 2005). Supportive reactions included validating (Herman, 2005), empathizing with (Ahrens et al., 2007), and expressing general support for the survivor (Ahrens et al., 2007). Unsupportive reactions included blaming or doubting the survivor (Ahrens et al., 2007), a cold or detached response (Ahrens et al., 2007), and diminishing the survivor's agency (Brooks-Hay, 2020). To measure a participant's overall response to the survivor, I reviewed each of the three open-ended responses separate from the variables of interest (e.g., the condition and the participant's gender and race).

I then coded the overall narrative response as unambiguously supportive, mixed, or unsupportive. In the analyses, I collapsed these response codes into a dummy variable of an unambiguously supportive reaction (or not). If a participant indicated at least one unsupportive reaction (e.g., doubting the survivor) – even if they also indicated a positive or supportive reaction (e.g., offering to accompany her to the hospital) – the overall response received a 0. For example, one respondent wrote, "I usually believe the victim, however, the logical side of my brain also knows that both were intoxicated and key parts of the situation may be forgotten. … I would definitely believe her on the outside, as in be there to comfort her and be there for her … However, I can't help but consider all possibilities and not make any acute assumptions without enough evidence." Although this respondent says that they would be externally supportive ("believe her on the outside") to the survivor, their persistent doubt indicates that they don't fully believe the survivor; this disbelief could further translate to an equivocal response to the survivor's disclosure. This response was coded as a "mixed" reaction, which, when collapsed into the dummy variable of unambiguously

17

positive or not, became coded as a 0. As survivor-centered literature suggests, a mixed

response to a disclosure can still be harmful to survivors (Ahrens et al., 2007).

Intercoder agreement. Next, I hired an undergraduate research assistant to independently

code the responses using the codebook I developed. This research assistant was unaware of

the study's hypotheses and, like in my coding process, coded the responses separately from

the potential variables of interest during her coding. We then compared our independent

codes. Following the coding procedure of Ahrens et al. (2007), we noted and discussed

disagreements until a consensus was reached for each response. The kappa coefficient was

1.0 for the Overall Positive Reaction, which indicates excellent interrater agreement

(O'Connor & Joffe, 2020).

FINDINGS

Effect of Survivor Race and Participant Characteristics

Table 1 shows descriptive statistics for key variables. Contrary to my predictions, the

experimental condition had minimal impact on the quantitative measures: nearly all

participants rated the survivor highly in terms of their belief in her and their evaluation of her

believability.

Across the three conditions, the mean ratings for both survivor belief and survivor

believability were between 94% and 95%. Compared to the Black and Asian condition ratings,

the white condition received the highest mean ratings of participant belief (Table 1, column

9, third row from the bottom) but received slightly lower mean ratings of believability (Table

1, column 9, second row from the bottom), but these differences are not statistically

significant.

18

However, the qualitative responses did differ significantly by experimental condition. The last row of Table 1 shows that the Black survivor (Column 5) compared to the white (Column 9) and Asian survivors (Column 13) received the least supportive narrative responses in the open-ended questions. The white survivor, meanwhile, received the most supportive narrative responses, and the Asian survivor received a mix of supportive and unsupportive narrative responses. These findings are consistent with my predictions.

Finally, despite the random distribution of the experimental condition among participants, men were not distributed equally across the three conditions (Table 1, row 1): eight of the fourteen men in the study received the Black condition (Table 1, row 1, Column 8), four men received the Asian condition (Table 1, row 1, Column 16), and two men received the white condition (Table 1, row 1, Column 12). This is likely due, in part, to the relatively few number of men who participated in the study overall.

TABLE 1: MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, RANGE, AND SAMPLE SIZE OF KEY VARIABLES IN STUDY 1, FULL SAMPLE AND BY CONDITION

	Full Sample N=50				Black Condition n = 21				White Condition n = 11				Asian Condition n = 18			
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	N
Men [0, 1]	0.28	0.45	0-1	14	0.38	0.5	0-1	8	0.18	0.4	0-1	2	0.22	0.43	0-1	4
White Non-Hispanic [0, 1]	0.18	0.38	0-1	9	0.29	0.46	0-1	6	0.09	0.3	0-1	1	0.11	0.32	0-1	2
Hispanic [0, 1]	0.54	0.5	0-1	27	0.48	0.51	0-1	10	0.55	0.52	0-1	6	0.61	0.5	0-1	11
Black [0, 1]	0.05	0.2	0-1	2	0.1	0.3	0-1	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Asian [0, 1]	0.16	0.37	0-1	8	0.05	0.22	0-1	1	0.27	0.47	0-1	3	0.22	0.43	0-1	4
American Indian [0, 1]	0.08	0.27	0-1	4	0.05	0.22	0-1	1	0.09	0.3	0-1	1	0.11	0.32	0-1	2
Two or more races [0, 1]	0.08	0.27	0-1	4	--	--	--	--	0.18	0.4	0-1	2	0.11	0.32	0-1	2
At least one parent with a Bachelor's [0, 1]	0.44	0.5	0-1	22	0.38	0.5	0-1	8	0.36	0.5	0-1	4	0.56	0.51	0-1	10
Belief in Survivor [0-100]	94.4	15.26	10 - 100	50	94.48	12.95	51 - 100	21	95.27	6.77	80 - 100	11	93.78	21.11	10 - 100	18
Survivor's Believability [0-100]	94.28	13.74	20 - 100	50	94.57	11.51	51 - 100	21	94	7.76	80 - 100	11	94.11	18.79	20 - 100	18
Overall Positive Response [0, 1]	0.7	0.46	0-1	50	0.52	0.51	0-1	11	0.91	0.3	0-1	11	0.78	0.43	0-1	18

20

	TABLE 2: LOGISTIC REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS FOR MODELS PREDICTING PARTICIPANT'S SUPPORTIVE NARRATIVE RESPONSE TO SURVIVOR BY SURVIVOR RACE, INCLUDING STATISTICAL CONTROLS FOR PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS							
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8
Black Survivor (1=yes)	-1.47* (-0.66)			(Ref)	-1.51† (0.80)			(Ref)
White Survivor (1=yes)		1.72 (1.10)		2.21† (1.14)		1.42 (1.14)		1.96† (1.19)
Asian Survivor (1=yes)			0.61 (0.68)	1.16 (0.72)			0.67 (0.81)	1.27 (0.89)
Participant is a man					-1.75* (0.77)	-1.77* (0.75)	-1.85* (0.74)	-1.71* (0.78)
Participant is White, non-Hispanic					-0.49 (0.99)	-0.98 (0.92)	-0.87 (0.93)	-0.54 (1.00)
Participant has at least 1 parent with BA					-1.28 (0.86)	-0.71 (0.79)	-1.01 (0.83)	-1.17 (0.88)
Intercept	1.57*** (0.49)	0.58† (0.33)	0.65† (0.37)	0.10 (0.44)	2.90*** (0.85)	1.77** (0.64)	1.93** (0.65)	1.35† (0.69)
R2	0.09	0.06	0.01	0.10	0.24	0.21	0.19	0.24
N	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50

NOTES:
† $p \leq 0.10$
* $p \leq 0.05$
** $p \leq 0.01$
*** $p \leq 0.001$

Measuring Credibility Qualitatively: Participants' Qualitative Evaluations of the Survivor by Survivor Race

In order to further assess the relationship between a survivor's race and a participant's

narrative responses, I use a logistic regression analysis to examine the relationship between

survivor race and participants' narrative responses to the survivor. Positive, supportive

responses are coded as 1. The results presented in Table 2 demonstrate that survivor race is

indeed associated with participants' narrative responses to her, but only when she, the

survivor, is Black. As predicted, the Black survivor received the most unsupportive

narrative responses from participants (Table 2, Model 1, row 1: b = -1.47, P $\leq$ 0.05)

compared to the responses given to the non-Black (white and Asian) survivors. This is

largely driven by the disparity between the responses given to the Black survivor and the white survivor (Table 2, Model 4, row 2: $b = 2.21$, $P \leq 0.10$). I also find that, consistent with my predictions, the Asian survivor received more supportive responses than the Black survivor did, though the magnitude of this difference is smaller than the difference between the white and Black survivors and does not reach statistical significance (Table 2, Model 4, row 3: $b = 1.16$, $P = 0.106$). The small sample size is likely shaping significance levels.

When controlling for participant gender, race (as non-Hispanic white or not), and socioeconomic class[1], I find that the relationship between participant response and survivor race, though attenuated, still holds: the Black survivor, net of these sociodemographic controls, was marginally associated with the most unsupportive narrative responses compared to the non-Black survivors (Table 2, Model 5, row 1: $b = -1.51$, $P \leq 0.10$). Again, this is largely due to the difference between the responses given to the white compared to the Black survivor (Table 2, Model 8, row 2: $b = 1.96$, $P \leq 0.10$). The Asian survivor also received somewhat more supportive responses than Black survivors, and again, the magnitude of this difference is smaller than the difference between white survivors and Black survivors and does not reach statistical significance (Table 2, Model 8, row 3: $b = 1.27$, $P = 0.153$).

Converting the coefficients to odds ratios for interpretation reveals that presenting a participant with a Black survivor, compared to a non-Black (white or Asian) survivor, is associated with 77% decreased odds of providing a supportive narrative response to her (Table 2, Model 1, row 1: $b = -1.47$, $P \leq 0.05$). Controlling for participant characteristics slightly reduces the odds of a supportive response even more: net of sociodemographic

---

[1] Socioeconomic class is approximated by the educational background of the participant's parents.

controls, if a participant is presented with a Black survivor of sexual assault, the odds that

the participant provides a supportive narrative response to her decreases by 78% compared

to a non-Black survivor (Table 2, Model 5, row 1: b = -1.51, P $\leq$ 0.10). This finding supports

my hypothesis that Black women survivors will be viewed as less credible, even when

controlling for sociodemographic factors.

Overall, the trends of participants' narrative responses to the Black, white, and Asian

survivors are consistent with my predictions. I find that, with and without statistical controls,

the Black survivor received the least supportive responses, the white survivor received the

most supportive responses, and the Asian survivor received a mix of supportive and

unsupportive responses roughly in the middle. While the only models to reach statistical

significance were those predicting responses to the Black survivor (Models 4 and 8), this

study's relatively small sample size may have influenced the lack of statistical significance

of the models predicting responses to the white (Models 2 and 6) and the Asian survivor

(Model 3 and 7).

Lastly, I test whether any participant characteristics are predictors of supportive

narrative responses to survivors who are Black, white, or Asian women. I find that only

gender is a significant predictor of the supportiveness of a participant's narrative response to

the survivor: men participants provided less supportive responses to survivors than women

and non-binary participants did (Table 2, Model 8, row 4: b = -1.71, P $\leq$ 0.05). Specifically,

net of participant sociodemographic controls as well as survivor race, men participants were

associated with 82% decreased odds of providing a supportive narrative response to a

survivor compared to women and non-binary participants. This finding supports my

hypothesis that men participants would express unfavorable attitudes toward the survivor compared to the women and non-binary participants.

	TABLE 3: OLS REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS FOR MODELS PREDICTING PARTICIPANT'S BELIEF IN SURVIVOR BY SURVIVOR RACE, INCLUDING STATISTICAL CONTROLS FOR PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS							
	Model 1	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**
Black Survivor (1=yes)	0.13 (4.42)			(Ref)	-0.28 (4.52)			(Ref)
White Survivor (1=yes)		1.12 (5.26)		0.80 (5.79)		0.17 (5.09)		0.30 (5.74)
Asian Survivor (1=yes)			-0.97 (4.54)	-0.70 (5.00)			0.14 (4.54)	0.26 (5.12)
Participant is a man					-10.75* (4.72)	-10.78* (4.67)	-10.79* (4.66)	-10.75* (4.78)
Participant is White, non-Hispanic					9.01 (6.28)	8.92 (6.01)	8.94 (6.15)	9.01 (6.36)
Participant has at least 1 parent with BA					-6.27 (4.75)	-6.20 (4.63)	-6.25 (4.79)	-6.27 (4.86)
Intercept	94.34*** (2.86)	94.15*** (2.47)	94.75*** (2.72)	94.48*** (3.40)	98.66*** (3.56)	98.51*** (3.40)	98.51*** (3.41)	98.38*** (4.17)
R2	0.0000	0.0009	0.001	0.0014	0.1469	0.1468	0.1468	0.1469
N	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50

NOTES:
† p ≤= 0.10
* p ≤= 0.05
** p ≤= 0.01
*** p ≤= 0.001

Measuring Credibility Quantitatively: Participants' Quantitative Evaluations of the Survivor by Survivor Race

Next, I examine participants' responses in the quantitative measures of survivor credibility, focusing specifically on the subconstruct of believability (Voogt et al., 2019). I predicted that the two quantitative evaluations of the survivor – the participant's rating of their belief in the survivor, and the participant's rating of the survivor's believability – would be associated with the survivor's race. Using ordinary least squares (OLS) regression models, I

	TABLE 4: OLS REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS FOR MODELS PREDICTING PARTICIPANT'S EVALUATION OF SURVIVOR'S BELIEVABILITY BY SURVIVOR RACE, INCLUDING STATISTICAL CONTROLS FOR PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS							
	Model 1	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**
Black Survivor (1=yes)	0.50 (3.98)			(Ref)	0.69 (4.25)			(Ref)
White Survivor (1=yes)		-0.36 (4.74)		-0.57 (5.22)		-1.04 (4.78)		-1.21 (5.39)
Asian Survivor (1=yes)			-0.26 (4.09)	-0.46 (4.51)			0.14 (4.27)	-0.34 (4.81)
Participant is a man					-7.44† (4.43)	-7.42† (4.39)	-7.30† (4.38)	-7.47† (4.49)
Participant is White, non-Hispanic					4.56 (5.90)	4.73 (5.65)	4.89 (5.78)	4.61 (5.97)
Participant has at least 1 parent with BA					-2.75 (4.46)	-2.95 (4.35)	-2.95 (4.50)	-2.86 (4.56)
Intercept	94.07*** (2.58)	94.36*** (2.22)	94.38*** (2.45)	94.57*** (3.06)	96.47*** (3.35)	97.03*** (3.19)	96.69*** (3.20)	97.19*** (3.92)
R2	0.0003	0.0001	0.0001	0.0003	0.0721	0.0725	0.0715	0.0726
N	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50

NOTES:
† p $\leq$ 0.10
* p $\leq$ 0.05
** p $\leq$ 0.01
*** p $\leq$ 0.001

assess the relationships between the survivor's race and the participant's belief in the survivor (Table 3), as well as the survivor's race and the participant's assessment of the survivor's believability (Table 4), with controls for the participant's gender, race, and class (Models 5-8 in each Table). I find that there are no significant differences between participants' ratings of their belief in a survivor by survivor race (Table 3, Models 1-8, rows 1-3). Similarly, there are no significant differences between participants' ratings of a survivor's believability by survivor race (Table 4, Models 1-8, rows 1-3).

However, of the participant characteristic variables, I find that men participants evaluated the survivor worse compared to women and non-binary participants (Tables 3 and

4, Models 5-8, row 4). This is consistent with the aforementioned finding that men participants were predictors of unsupportive narrative responses in the qualitative measures of credibility (Table 2, Models 5-8, row 4). Specifically, I find that men, controlling for race and class, were predicted to rate their belief in the survivor 10.75 points lower than women respondents did (Table 3, Model 8).

Men participants were also predicted to report lower levels of survivor's believability than women and non-binary participants. Overall, when controlling for the survivor's race as well as the participant's race and socioeconomic class, men participants were predicted to rate the survivor's believability 7.47 points lower than women and non-binary participants (Table 4, Model 8, row 4).

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

Sociologists studying sexual violence often center college-educated, young, white, cisgender women, neglecting to consider the experiences of women of color, as well as members of other multiply marginalized identities (Armstrong et al., 2018; Gravelin et al., 2019). Moreover, previous research that has found greater discrimination against women survivors of color has been unable to ascertain if or to what extent other confounding factors, such as class, shape these cultural narratives and perspectives of disbelief (e.g., Powell et al., 2017). By using an experimental design, this research holds constant all other relevant variables – i.e., survivor's gender, class, relationship to participant, and rape scenario – and finds that, on average, participants evaluated Black survivors as less credible than non-Black survivors, although this finding was only statistically significant in the qualitative measure of credibility.

Black feminist scholars have long argued that women survivors of color encounter greater disbelief compared to white women survivors due to converging axes of oppression such as anti-Black racism and sexism (Crenshaw, 1991; Collins, 2000). The results in this study suggest that, although different racially minoritized groups may experience greater and varied forms of discrimination compared to whites, Black women survivors may be subjected to particularly pronounced forms of intersecting prejudices. These attitudes and beliefs can translate into the different institutional responses to survivors and perpetrators – for example, that Black women's rapists are less likely to be convicted compared to white women's rapists (Crenshaw, 1991). Importantly, this study's findings suggest that, even in a population uniquely primed to demonstrate pro-survivor and anti-racist beliefs, discrimination against Black women is potent enough to be expressed at higher rates compared to those against white or Asian women.

It is interesting that the Black survivor was evaluated negatively on the qualitative but not the quantitative measures of credibility. One potential explanation is that this population is relatively likely to experience social desirability pressures – even though the survey's anonymous, self-administered nature should help mitigate these biases (Schaeffer & Presser, 2003). The participants were recruited from a Sociology of Gender undergraduate college course at a university that requires multiple annual interpersonal violence prevention training sessions and were thus highly educated on relevant topics to this study. In addition, this study was conducted after the #MeToo and Black Lives Matter movements drove a surge of attention to sexual assault and racism in recent years. Therefore, these participants were uniquely primed to demonstrate full support for sexual assault survivors, Black women, and perhaps, Black women survivors of sexual assault in particular. This

population, then, may have been more conscious of signaling socially desirable attitudes in the closed-ended questions. To extend Khan and Jerolmack's (2013) theory that elites may be adept at "saying" meritocracy in interviews while "doing" privilege when ethnographically observed, the highly educated participants in this study may have found it easier to "say" belief in the numeric ratings while "doing" doubt in the narrative responses. It may be more difficult to hide underlying prejudices in narrative form than in numeric ratings.

Additionally, in line with moral credentialing theory, participants may have felt more comfortable expressing prejudiced and unsupportive reactions in the open-ended responses since they had already established their "moral credentials" as pro-survivor in the closed-ended ratings (Monin & Miller, 2001). Participants may have even felt that they had pre-existing institutional credentials given their enrollment in the Sociology of Gender course (Castilla & Benard, 2010). Future research could more directly examine the potential effect of moral credentials on participants, such as by varying the question order (as closed-ended or open-ended) that participants receive in the survey.

The second main finding in this study is that men consistently evaluated the survivor more negatively than women and non-binary participants did across both the quantitative and qualitative measures of credibility. Men's odds of providing a supportive response to a survivor were 82% lower than women and non-binary respondents' odds. Additionally, men were significantly more likely than women to rate the survivor negatively on quantitative measures of credibility. Although men comprised nearly a third of the total sample, they were unevenly distributed across the three conditions. Therefore, I am unable to assess

whether participant gender may differentially shape evaluations of survivors by survivor race. Future work should recruit a larger and more gender-balanced participant population to further investigate the impact of participant gender on assessments of survivors, particularly as these may differ by a survivor's race.

Still, the men participants' unsupportive responses in this sample are largely consistent with experimental research investigating attitudes toward campus sexual violence (e.g., Jimenez & Abreu, 2003; Donovan, 2007; Foley et al., 2007). These findings are also in line with studies in which undergraduate men enrolled in gender inequality or criminal victimization classes still exhibited comparatively higher sexist (Currier & Carlson, 2009) and victim-blaming attitudes (Fox & Cook, 2011) than did women students, even upon conclusion of the course.

At the same time, this study contributes to the literature in two key ways: first, this study employs both qualitative and quantitative measures of perceived survivor credibility, and second, this study includes survivors whose racial backgrounds are white, Black, or Asian. I find that men's comparatively negative attitudes towards survivors are captured in multiple measures such that men, when given the opportunity to express their reactions in their own words, still expressed significantly more victim-blaming, doubting, and disbelieving attitudes compared to the women and non-binary respondents; moreover, these unsupportive reactions occurred even when controlling for survivor race. Unlike the anti-racist social desirability biases likely at play when participants expressed supportive reactions in the closed-ended ratings but unsupportive reactions in the open-ended questions about the Black survivor, the pressure to exhibit anti-sexist, pro-survivor attitudes did not seem to meaningfully affect the men participants in this study.

One explanation for the men participants' unfavorable attitudes towards sexual assault survivors is the reportedly lower rates of men's sexual victimization compared to women and non-binary students (Mellins et al., 2017; Smith et al., 2017), thus making them less likely to empathize with the survivor in this scenario (Ahrens & Campbell, 2000). These men may also not, to their knowledge, know a sexual assault survivor: given that young adults primarily have close friendships with the same gender (Gillespie et al., 2015), and men survivors have a low likelihood of disclosing an experience of sexual assault if they are victimized (Banyard et al., 2007), the men participants in this study might not be as familiar with acts of sexual violence. This lack of familiarity with sexual assault and those who survive it, in turn, may cause men to harbor more doubt towards survivors and narratively respond in an unsupportive manner.

Another consideration is the imagined perpetrator of the crime: would participants react differently if the man perpetrator's race was specified – particularly, if he was described as Black? In Donovan's (2007) experimental study, she found that this was an influential factor in men's responses: white men participants held a woman rape survivor, regardless of her race, responsible for her victimization when the perpetrator was a Black man. While there are few studies examining the effects of both victim and perpetrator race on participants' reactions to sexual violence, future researchers should examine the potential influence of perpetrator characteristics.

Lastly, one may ask how participant characteristics aside from gender – such as race, class, and sexuality – influence participant responses to sexual assaults like the one presented in this vignette. While regression analyses found no significant effects of participant race or class on survey responses (and I did not ask respondents about their

sexuality), these null findings are likely due to this study's small sample size and, in particular, this study's lack of racial diversity. Furthermore, since my study aims to understand broader group perceptions of survivors by race – the attitudes that are "in the water" in this highly educated population (Hart, 2019) – I did not design the study to match conditions by participant gender and/or race, nor (due to sample size limitations) was the participant population diverse across a variety of sociodemographics. Future research should extend this study by recruiting a diverse participant population and examining how participant characteristics aside from gender affect evaluations of a survivor's credibility.

REFERENCES

Ahrens, C. E., & Campbell, R. (2000). Assisting Rape Victims as They Recover From Rape: The Impact on Friends. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *15*(9), 959–986.

Ahrens, C. E., Campbell, R., Ternier-Thames, N. K., Wasco, S. M., & Sefl, T. (2007). DECIDING WHOM TO TELL: EXPECTATIONS AND OUTCOMES OF RAPE SURVIVORS' FIRST DISCLOSURES. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *31*(1), 38–49.

Anderson, J. R., Holland, E., Heldreth, C., & Johnson, S. P. (2018). Revisiting the Jezebel Stereotype: The Impact of Target Race on Sexual Objectification. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *42*(4), 461–476.

Armstrong, E. A., Gleckman-Krut, M., & Johnson, L. (2018). Silence, Power, and Inequality: An Intersectional Approach to Sexual Violence. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *44*(1), 99–122.

Banyard, V. L., Ward, S., Cohn, E. S., Plante, E. G., Moorhead, C. A. E., & Walsh, W. (2007). Unwanted Sexual Contact on Campus: A Comparison of Women's and Men's Experiences. *Violence and Victims*, *22*(1), 52–70. https://doi.org/10.1891/088667007780482865

Becker, H. (1967). Whose side are we on? *Social Problems*, *14*(3), 239–247. https://doi.org/10.2307/799147

Berdahl, J. L., & Moore, C. (2006). Workplace Harassment: Double Jeopardy for Minority Women. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(2), 426–436. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.2.426

Berger, J., Ridgeway, C. L., Fisek, M. H., & Norman, R. Z. (1998). The Legitimation and Delegitimation of Power and Prestige Orders. *American Sociological Review*, *63*(3), 379–405.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2004). From bi-racial to tri-racial: Towards a new system of racial stratification in the USA. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *27*(6), 931–950. https://doi.org/10.1080/0141987042000268530

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2018). *RACISM WITHOUT RACISTS: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in America* (Fifth). Rowman & Littlefield.

Brooks-Hay, O. (2020). Doing the "Right Thing"? Understanding Why Rape Victim-Survivors Report to the Police. *Feminist Criminology*, *15*(2), 174–195.

Bryant-Davis, T., Chung, H., & Tillman, S. (2009). From the Margins to the Center: Ethnic Minority Women and the Mental Health Effects of Sexual Assault. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *10*(4), 330–357.

Cantalupo, N. C. (2019). And Even More of Us are Brave: Intersectionality and Sexual Harassment of Women Students of Color. *Harvard Journal of Law and Gender*, *42*(1), 1–82.

Case, K. A. (2007). Raising Male Privilege Awareness and Reducing Sexism: An Evaluation of Diversity Courses. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *31*(4), 426–435. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00391.x

Castilla, E. J., & Benard, S. (2010). The Paradox of Meritocracy in Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *55*(4), 543–676.

Cavender, G., Bond-Maupin, L., & Jurik, N. C. (1999). The Construction of Gender in Reality Crime TV. *Gender & Society*, *13*(5), 643–663.

Cho, S. K. (1997). Converging Stereotypes in Racialized Sexual Harassment: Where the Model Minority Meets Suzie Wong. *Journal of Gender, Race and Justice*, *1*(1), 177–212.

Christie, N. (1986). The Ideal Victim. In E. A. Fattah (Ed.), *From Crime Policy to Victim Policy*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-08305-3_2

Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment* (Second). Routledge. https://uniteyouthdublin.files.wordpress.com/2015/01/black-feminist-though-by-patricia-hill-collins.pdf

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review*, *43*(6), 1241–1299. https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039

Crenshaw, K. (1992). Whose story is it anyway? Feminist and antiracist appropriations of Anita Hill. In T. Morrison (Ed.), *Race-ing justice, en-gendering power: Essays on Anita Hill, Clarence Thomas and the construction of social reality* (pp. 402–440). Pantheon.

Currier, D. M., & Carlson, J. H. (2009). Creating Attitudinal Change Through Teaching How a Course on "Women and Violence" Changes Students' Attitudes About Violence Against Women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *24*(10), 1735–1754. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260509335239

Donovan, R. A. (2007). To Blame or Not to Blame: Influences of Target Race and Observer Sex on Rape Blame Attribution. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *22*(6), 722–736.

Epstein, S. (1995). The Construction of Lay Expertise: AIDS Activism and the Forging of Credibility in the Reform of Clinical Trials. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, *20*(4), 408–437. https://doi.org/10.1177/016224399502000402

Espeland, W., & Stevens, M. (2008). A Sociology of Quantification. *European Journal of Sociology*, *49*(3), 401–436. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003975609000150

Evans, D. N., Kim, C., & Sachs, N. M. (2022). To date a "victim": Testing the stigma of the victim label through an experimental audit of dating apps. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-022-09500-6

Foley, L. A. F., Evancic, C., Karnik, K., King, J., & Parks, A. (1995). Date Rape: Effects of Race of Assailant and Victim and Gender of Subjects on Perceptions. *Journal of Black Psychology*, *21*(1), 6–18.

Fox, K. A., & Cook, C. L. (2011). Is Knowledge Power? The Effects of a Victimology Course on Victim Blaming. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *26*(17), 3407–3427. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260511403752

Franklin, C., & Garza, A. (2021). Sexual Assault Disclosure: The Effect of Victim Race and Perpetrator Type on Empathy, Culpability, and Service Referral for Survivors in a Hypothetical Scenario. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *36*(5–6), 2327–2352. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518759656

Geiger, B. B. (2021). Performing Trustworthiness: The 'Credibility Work' of Prominent Sociologists. *Sociology*, *55*(4), 785–802. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038520977805

George, W., & Martinez, L. (2002). Victim Blaming in Rape: Effects of Victim and Perpetrator Race, Type of Rape, and Participant Racism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *26*(2), 110–119.

Gillespie, B. J., Lever, J., Frederick, D., & Royce, T. (2015). Close adult friendships, gender, and the life cycle. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *32*(6), 709–736. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407514546977

Goh, J. X., Bandt-Law, B., Cheek, N., Sinclair, S., & Kaiser, C. R. (2022). Narrow Prototypes and Neglected Victims: Understanding Perceptions of Sexual Harassment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *122*(5), 873–893.

Gravelin, C. R., Biernat, M., & Bucher, C. E. (2019). Blaming the Victim of Acquaintance Rape: Individual, Situational, and Sociocultural Factors. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *9*(2422). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02422

Grubb, A., & Harrower, J. (2008). Attribution of blame in cases of rape: An analysis of participant gender, type of rape and perceived similarity to the victim. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *13*(5), 396–405.

Hart, C. G. (2019). The Penalties for Self-Reporting Sexual Harassment. *Gender & Society*, *33*(4), 534–559. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243219842147

Herman, J. L. (2005). Justice From the Victim's Perspective. *Violence Against Women*, *11*(5), 571–602.

Hirsch, J. S., & Khan, S. (2020). *Sexual Citizens* (First Edition). W. W. Norton & Company.

Jacques-Tiura, A. J., Tkatch, R., Abbey, A., & Wegner, R. (2010). Disclosure of sexual assault: Characteristics and implications for posttraumatic stress symptoms among African American

and caucasian survivors. *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation*, *11*(2), 174–192. https://doi.org/10.1080/15299730903502938

Jimenez, J., & Abreu, J. (2003). Race and Sex Effects on Attitudinal Perceptions of Acquaintance Rape. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *50*(2), 252–256. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.50.2.252

Katz, J., Merrilees, C., Hoxmeier, J. C., & Motisi, M. (2017). White Female Bystanders' Responses to a Black Woman at Risk for Incapacitated Sexual Assault. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *41*(2), 273–285.

Khan, S., & Jerolmack, C. (2013). SAYING MERITOCRACY AND DOING PRIVILEGE. *The Sociological Quarterly*, *54*(1), 9–19.

Lee, M. Y., & Law, P. F. M. (2001). Perception of Sexual Violence Against Women in Asian American Communities. *Journal of Ethnic And Cultural Diversity in Social Work*, *10*(2), 3–25. https://doi.org/10.1300/J051v10n02_02

Lewis, K. R., Robillard, A., Billings, D., & White, K. (2019). Differential perceptions of a hypothetical sexual assault survivor based on race and ethnicity: Exploring victim responsibility, trauma, and need for social support. *Journal of American College Health*, *67*(4), 308–317.

Madriz, E. (1997). Images of Criminals and Victims: A study on Women's Fear and Social Control. *Gender & Society*, *11*(3), 342–356.

Mellins, C. A., Walsh, K., Sarvet, A. L., Wall, M., Gilbert, L., Santelli, J. S., Thompson, M., Wilson, P. A., Khan, S., Benson, S., Bah, K., Kaufman, K. A., Reardon, L., & Hirsch, J. S. (2017). Sexual assault incidents among college undergraduates: Prevalence and factors associated with risk. *PLoS ONE*, *12*(11), e0186471.

Mennicke, A., Bowling, J., Gromer, J., & Ryan, C. (2021). Factors Associated With and Barriers to Disclosure of a Sexual Assault to Formal On-Campus Resources Among College Students. *Violence Against Women*, *27*(2), 255–273.

Meyer, D. (2021). Constructing hierarchies of victimhood: Queer male survivors' evaluations of sexual assault survivors. *Sexualities*, *0*(0), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1177/13634607211060502

Miller, A. K. (2019). "Should Have Known Better than to Fraternize with a Black Man": Structural Racism Intersects with Rape Culture to Intensify Attributions of Acquaintance Rape Victim Culpability. *Sex Roles*, *81*(7), 428–438. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-019-1003-3

Monin, B., & Miller, D. (2001). Moral Credentials and the Expression of Prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*(1), 33–43.

Mori, L., Bernat, J. A., Glenn, P. A., Selle, L. L., & Zarate, M. G. (1995). Attitudes Toward Rape: Gender and Ethnic Differences Across Asian and Caucasian College Students. *Sex Roles*, *32*(7/8).

Muehlenhard, C. L., Peterson, Z. D., Humphreys, T. P., & Jozkowski, K. N. (2017). Evaluating the One-in-Five Statistic: Women's Risk of Sexual Assault While in College. *THE JOURNAL OF SEX RESEARCH*, *54*(4–5), 549–576. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2017.1295014

Munsch, C. L., & Willer, R. (2012). The Role of Gender Identity Threat in Perceptions of Date Rape and Sexual Coercion. *Violence Against Women*, *18*(10), 1125–1146.

O'Connor, C., & Joffe, H. (2020). Intercoder Reliability in Qualitative Research: Debates and Practical Guidelines. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *19*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406919899220

Onwuachi-Willig, A. (2018). What About #UsToo?: The Invisibility of Race in the #MeToo Movement. *The Yale Law Journal Forum*, 105–120.

Orchowski, L. M., & Gidycz, C. A. (2012). To Whom Do College Women Confide Following Sexual Assault? A Prospective Study of Predictors of Sexual Assault Disclosure and Social Reactions. *Violence Against Women*, *18*(3), 264–288. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801212442917

Patterson, D., & Campbell, R. (2010). Why rape survivors participate in the criminal justice system. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *38*(2), 191–205.

Powell, A. J., Hlavka, H. R., & Mulla, S. (2017). Intersectionality and Credibility in Child Sexual Assault Trials. *Gender & Society*, *31*(4), 457–480.

Purdie-Vaughns, V., & Eibach, R. P. (2008). Intersectional Invisibility: The Distinctive Advantages and Disadvantages of Multiple Subordinate-Group Identities. *Sex Roles*, *59*, 377–391. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9424-4

Pyke, K. D., & Johnson, D. L. (2003). ASIAN AMERICAN WOMEN AND RACIALIZED FEMININITIES: "Doing" Gender across Cultural Worlds. *Gender & Society*, *17*(1), 33–53.

Religious Landscape Study: Party affiliation among adults in California. (2015). Pew Research Center. https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/state/california/party-affiliation/

Ridgeway, C. L., & Kricheli-Katz, T. (2013). Intersecting Cultural Beliefs in Social Relations: Gender, Race, and Class Binds and Freedoms. *Gender & Society*, *27*(3), 294–318. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243213479445

Rivera, L. A., & Tilcsik, A. (2019). Scaling Down Inequality: Rating Scales, Gender Bias, and the Architecture of Evaluation. *American Sociological Review*, *84*(2), 248–274.

Schaeffer, N. C., & Presser, S. (2003). The Science of Asking Questions. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *29*(1), 65–88.

Seabrook, R. C., & Ward, L. M. (2019). Bros Will Be Bros? The Effect of Fraternity Membership on Perceived Culpability for Sexual Assault. *Violence Against Women*, *25*(12), 1471–1490.

Smith, S. G., Basile, K. C., Gilbert, L. K., Merrick, M. T., Patel, N., Walling, M., & Jain, A. (2017). *National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010-2012 state report*. National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. https://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/46305

Stake, J. E., & Hoffmann, F. L. (2001). Changes in Student Social Attitudes, Activism, and Personal Confidence in Higher Education: The Role of Women's Studies. *American Educational Research Journal*, *38*(2), 411–436. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312038002411

Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C., Torino, G., Bucceri, J., Holder, A., & Nadal, K. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist*, *62*, 271–286.

Tuerkheimer, D. (2017). Incredible Women: Sexual Violence and the Credibility Discount. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, *166*(1), 1–58.

Ullman, S. E., Starzynski, L. L., Long, S. M., Mason, G. E., & Long, L. M. (2008). Exploring the Relationships of Women's Sexual Assault Disclosure, Social Reactions, and Problem Drinking. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *23*(9), 1235–1257. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260508314298

Viki, G. T., & Abrams, D. (2002). But She Was Unfaithful: Benevolent Sexism and Reactions to Rape Victims Who Violate Traditional Gender Role Expectations. *Sex Roles*, *47*(5/6), 289–293.

Voogt, A., & Klettke, B. (2017). The Effect of Gender on Perceptions of Credibility in Child Sexual Assault Cases: A Systematic Review. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, *26*(2), 195–212. https://doi.org/10.1080/10538712.2017.1280576

Voogt, A., Klettke, B., & Crossman, A. (2019). Measurement of Victim Credibility in Child Sexual Assault Cases: A Systematic Review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *20*(1), 51–66. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838016683460

Walsh, K., Sarvet, A. L., Khan, S., Choo, T.-H., Wall, M., Santelli, J., Wilson, P., Gilbert, L., Reardon, L., Hirsch, J. S., & Mellins, C. A. (2021). Socio-Ecologically Constituted Types of Sexual Assault. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *45*(1), 8–19.

Werner, A., & Malterud, K. (2003). It is hard work behaving as a credible patient: Encounters between women with chronic pain and their doctors. *Social Science and Medicine*, *57*(8), 1409–1419.

Willis, C. E. (1992). The Effect of Sex Role Stereotype, Victim and Defendant Race, and Prior Relationship on Rape Culpability Attributions. *Sex Roles*, *26*(5/6), 213–226.

Yarbrough, M., & Bennett, C. (2000). Cassandra and the Sistahs: The Peculiar Treatment of African American Women in the Myth of Women as Liars. *Journal of Gender, Race and Justice*, *3*(2), 625–658.

APPENDIX A: Sexual Assault Vignette

Kayla is a friend of yours at a nearby college. She is a [Black/white/Asian] woman from a middle-class background, majoring in English. You've known her for a couple of years.

One Saturday afternoon, she calls you and asks to talk. Something in her voice sounds off, so you ask her what's wrong. She begins to tell you:

"Last night, I went to a party on campus with some friends. We all had a few drinks and got pretty drunk. I wanted to leave early so one of my friends, Dan, offered to walk me home.

36

When we got to my place, it started raining hard, so I invited Dan to wait inside until it stopped. While we waited, we decided to watch a movie. At some point, we started fooling around. After we were kissing for a while, Dan tried to do more. I told him I was getting tired and didn't want to fool around anymore. But Dan continued trying, even though I kept trying to push him away. Eventually he was able to take off my clothes and had sex with me."

Kayla pauses, and then says, "I think he raped me."

APPENDIX B: Survey Questions

Page 2:
Do you believe Kayla? [RESPONDENTS ANSWER ON A SLIDER SCALE FROM 0 TO 100.
0 = "I don't believe Kayla at all" 50 = "I neither believe nor don't believe Kayla" 100 = "I completely believe Kayla"]

Please explain your answer above [OPEN-ENDED QUESTION]

Page 3:
Would you say that Kayla is believable? [RESPONDENTS ANSWER ON A SLIDER SCALE FROM 0 TO 100. 0 = "Kayla is completely not believable 50 = "Kayla is neither believable nor not believable" 100 = "Kayla is completely believable"]

Please explain your answer above [OPEN-ENDED QUESTION]

Page 4:
Directions: Please indicate your agreement with the following statements: [RESPONDENTS ANSWER ON A SLIDER SCALE FROM 0 TO 100. 0 = "I completely disagree" 50 = "I neither agree nor disagree" 100 = "I completely agree"]

1. I believe the incident happened as Kayla described it
2. I believed that this incident was a rape
3. I think Kayla should have done more to prevent this incident
4. Kayla's memory of what happened was accurate
5. Kayla is reliable
6. What Kayla said was credible
7. Kayla is trustworthy
8. Kayla was telling the truth about what happened
9. Kayla is credible
10. Kayla is honest

37

Page 5:
After Kayla shares this with you, what do you imagine you would say or do in response?
[OPEN-ENDED QUESTION]

Page 6:
1. What is Kayla's gender?
2. What is Kayla's race?
3. What is Kayla's socioeconomic class?