

8-1-2014

Prison, Perceptions, and Policy: Authoritarianism and Attitudes toward Sexual Assault Victims in U.S. Correctional Facilities

Amy Michelle Magnus
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations>



Part of the [Criminology Commons](#), [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Magnus, Amy Michelle, "Prison, Perceptions, and Policy: Authoritarianism and Attitudes toward Sexual Assault Victims in U.S. Correctional Facilities" (2014). *UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones*. 2192.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.34917/6456422>

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Scholarship@UNLV with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@unlv.edu.

PRISON, PERCEPTIONS, AND POLICY: AUTHORITARIANISM AND ATTITUDES
TOWARD SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIMS IN U.S. CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

By

Amy M. Magnus

Bachelor of Arts in Psychology
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
2012

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Master of Arts – Criminal Justice

**Department of Criminal Justice
Hank Greenspun College of Urban Affairs
The Graduate College**

**University of Nevada, Las Vegas
August 2014**

Copyright by Amy Magnus, 2014

All Rights Reserved



THE GRADUATE COLLEGE

We recommend the thesis prepared under our supervision by

Amy M. Magnus

entitled

Prison, Perceptions, and Policy: Authoritarianism and Attitudes toward Sexual Assault Victims in U.S. Correctional Facilities

is approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts - Criminal Justice

Department of Criminal Justice

Joel Lieberman, Ph.D., Committee Chair

Emily Troshynski, Ph.D., Committee Member

Terance Miethe, Ph.D., Committee Member

David Beisecker, Ph.D., Graduate College Representative

Kathryn Hausbeck Korgan, Ph.D., Interim Dean of the Graduate College

August 2014

ABSTRACT

**Prison, Perceptions, and Policy: Authoritarianism and Attitudes
Toward Sexual Assault Victims in U.S. Correctional Facilities**

by

Amy M. Magnus

Dr. Joel Lieberman, Examination Committee Chair
Professor and Chair of Criminal Justice
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Existing research on sexual victimization in correctional facilities has expanded since the enactment of the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) of 2003. Previous literature suggests that the prevalence of sexual victimization in prisons is unknown, yet the known ramifications of reported sexual assaults are serious for both the individuals involved and the institution. Government policies such as the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) of 2003 attempt to address the issue of sexual violence in U.S. correctional facilities.

Limitations of PREA, however, derive from a lack of clear distinction between coerced and consensual behavior and how these ideas manifest and co-exist in different facilities. Further, sexual and gender identities of inmates, age, and other cultural factors influence the usefulness and consistency of PREA. This paper will describe the unique cultural aspects of prison life for both adult men and women and how sexual victimization affects inmates on a social and psychological level. This paper will further address the personality factor of authoritarianism and its influence on perceptions of sexually victimized men and women in prison and in other settings. Finally, this thesis will discuss how PREA does not fully succeed in properly addressing sexual violence in U.S. prisons.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee for their constant guidance and reassurance. I owe gratitude to Dr. Joel Lieberman, for I would not possess the passion that I do for research without your mentorship and the opportunities you have allotted me throughout my undergraduate and graduate careers. I am incredibly thankful for Dr. Terry Miethe's passion, humor, and love for teaching – without it, my experience while writing this thesis would have been impossible. I owe so much to Dr. Emily Troshynski, as her mentorship, strength, and passion for academia are some of the many reasons I have decided to continue my graduate studies. Dave – I thank you for being part of this process and teaching me how to think, write, and articulate myself throughout my time in the UNLV Philosophy Department. I admire all of you and hope to someday be as great of a scholar as the four of you.

Dr. Alexis Kennedy and Dr. Randall Shelden deserve my utmost respect and gratitude. You have inspired me to find my own path in academia and to always defend my thoughts, positions, and beliefs. Your passion for students and research inspires me to keep moving forward. You have taught me so much about the leader and professor I would like to be in the future, and I cannot thank you enough for that. To Tanesha, Katie, Andrea, and Cathy – this project would not have been possible without you, so thank you. Because of your support, I now have a completed project that I am proud of, and I am forever grateful.

I could not have accomplished this feat without the support of my family, colleagues, and close friends. The individuals who have stayed by my side, through thick and thin, are well aware of the impact they have had on my graduate school experience

and life as a whole. I am stronger because of your love and friendship, and I could not have made it through this process without you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Prevalence of Sexual Victimization in Prisons	1
Defining Sexual Assault in Prison	2
Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) of 2003	4
Authoritarianism	6
Overview of Thesis Project	8
CHAPTER 2: CRIMINOLOGICAL ETIOLOGY OF SEXUAL BEHAVIOR IN PRISONS	10
Attitudes Toward Incarceration in the United States	10
Summary of Gender and Incarceration	12
Men’s Prison Culture	14
Women’s Prison Culture	17
CHAPTER 3: PERCEPTIONS OF VICTIMIZATION	20
Perceptions of Sex Crime Victims	20
Defensive Attribution and Authoritarianism	22
CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY	26
Participants and Design	26
Measures and Procedure	26
CHAPTER 5: RESULTS AND ANALYSIS	31
Sample Demographics	31
Scenario Detail Question	31
Manipulation Check Questions	32
Main Effects and Significant Interactions	32
Participants’ Perception of Victim Responsibility	33
Participants’ Perception of Expected Reporting Behavior	34
Perceived Seriousness of the Offense	36
Attribution of Formal Criminal Charge to the Offender	36
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION	39
Findings	39
Limitations	42
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION	44
Critique of the Prison Rape Elimination Act	44

1) Assumption of Demographic Neutrality.....	45
2) PREA Training: Understanding Who is Protected and the Role of Staff Enforcement.....	45
3) Federal Expectation and State Influence	46
4) Bureau of Justice Statistics Sampling and Data Collection.....	47
Future Research Directions.....	48
Summary.....	49
APPENDIX A: AUTHORITARIANISM (SOCIAL ISSUES) SURVEY	53
APPENDIX B: JUST WORLD BELIEFS (JWB) SURVEY.....	56
APPENDIX C: FINAL SURVEY	58
APPENDIX D: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE	60
APPENDIX E: MAIN EFFECTS.....	63
REFERENCES	64
CURRICULUM VITA	70

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Effects of Level of Authoritarianism and Authority Status of Offender on Attribution of Victim Responsibility.....	34
Table 2: Effects of Offense Setting and Victim’s Gender on Participants’ Expectation of Reporting Behavior.....	35
Table 3: Effects of level of Authoritarianism and Setting of Offense on Attribution of a Formal Charge to the Offender.....	37
Table 4: Effects of Victim’s Gender and Setting of Offense on Attribution of a Formal Charge to the Offender	38

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Prevalence of Sexual Victimization in Prisons

It has been reported in previous studies that as many as one-fifth of all U.S. prison inmates have been sexually victimized in some way, although the exact amounts are unknown because of underreporting (Jones & Pratt, 2008). In a 2007 study, 60,500 prison inmates reported being sexually assaulted in some way within the previous year (National Prison Rape Commission Report, 2009). From 2011-2012, approximately 4% of surveyed state and federal prison inmates, and 3% of jail inmates, reported being sexually victimized by an inmate or staff member within the last year (Bureau of Justice Statistics [BJS], 2013). These percentages translate to 27,500 jail and 68,900 prison inmates reporting being sexually victimized at some point in the last year by either inmates, staff, or a combination of the two (BJS, 2013). These findings suggest that, even after the passing of the Prison Rape Elimination Act (2003), rates of sexual victimization in prisons are increasing.

While most scholarship on prison violence focuses on age, race, and biological sex of both perpetrators and victims, recent PREA data collection efforts show that inmates (both men and women) in prisons and jails who reported being gay, lesbian, bisexual, or other had the highest rates of sexual victimization. Amongst all inmates who identified as non-heterosexual, “12.2% of prisoners and 5.5% of jail inmates reported being sexually victimized by another inmate, while 5.4% of prisoners and 4.3% of jail inmates reported being victimized by staff” (BJS, 2013). Again, these findings suggest that, even after the implementation of PREA, rates of victimization are far too high.

Current rates of victimization are concerning, and while it may seem easy to pinpoint particular groups susceptible to such violence, sexual activity occurring in men's and women's prison, either consensual or forced, is a highly complex phenomenon. It is important to understand the variation of victimization rates between groups, and it is equally important to understand why certain groups experience different types of victimization and how they deal with these occurrences. In order to conceptualize the prevalence of sexual victimization in U.S. jails and prisons, the ways in which sexual assault and victimization has been defined in the past and how we define and perceive these concepts today are discussed in the following section. After a discussion of definitions and terms, this introduction will discuss PREA, including its strengths and limitations as a policy.

Defining Sexual Assault in Prison

Early definitions of sexual victimization in prisons are characterized as "homosexual activity engaged in by homosexual individuals or by men with weak moral character" (Jones & Pratt, 2008, pg. 16). Little was known about sexual activity in prisons (with regard to empirical data) until the early 1980s (for men's prisons) and the 1990s (for women's prisons) when sexual victimization was redefined in empirical research as "assaultive" and "often coerced" (Jones & Pratt, 2008; Greer, 2000). While the early definition seemed to perpetuate throughout literature prior to the 1990s, many scholars began to realize that sexual activities in prisons were dependent upon the prison culture and various characteristics of the inmates. This shift in the empirical understanding of sexual activity in prisons began to change assumptions that assaults in prisons were not also victimization, but could also occur consensually (Jones & Pratt,

2008). Either way, whether research articulates prison victimization as assaultive or consensual, the prevalence of sexual victimization in both men's and women's prisons is vastly underreported both due to the sensitive nature of the topic and the cultural implications of "snitching" in prison (Jones & Pratt, 2008; Knowles, 1999).

It is important to recognize that underreporting of sexual victimization in prisons occurs because of the stigma/shame associated with being a victim. Also, misconceptions on behalf of correctional staff and guards regarding victim identities and fear of further victimization are realities for inmates. While men and women experience incarceration very differently (Murray & Farrington, 2008), they also experience prison victimization very differently. Reporting victimization is complicated by the need to trust the individual to whom the inmate is reporting – for inmates, this means authority figures who may not fully understand victimization.

The Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) of 2003 attempts to address issues of sexual victimization in prison and encourages inmates to report their assaults. However, federal reports mandated by PREA are contingent upon inmates' willingness to report – perpetuating an under-developed understanding of the cultural context and pressure of reporting sexual victimization in the prison setting. Again, considering the context of the prison environment, this expectation of reporting limits the effectiveness of policies such as PREA.

Although research has uncovered some of the cultural context of sexual victimization, the implications following sexual victimization have been frequently overlooked. For example, research by Lisa Pasko (2010), Meda Chesney-Lind (2006), and Kimberly Greer (2000) discusses a feminist perspective of incarcerated women and

how their experiences of prison and victimization differ from men's. Listwan, Colvin, Hanley and Flannery (2010), Jones and Pratt (2008) and Hochstetler, Murphy and Simons (2004) observe stereotypical perceptions of victims and inmates in addition to mental and physical health outcomes of inmates who have witnessed and/or experienced sexual violence in prison. Building on this more recent research, this thesis will discuss differing contexts of sexual victimization in men's and women's prisons, the influence of the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003, and how the totality of the institution influences the phenomenon of sexual violence. Further, this thesis will use an experimental design involving sexual assault scenarios to assess perceptions of sexually victimized prisoners. Finally, this thesis will discuss the possible consequences that certain perceptions of victims have on the writing of prison policy and how it is enforced.

Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) of 2003

The Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) of 2003 was enacted by Congress to address sexual victimization in "confinement" facilities across the United States. The purpose of this policy is two-fold, to target the overall health and safety of inmates along with the health and safety of the public (McGuire, 2005). In order to understand experiences of victimization in U.S. jails and prisons, the Act requires government-funded research to be conducted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) on the basis of "penological, physical, mental, social and economic impacts of prison rape on every level of government, communities, social institutions and individuals" (PREA, 2003, p. 117, stat. 981). Following this, the Nation Prison Rape Elimination Commission is required to provide suggestions for policy implementation within correctional facilities regarding "investigation of rape complaints, preserving physical and testimonial evidence,

providing acute medical care in treating injuries, minimization of disease transmission and minimization of psychological damage” (PREA, 2003, p. 117, stat. 983). PREA is a very extensive policy, intended to enforce a documented, “zero-tolerance” prohibition against prison rape in U.S. correctional facilities between all agents within the facility (i.e. staff, inmates, or any combination of the two). Failure to comply with the program results in revocation of government funds (PREA, 2003).

Generally, there is very limited research on how effective PREA is and how effectiveness is to be defined. Considering the federal Act requires states to implement differing programs that may or may not address the unique needs of particular facilities, it has been difficult for policy makers, researchers, and scholars alike to fully assess what constitutes an effective PREA program. Limitations of PREA exist, for various reasons, and will be discussed in proceeding chapters, including: 1) assumptions of demographic neutrality, 2) PREA training and enforcement practices, 3) state influence on federal policy, and 4) Bureau of Justice Statistics sampling frames and data collection.

Another limitation of PREA involves the role of dominant personality traits like authoritarianism, a concept further tested within this thesis. In particular, implementation and enforcement of PREA stems from individuals in positions of authority, and while inmates are expected to report incidents of sexual victimization, facility staff is expected to “detect, prevent, reduce, and punish [incidents] of prison rape” (PREA, p. 117, stat. 975). Clearly, understanding authoritarianism is an important component in analyzing the legislation that regulates sexual activity in prisons and will be beneficial in conceptualizing how both victimization and victimized inmates are being perceived.

Authoritarianism

The origin of the authoritarian personality derives from the work of Theodor Adorno (along with many of his colleagues) that was published in 1950. Adorno's work focused on the ideologies of anti-Semitism, ethnocentrism, and fascism and how some individuals are easily influenced by these psychological beliefs. In Adorno's development of the F-scale, used to measure one's level of authoritarianism, these particular ideological beliefs were emphasized and observed. In his empirical findings, Adorno identified a cluster of items, which he characterized as authoritarian belief patterns (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson & Sanford, 1950). His findings highlighted the relationship between ethnocentrism, a very strict obedience to authority and an extremely punitive attitude toward those who disobey authority and rules. Overall, the contribution of Adorno's Authoritarianism Scale provided social-psychological rationalization for group-think behaviors, susceptibility to belief in stereotypes, and opposition to individuals who are perceived as deviant or law-breaking.

Adorno and his colleagues characterized individuals with an "authoritarian" personality as those with a conventional value system marked by rigid beliefs about following the law, abiding by authority, and manifesting extremely oppositional attitudes toward individuals who did not fit this criteria. For example, individuals who are considered to be an "authoritarian" typically prefer right-wing politics, are highly religious, have a high tolerance of, and support for, government action, and very low tolerance of rule breakers, law breakers, and individuals considered to be "deviant" (Adorno et al., 1950). Building on Adorno et al.'s (1950) work, Altemeyer (1996) also identified hostility and aggression toward women and homosexuals as a key authoritarian

attitude. Authoritarians are highly intolerant of psychological and physical weaknesses and tend to relate to and agree with authority figures.

Connected to this, research on self-selection, prison life, and attitudes toward abusive behavior uncovered that individuals who choose to participate in tasks and jobs associated with prison dynamics, power roles, and authority structure, such as correctional officers, tend to possess strong authoritarian attitudes, stronger attitudes toward social dominance, and lack of empathy (Carnahan & MacFarland, 2007).

Following from this idea, authoritarian attitudes may pose various limitations in the implementation of PREA and the consistency of enforcement within differing facilities (i.e. adult/juvenile, men/women, mental health/correctional, etc.). While authoritarians may typically adhere to government action and laws, this trend may be compromised by their intolerance of law-breakers and deviant people (i.e. the inmates they are overseeing). Again, this poses a challenge with regard to PREA implementation.

Although the Act is in place, the officers may not take reports of sexual victimization seriously or may abuse power because of their attitudes toward these “delinquent” individuals. While generalizations cannot be applied to all correctional officers, it follows that individuals with authoritarian values would be faced with conflicting attitudes while executing their duties as a correctional officer; they have a duty to uphold the law, yet they also have a duty to protect people they find intolerable. These conflicting attitudes are further complicated when we consider stereotypes associated with gender, race, and sexual orientation.

Overview of Thesis Project

Given the current extent of sexual victimization occurring in U.S. jails and prisons and a policy that does not fully address the problem, this thesis aims to bridge the empirical gap between authoritarian perceptions of victims in the correctional setting and beliefs about reporting, victim blaming, and the seriousness of victimization. In so doing, this thesis suggests that comprehending the full nature of sexual victimization in total institutions, such as jails and prisons, is highly dependent upon a complete understanding of authoritarian attitudes.

Chapter 2 of this thesis will discuss the etiology and cultural context of sexual activities in U.S. men's and women's prisons from a criminological standpoint. Chapter 3 will provide an overview of the psychology of victimization, including the general perceptions associated with sexual victimization, attributions of victim blaming, belief in rape myths, and beliefs about victims' reporting behavior. Chapter 3 will also discuss authoritarianism and how this psychological concept relates to perceptions of victims. Chapter 4 will describe the research methodology used in the current experimental study assessing authoritarian perceptions of sexual assault victims and the influence of crime setting, authority of the offender, and the victim's gender on participants' perceptions of institutional rape scenarios. Chapter 5 will discuss the results and analysis of the previously noted study, and Chapter 6 will explain the findings and limitations of the study, including how Kelly Shaver's (1970) Defensive Attribution Theory may support these findings. Finally, Chapter 7 will conclude with future research directions and a critique of the Prison Rape Elimination Act, namely, how authoritarian personalities often interfere with the functionality of PREA.

The current project uses a multi-disciplinary approach within the fields of law, psychology, sociology, and criminal justice to gauge the unique relationship between sexual victimization in men's and women's prisons, gender dynamics that influence such phenomena, and how authoritarianism influences perceptions of offenders and victims. The independent variables in the project will speak not only to criminal justice audiences, but individuals in other disciplinary fields with an interest in psychological processes, gender dynamics within institutional settings, and current policy that addresses sexual abuses within correctional settings.

CHAPTER 2

CRIMINOLOGICAL ETIOLOGY OF SEXUAL BEHAVIOR IN PRISONS

It is important to understand the experiences of men and women in prison from a culturally-relative point of view. Experiences of institutional victimization, namely, sexual victimization in incarcerated settings, are substantively different for individuals of different demographic groups. Men and women not only experience victimization differently, but also manifest different perceptions of those who are victimized based on previous histories of violence, sexual and emotional abuse, and exposure/adherence to gender and victim stereotypes (Murray & Farrington, 2008). Stereotypes combined with attitudes attributed to inmates in the United States constitute a unique social dynamic for inmates and correctional officers. This chapter discusses, in depth, attitudes toward incarceration in the United States, how those attitudes are associated with gender dynamics, and how gender dynamics have been perceived and articulated in the academic literature.

Attitudes Toward Incarceration in the United States

Erving Goffman (1961) described institutional settings that encompassed every aspect of an inmates' life as a "total institution" (p. 313-320). For Goffman, it was the totality of the institution that infiltrated the inmate's mind, and encompassed the lives of those who were sentenced to live there as a form of punishment for the crimes they committed. The totality of the U.S. "correctional" institution is not correcting deviant behavior, but rather teaching new social behaviors that are required for adapting to the struggles of incarceration. This trend is apparent in the United States, where the reliance on incarcerating offenders continues to rise.

The inmate population in the United States correctional system is the largest in the world. According to Currie (2013), 200,000 people were incarcerated in the United States in 1971, and by the end of 1996, the population rose to over 1.2 million. In 1995, the US incarceration rate was 600 people per 100,000, and has been steadily increasing per year (Currie, 2013), where as of 2011, the incarceration rate was 743 people per 100,000 (International Centre for Prison Studies [ICPS], 2012). This trend, compared to other industrialized countries, is a uniquely American phenomenon.

The US implements “zero-tolerance policies”, harsh sentences for two or three-time convicted felons, and extremely punitive sentences for minor offenses (compared to similar industrialized nations) (Austin & Irwin, 2012). If this system of sentencing and imprisonment were effective, it would logically follow that the incarceration rate would remain static or decrease over time. Unfortunately, individuals are incarcerated at a rapid rate and very little is done to facilitate their reintegration into society – thus, what Austin and Irwin coined the “imprisonment binge” (Austin & Irwin, 2012). This phenomenon reflects the U.S. attitude toward incarceration as well as gender stereotypes and how these dynamics interconnect.

In 2012 alone, almost 110,000 women were incarcerated in U.S. federal and state correctional facilities (The Sentencing Project, 2013). Although many more men than women are currently incarcerated, women make up a sizeable amount of the overall U.S. prison population (approximately 8%) (The Sentencing Project, 2013). Women are often victims of physical and sexual abuse prior to prison life, and often suffer from extremely high rates of HIV (The Sentencing Project, 2013). Men and women also experience prison life differently because of familial relationships – over 80% of women in prison

have at least two children, and many of these women lose their children as a result of incarceration (Murray & Farrington, 2008). Men, however, do not experience this same phenomenon (Murray & Farrington, 2008). It is important to understand the gender differences in U.S. prisons and how these differences impact men and women psychologically.

Summary of Gender and Incarceration

It is important to consider the gender differences in incarcerated settings to fully comprehend how correctional staff perceives inmates. Further, it is important to understand the differences in how correctional settings were developed to better understand why gender stereotypes are such a major hindrance for correctional policy. Feminist literature discusses treatment of inmates and prison victimization with an emphasis on gender differences. While this is not the traditional view in correctional literature, Feminist scholars such as Meda Chesney-Lind and Lisa Pasko have repeatedly shown that gender differences in incarcerated settings impact inmates' prison experiences. Sexual violence in prisons reflects gender stereotypes and gender roles, which is indicative of the differing contexts of victimization in men's and women's prisons.

Much of the historical lineage of how girls, boys, men and women are treated in the criminal justice system derives from the application of patriarchal attitudes to correctional facilities and policies (Pasko, 2010; Chesney-Lind, 2006). Girls' and women's facilities were built upon the foundation of boys' and men's facilities – which consequently infiltrated many gender stereotypes and beliefs about girls' and women's needs that were often inaccurate. Consequently, basing women's and girls' programs on

stereotypes associated with boys and men not only discriminated against women, but also individuals that identify as non-heterosexual. Gender-neutral correctional policy creates similar phenomena, ultimately ignoring the differing needs and risks of men and women in prison.

Research by Lisa Pasko (2010) found that girls coming into juvenile facilities who identified as non-heterosexual were being identified as “treatable”, insinuating that the girls had a psychological disorder (p. 1121). Rather than providing services for individuals with non-heterosexual identities, correctional facilities have often ignored these components of incarceration (Pasko, 2010). Pasko’s (2010) research indicated that staff often have difficulty categorizing individuals that do not fit into the dichotomous parameters established by policies like PREA, and thus assume that non-heterosexual behavior is a “temporary choice” and, possibly, a “pain of imprisonment” (Pasko, 2010, pg. 1123). This general belief that sexual orientation is temporary delegitimizes inmates’ needs and puts them at future risk of discrimination and victimization.

Correctional programs have not, and do not in most cases, address differences in psychological needs of men and women and do not discuss differences between “coercive” and “consensual” sex acts because of legal restrictions. As an inmate, the right to decide what is consensual and coercive is legally ambiguous – even though the psychological ability exists and plays a part in why sexual activity is happening in prisons. By incorporating information about disadvantages associated with gender into correctional policy, the correctional system may be able to better identify inmates at risk for victimization, inmates who may perpetrate sexual violence, and how correctional

officers handle inmates who are not heterosexual males and females. Understanding how gender differences have influenced U.S. prisons is essential in understanding the sub-cultures of men's and women's facilities, and how this is indicative of the context associated with victimization. The following sections will describe the unique sub-cultural aspects of men's and women's prison cultures and how sexual victimization occurs and is perceived by prison staff.

Men's Prison Culture

Men's prison experiences have often been the focus of correctional literature. Gresham Sykes (1958) pinpointed five primary "pains of imprisonment" that individuals (mainly men) face during long-term incarceration. Sykes (1958) suggested that inmates face five pains of imprisonment: the deprivation of goods and services, deprivation of liberty, deprivation of autonomy, deprivation of security, and the deprivation of heterosexual relationships. In his description of the fifth "pain of imprisonment", Sykes explained that inmates participated in homosexual relationships to cope with the lack of heterosexual relationships. While these relationships occurred because of lacking heterosexual opportunities, according to Sykes, they often occurred involuntarily. According to Sykes' work on aggressive inmates, often labeled "wolves", Sykes found that "wolves" often offered protection to the inexperienced, passive "fish" in return for sexual favors. These relationships were considered coerced, and were often used to the wolf's advantage. Although these relationships were discussed as being obvious and somewhat inevitable, Sykes' work was some of the first to acknowledge sexual activity in men's prisons as "coercive".

Similar to Donald Clemmer's (1940) description of "prisonization" and Erving Goffman's (1961) research on the "total institution", inmates were expected to, and often do, accept, conform, and integrate themselves within the prison culture as a form of physical and psychological survival. Inmates in men's prisons learn to focus their efforts on achieving "minor privileges" to regain their manhood (Phillips, 2001). Men strive to portray themselves as a "stand-up man" – one who exudes physical and mental strength with the ability to ward off perpetrators (Phillips, 2001). Perpetrators often want to take away another inmate's manhood to increase his own, a cultural phenomenon (relatively) limited to the men's prison setting. The perpetrator of sexual violence in men's prison "demonstrates physical prowess and control over others," gaining a reputation of manhood in prison (Phillips, 2001, p. 16). The recipient of sexual violence is not considered a victim, but rather a weakling of "diminished manhood" who will be "marked as subservient" and treated as a lesser being (Phillips, 2001, p. 15).

Sexual violence must, therefore, be understood from a culturally relative standpoint – sexual assault in men's prison is not necessarily referred to as "rape" in the sense of how free society uses the term. Knowles (1999) found that those who were "raped" in prison were not labeled as a "victim", but rather a "target". Exploitation on behalf of an aggressor to a weaker inmate was a way for inmates to assert their manhood and determine where inmates fell within the social hierarchy (Knowles, 1999). This phenomenon reiterates the difficulty correctional officers have in determining whether or not sex is consensual or coercive. The dynamic of sexual violence in women's prisons is very different from men's prisons and must be acknowledged as such when creating correctional policy.

Although previous research suggests that sex in prisons is consensual, the perception of sexual activity in confinement facilities has shifted. This shift has taken place as a result of human rights groups and social scientists from the 1990s to early 2000s (Human Rights Watch, 2001) calling for attention to be paid to sexual assaults in prisons. While the literature on sexual victimization in jails and prisons prior to the 1990s was sparse, many researchers in the last decade have begun to open the conversation about sexual assaults in prisons. Because of the shift in academic literature focusing more heavily on the coercive context of sex in correctional facilities, it also follows that the perception of the prison culture as a highly coercive space would have developed.

In a limited body of research on correctional staff perceptions of risk factors associated with victimization in prisons, staff in men's prisons believed that men were at a higher risk of victimization because they have "male sex drives, forced abstinence, interpersonal conflicts, are faced with the exploitative nature of inmate culture, and the pursuit of power over weaker inmates" (National Institute of Corrections, 2006). This finding clearly displays the perpetual perceptions and stereotypes associated with sex in men's prisons as a function of male prowess, strength, dominance and aggression. Similar to the belief about sex in men's prisons, early research believed that sex in women's prisons was a reactionary tool to the "pains of imprisonment" (Greer, 2000). This belief exemplifies the generalization of research done on men to women populations. The following section will explain women's prison culture, and how it differs from men's prison culture.

Women's Prison Culture

Research suggests that sexuality in men's prisons differs greatly from sexuality in women's prisons. For example, prior to 1995, sexual activity in female prisons had been vastly under-researched. Even so, Greer (2000) suggests that while many women either support or have neutral emotions regarding sexual interactions in prison, many women do not participate in homosexual relationships because the relationships, in their opinion, can be "coercive" and "manipulative". Women who do participate in sexual relationships in prison, however, often do so on a truly consensual basis (Greer, 2000).

Women's sexual victimization in prison was portrayed similarly to men's experiences; sexual violence was occurring in women's prisons because of a need for dominance and submission, and as inmate-on-inmate offenses. Women's prisons, however, differ greatly from men's prisons in the sense that sexual behavior is not always coerced, but sometimes consensual and condoned by female inmates (Greer, 2000). Recent research has also shown a shift in what initial research on women's prisons coined the "pseudofamily network," in which women would form tight kinships as a defense mechanism against deprivation of strong social networks. While this may still be true in certain areas of the United States, many women report serving prison time individually rather than collectively as previously documented (Severance, 2005; Greer, 2000). Similar to Greer's (2000) findings, Severance (2005) also found that women tend to have mixed feelings about significant others in prison – some find the idea repulsive, others find it acceptable, and some participate in relationships while they are incarcerated. Romantic relationships were rarely identified as such in women's prisons, but the relationships that were identified between inmates were found to be socially and

psychologically beneficial for those involved (Severance, 2005). Wolff and Shi (2009) documented that sexual victimization often occurs between female inmates and correctional staff, contradicting the popular belief that sexual interaction in women's prisons was similar to men's prisons.

Sexual behavior and sexual violence in men's and women's prisons may develop and manifest very differently, but both occurrences are essential in understanding the context of the unique prison cultures. Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson (2006) suggest that context of sexual behavior in prison is critical in understanding the nature of the sexual acts. In a recent study of 1,788 usable surveys of both victimized men and women in prison, women reported being victimized at least four times on average during their period of incarceration, mostly by inmates and correctional staff (Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 2006). This differs from men that reported being victimized an average of nine times during their incarceration by predominantly inmates.

Sexual violence in prisons was considered taboo and, until the early 2000s, a phenomenon that was vastly viewed as inevitable and due punishment for the "bad people" within the prison walls. Similar to the results of the men's correctional staff's perceived risk factors (National Institute of Corrections, 2006), correctional staff in women's prisons identified specific risk factors such as "the need to connect with others, histories of abuse and inappropriate sexualization, predatory behavior, and staff sexual misconduct" as defining characteristics of a woman's vulnerability in prison. Again, these perceived risk factors appear to be based more on gender stereotypes rather than empirical research. Derived from the historical lineage of strictly heterosexual behavior as acceptable and the "norm", anyone who identified as anything other than heterosexual

(i.e. bisexual, lesbian, gay, etc.) was viewed as suffering from a treatable mental illness (Pasko, 2010). Further, the perceptions of both men's and women's correctional staff reiterate the somewhat mystified stereotypes that men and women are perceived as different biologically, but that victimization is executed and experienced by men and women in the same manners.

CHAPTER 3

PERCEPTIONS OF VICTIMIZATION

Perceptions of Sex Crime Victims

Much of the literature regarding attitudes towards sexual assault victims addresses ideas of rape myths and victim blaming. Victim gender has been shown to influence individuals' perceptions of the victim and their legitimacy as victims. Yamawaki (2007) and Smith, Pine and Hawley (1988) found that, with regard to gender stereotyping, male victims of sexual assault (with a female aggressor) were perceived by participants to have initiated the encounter and actually derived pleasure from the encounter. Male participants tended to perceive male victims as enjoying a sexual assault from a female offender more than female victims assaulted by a male (Smith et al., 1988). This finding suggested that gender stereotypes had a serious impact on societal perceptions of sexual assault victims, and thus, attributions of rape myths to rape situations. While, according to the literature, it is considered appealing or appropriate for a woman to sexually overpower a man, the same perception does not seem to hold true for the inverse situation (Smith et al., 1988).

Previous research also suggested that individuals are likely to show empathy toward victims of the same gender; males are more likely to have negative perceptions of offenders who assault males than females. The same phenomenon is true for female attitudes toward female victims (Judson, Johnson & Perez, 2013; Schneider, Ee and Aronson, 1994). Recent research indicated that perceptions of sexual assault victims were influenced more heavily by attitudes of gender stereotypes, hostile sexism, and homophobia (Judson et al., 2013).

Yamawaki (2007) and Begany and Milburn (2002) found that sexism, primarily hostile sexism (i.e., “prejudicial and stereotypical beliefs about women”) predicted negative attitudes toward women in rape scenarios. “Benevolent sexism” (i.e. somewhat stereotypical and restricting views about women), however, reduced victim-blaming attitudes in serious rape scenarios (Yamawaki, 2007, p. 2). Considering the ideas surrounding gender stereotypes, males encounter the perception from outside views that sex with a woman should be embraced and enjoyed, not unwanted or refused (Judson et al., 2013). In turn, men often perceive these encounters as contrary to traditional male behavior.

Polimeni, Hardie and Buzwell (2000) suggest that homophobia has been a long-standing predictor of negative perceptions toward both male and female victims, regardless of the aggressor’s gender. These perceptions are often where ideas of hostile and benevolent sexism along with homophobia come into play. These factors, in general, have been noted as potential predictors of sexual aggression throughout the literature. The need for sexual dominance and the belief in male superiority (key contributors to the hostile and benevolent sexism belief systems) highlight the connection between sexual victimization and authoritarianism – a personality component highlighting strong affinity for authority, rigid social structure and conventional belief systems.

Begany and Milburn (2002) found that authoritarian beliefs are a predictor of rape myth support and hostile sexism beliefs. This study suggested that individuals with authoritarian belief systems will not only be more likely to engage in sexual harassment behaviors, but also perceive victims of sexual harassment and assault with notions of rape

myths and hostile sexist beliefs in mind, mitigating their “victim” status altogether (Begany & Milburn, 2002).

Much of the literature on authoritarianism and sexual assaults fails to capture the connection between authority status of the offender and victim gender. The literature is also lacking in its ability to distinguish gender differences in men and women’s prisons as fundamentally different entities, especially regarding sexual victimization. Policies such as PREA should encourage inmates to report sexual violence in prisons, but the reality of the matter is that those who are assaulted often report to individuals of authority – those who often misunderstand inmates’ status as a victim or are the perpetrators of the sexual violence. Understanding how people perceive others is of paramount importance with regard to power dynamics and vulnerable populations, such as guards and prisoners. Further, understanding perceptions of victims and why characteristics of the victims alter perceptions is important for understanding limitations of correctional policies, such as PREA, and where deficits may arise.

Defensive Attribution and Authoritarianism

From a theoretical perspective, Defensive Attribution Theory (Shaver, 1970) provides context for participants’ responses about victims and offenders. Shaver suggested that individuals, as a defense mechanism, would distance themselves from similar people who are experiencing/creating negative circumstances. For example, a participant with high authoritarian values will distance themselves from the hypothetical authority offenders because they are similar in nature, even if the perceived individual is experiencing a very negative circumstance. In other words, the highly authoritarian participants should attribute more negative dispositions toward authority offenders

because they do not want to be associated with the authority offender's behavior. The high authoritarians will, by nature, be inclined to follow/agree with authority figures. The abuse of power (resulting in a heinous crime) should ultimately cause the participants to distance themselves, resulting in a more punitive perception of the authority offenders as opposed to the offenders in other scenarios.

Shaver (1970) identified two characteristics responsible for a perceiver's attribution. The level of "personal similarity" between the perceiver and the perceived will, alternatively, result in psychologically distancing oneself on behalf of the perceiver. With regard to the current study, the highly authoritarian participants perceive victims and offenders that could be personally similar to them. The perceiver will act in a psychologically defensive manner to protect their external reputation and distance themselves from those who are similar in personality and in circumstance (i.e. the perceiver will deny similarity and attribute responsibility as a type of psychological defense mechanism).

Much of the research conducted on victim blaming and attribution of responsibility suggests that victims are often blamed for their victimization. Men are more likely to blame rape victims for their victimization, while women are less likely to blame victims and attribute responsibility to the actions of the victim (Furnham & Boston, 1996). This finding is consistent with earlier research (Jensen & Gutek, 1982), suggesting that women are more likely to identify with the stereotypical "victim" identity, whereas men may identify with the more stereotypical dominant characteristics of the perpetrator (Furnham & Boston, 1996; Jensen & Gutek, 1982). The victim's characteristics play a major role in attribution of blame, as the same sample of

participants in the Furnham and Boston (1996) study identified with stronger just world beliefs¹ when they felt the victim wore provocative clothes, attributing more blame and responsibility onto the victim.

Victims of crime also perceive other victims of crime differently from individuals who have not been victimized. While women attribute less blame in general, women who had been victimized were far less likely than non-victims in the sample to blame victims of sexual harassment for provoking the incident (Jensen & Gutek, 1982). Interestingly, authoritarians tend to blame victims more harshly given their perception of threat in the world (they only attribute blame and responsibility rather than considering their position when in similar circumstances) (Lambert, Thomas & Nguyen, 1999).

Based on previous literature, multiple research questions guided the current study:

1. How do high authoritarians perceive sex crime victims compared to low authoritarians on the basis of crime setting, offender authority status, and victim gender?
2. How do high authoritarians perceive sex crime offenders compared to low authoritarians on the basis of crime setting, offender authority status, and victim gender?
3. How do men perceive sex crime victims compared to women on the basis of crime setting, offender authority status, and victim gender?

¹ Lerner (1980) defined Just World Beliefs as a set of values that people use to justify and rationalize the world around them. The greater one's belief in a just world, the more likely they will believe that people get what they deserve in life and that overall, the world is a just place.

² Participants' authoritarianism scores were based on their responses (coded 1 – 7) to 30 questionnaire items. A possible 30 points were rendered if participants marked '1' for

4. How do men perceive sex crime offenders compared to women on the basis of crime setting, offender authority status, and victim gender?

Following from previous research and the current research questions, three primary hypotheses were tested in the current study:

1. Authoritarian participants will be less punitive toward authority offenders than peer offenders (Adorno, 1950). Due to the pro-authority nature of authoritarian attitudes, the authoritarians will be more lenient with regard to attributing a formal charge to authority offenders as opposed to peer offenders.
2. Male participants will perceive male victims of sexual assault less harshly than female victims of sexual assault. Female participants will be less likely to perceive female victims of sexual assault negatively than male victims (Judson et al. 2013; Furnham & Boston, 2008).
3. High authoritarians will be more sympathetic with regard to overall perceptions of victims in a societal setting as opposed to a prison setting. Because authoritarian individuals condemn law-breaking individuals, it follows that victims who are in prison will be perceived as law breaking and individuals in society will be viewed as law-abiding (Adorno, 1950). Law-abiding individuals are viewed more favorably amongst high authoritarians, and this phenomenon should translate into perceptions of victims in the differing settings.

CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

Participants and Design

Participants were comprised of a sample from the UNLV CRJ 104 Subject Pool. As part of a requirement of their CRJ 104 course, students participated in research studies and/or research papers to complete this requirement. Students participated in a between-subjects design where they were randomly assigned to one of seven conditions. Independent variables included setting of the offense (prison or a university), the victim's gender (male or female), and the authority status of the offender (authority or no authority). The primary dependent measure was participants' perceptions of both the offender and the victim in the scenarios.

Five participants were dropped from the study because of research assistant error with labeling materials. Materials were unable to be matched by the research assistant after the experiment concluded. The final sample of 225 students consisted of 108 males and 117 females ranging from ages 18 to 51.

Measures and Procedure

Participants were welcomed into the UNLV Criminal Justice laboratory where they were told a cover story about the interaction between "personality factors and perceptions of institutional interactions". They were told that all responses were confidential and anonymous. They then completed a consent form and were asked by the research assistant to complete their materials in a cubicle of their choice to ensure privacy. The study was conducted in a double-blind manner.

Participants were approached by the research assistant on an individual basis and were presented with a manila envelope containing two surveys: the Authoritarianism Survey (Altemeyer, 1988) covered as the “Social Issues Survey” to gauge their level of authoritarianism and the Just World Belief Scale (Lerner, 1980) to gauge participants’ level of belief in a just world (further identifying their level of authoritarianism). The reliability and validity of both measures has been tested and supported throughout the academic literature by Dalbert (2009), Heaven and Connors (2001), Connors and Heaven (1987) and Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford (1950).

When completing the Authoritarianism Survey, participants were asked to respond to 30 statements on a scale of 1 (very strongly disagree) and 7 (very strongly agree). Two examples of questions from the Authoritarian Survey include the following: “It is always better to trust the judgment of the proper authorities in government and religion than to listen to the noisy rebel-rousers in our society, who are trying to create doubt in people's minds” and “Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn” (see Appendix A for a complete list of items).

When completing the Just World Belief Scale, participants were asked to respond to 20 statements on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Two examples of questions from the Just World Belief Scale include the following: “By and large, people deserve what they get” and “Good deeds often go unnoticed and unrewarded” (see Appendix B for a complete list of items).

Once participants completed these surveys, the research assistants collected the first set of materials and presented participants another manila envelope (to ensure the study was double-blind) containing a hypothetical vignette of rape where setting (prison

vs. university), offender's authority status (high vs. low), and victim gender (male vs. female) were manipulated. The offender's gender was kept constant (male).

Participants were randomly assigned to one of seven possible conditions, where they read the manipulated vignette (manipulations highlighted in bold):

Taylor Johnson, a 22 year old (**male/female**), is a (**junior/inmate**) at the (**University of North Brook/North Brook Correctional Institution**). Taylor is enrolled in a writing class with (**Professor/Officer**) Steve Davis as a requirement for (**his/her**) program. On March 13th, 2013, Taylor was approached by (**Professor/Officer/Steve**) Davis and was asked to meet (**Professor/Officer/Steve**) Davis in a classroom located in a remote area of the institution. Taylor agreed and arrived at the classroom around 3:15pm. (**Professor/Officer/Steve**) Davis initially told Taylor that he wanted to talk about how (**he/she**) was doing in the writing course. When Taylor arrived, Steve Davis shut and locked the door behind (**him/her**). The (**professor/officer/student/inmate**) explained that discussing (**his/her**) progress in the course would be done best in a private setting. (**Professor/Officer/Steve**) Davis then asked Taylor to have a seat at the nearby table.

(**Professor/Officer/Steve**) Davis and Taylor Johnson discussed the difficulties Taylor was having with the course material and if (**he/she**) needed help with the course. Taylor expressed that (**he/she**) wanted help with the material. After talking for approximately ten minutes, Steve Davis concluded by letting Taylor know that the only way (**he/she**) could get help and guarantee successful completion in the course was if (**he/she**) did what (**Professor/Officer/Steve**) Davis wanted (**him/her**) to first. (**Professor/Officer/Steve**) Davis grabbed Taylor and forced (**him/her**) over the table. (**Professor/Officer/Steve**) Davis held Taylor down and forced (**him/her**) to have sex with him. (**Professor/Officer/Steve**) Davis told Taylor that if (**he/she**) wanted to successfully complete the course, (**he/she**) wouldn't say anything about the incident. Taylor left the classroom very upset, but did not tell anyone what happened with (**Professor/Officer/Steve**) Davis.

One condition (prison setting, peer offender, female victim) was removed due to a lack of realism because of the context that was produced by a male peer offender in a female correctional institution. There would not be a situation where a male peer (inmate) offender and female victim would be housed in the same correctional facility. As

discussed previously, participants were faced with one of seven hypothetical scenarios.

These scenarios included the following combinations of conditions:

CONDITION #1: Societal Rape, Authority Offender, Female Victim

CONDITION #2: Societal Rape, Authority Offender, Male Victim

CONDITION #3: Societal Rape, Peer Offender, Female Victim

CONDITION #4: Societal Rape, Peer Offender, Male Victim

CONDITION #5: Prison Rape, Authority Offender, Female Victim

CONDITION #6: Prison Rape, Authority Offender, Male Victim

CONDITION #7: Prison Rape, Peer Offender, Male Victim

Once participants finished reading the vignette, the research assistant then collected the envelope with the vignette inside and provided the final set of materials in a manila envelope that were labeled with a unique participant number that was not traceable to the participant's identity. The final set of materials included the final survey and a demographic questionnaire.

The final survey (see Appendix C for a complete list of items) included questions about perceptions of the offender and the victim. With regard to attitudes toward the offenders, participants were asked (in multiple ways) whether the offender should face a criminal charge for their actions. They were also asked questions about the offender's legitimacy (regarding authority status) and further questions about their perception of the offender. The victim attitudes portion of the survey consisted of questions regarding the victim's fault in the hypothetical rape incident (gauging rape myth beliefs and victim blaming beliefs), the victim's legitimacy (regarding authority status and right to be protected under the law) and other perception questions about the victim. Participants responded to those questions using a Likert scale ranging from 1 (weak beliefs) and 7 (strong beliefs). The endpoints differed based upon the questions asked as exemplified in the examples provided.

The demographic questionnaire (see Appendix D for a complete list of items) contained items about the participant. Along with questions about the participant's gender, race, religious and political affiliations, participants were also asked about law enforcement and military affiliation (with regard to exposure to authoritarian belief systems), the demographic questionnaire also incorporated various questions regarding participants' victimization experiences from the Revised Conflict Tactic Scale (CTS-2).

Participants were asked to come out of the cubicle when they were finished and to place their materials in a drop box to ensure the participants' confidentiality and anonymity. All participants were debriefed, thanked and provided a signed credit receipt attached to a victim resource sheet. The victim resource sheet contained resources on the UNLV campus that are available to students, days and times that the services are available, and contact information. Participants were advised that victimization could be reported anonymously. Students were then dismissed from the lab.

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Sample Demographics

A sample of 225 participants ranged from ages 18 to 51, with an average age of 21 years old. A total of 108 (48%) participants were male and 117 (52%) participants were female. The sample's racial diversity was represented as 36% Caucasian, 22% Hispanic/Latino, and 12% Asian, with African American, Pacific Islander, and "Other" falling under 15% of the total sample. Participants who were categorized as low authoritarian represented 34% of the sample, medium authoritarian participants, 34%, and high authoritarians, 33%. Within the sample, 47% of participants reported being a victim of crime at some point in their life. Amongst the entire sample, 8% of participants had been threatened verbally with sexual violence, 12% reported having sex with someone when they did not want to, and 6% reported being forced to have sex with another person against their will.

Scenario Detail Question

Participants were asked to identify where the assault in the vignette took place (aside from prison or university), with options of apartment (n = 2, 1%), closet (n = 1, 0.4%), laundry room (n = 0), bathroom (n = 1, 0.4%), classroom (n = 165, 73%), or office (n = 56, 24%). The assault took place in a classroom (regardless of condition), however, only 73% of participants identified the correct location of the assault. Although 24% of the sample selected the incorrect assault location, this may be explained by the context of the vignette. For many participants, the offender of the assault was an authority figure. Because professors and prison guards tend to be associated with an office as a result of

their authority status, it may be the case that participants were identifying the location of the assault with the offender. Further, because the vignette was collected from the participant before completing the final survey, it would follow that participants associate the location of the office with the authority status of the offender.

Manipulation Check Questions

Participants were asked two manipulation check questions regarding the victim's gender and the aggressor's role in their assigned scenario. For the manipulation check regarding victim's gender, approximately 96% of the sample correctly identified the gender of the victim. The second manipulation check question indicated that some participants were incorrectly identifying the role of the aggressor, such that 79% correctly identified the aggressor in their assigned condition, while 21% incorrectly identified the role of the aggressor. While this large minority of participants may have incorrectly identified one manipulation, all participants were kept in the sample because of the trend in incorrect responses. Many participants (approximately 20%) incorrectly identified the aggressor as a professor. Because of this trend, it is possible that the context of the scenario (taking place as a teacher/student relationship in a writing class with an assault happening in a classroom) may have lead participants to believe that the scenario reflected this professor/student relationship, regardless of the university/prison setting condition. Considering the largely correct identification of the hypothetical victim's gender, all participants were kept in the sample for analyses.

Main Effects and Significant Interactions

The main dependent variables of interest were attribution of responsibility unto the victim in the hypothetical scenario, perception of expected reporting behavior on

behalf of the victim, participants' perceived seriousness of the crime, and participants' likelihood to attribute a formal criminal charge to the offender. A one-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) (see Appendix E for a complete list of items) was conducted on each of the four dependent measures by the four primary independent variables (offense setting, offender authority status, victim gender, and level of authoritarianism). The participant's gender and victim status were considered covariates in the analysis. For analysis purposes, participants were divided into three groups based on overall authoritarian scores of 30 – 210². Approximate calculated scores are indicated as follows: low authoritarians (48 – 104), medium authoritarians (105 - 120), and high authoritarians (121 - 173).

Participants' Perception of Victim Responsibility

The ANCOVA on victim responsibility indicated a significant main effect (as shown in Table 1) for participant's level of authoritarianism [$F(2, 202) = 3.56, p < .05$]. A comparison of the means revealed a greater likelihood for high authoritarians to attribute responsibility to the victim of the assault ($M = 2.38$) than low authoritarians ($M = 1.74$).

Another statistically significant main effect on victim responsibility is the authority status of the offender [$F(1, 202) = 5.75, p < .05$]. Participants were more likely to attribute greater responsibility to the victim of the assault when the offender was a peer ($M = 2.37$) as opposed to an authority figure ($M = 1.8$). Finally, an interaction effect that

² Participants' authoritarianism scores were based on their responses (coded 1 – 7) to 30 questionnaire items. A possible 30 points were rendered if participants marked '1' for each item, a possible 210 points were rendered if participants marked 7 for each item. Some items were reverse-coded for purposes of inverse meanings. This was considered in the authoritarian score calculation process.

approached significance was found for participant's level of authoritarianism and the authority status of the offender [$F(2, 202) = 2.16, p = .12$]. As shown in Table 1, as authoritarianism of the participant increased, so did attributions of responsibility. The effect of authoritarianism was far stronger for peer offenders than authority offenders, such that high authoritarians ($M = 3.07$) attributed more responsibility to the victim assaulted by a peer than low authoritarian participants ($M = 1.82$).

Table 1. Effects of level of authoritarianism and authority status of offender on attribution of victim responsibility.

Level of Authoritarianism	N	<u>Attribution of Responsibility</u>		
		Authority Offender	N	Peer Offender
Low	44	1.67 (.23)	32	1.82 (.27)
Medium	48	1.84 (.22)	28	2.20 (.28)
High	39	1.87 (.24)	34	3.07 (.27)

Means are identified with standard error in parentheses.
Higher means indicate greater attribution of responsibility.

Participants' Perception of Expected Reporting Behavior

The ANCOVA on participants' expected reporting behavior yielded a statistically significant main effect for setting of the offense [$F(1, 202) = 5.95, p < .05$]. A comparison of means indicates that participants had stronger beliefs that victims in the university condition should report the offense ($M = 6.91$) than victims in the prison condition ($M = 6.64$). The impact of participant's gender on reporting behavior approached statistical significance [$F(1, 202) = 3.71, p = .056$], indicating that participants had stronger beliefs that female victims should report the assault ($M = 6.92$) than male victims ($M = 6.7$).

A marginally significant interaction emerged for setting of the offense and the victim's gender (see Table 2) [$F(1, 202) = 2.75, p = .099$]. A comparison of means indicates that participants had a greater expectation about male victims in the university setting ($M = 6.90$) reporting the incident than male victims in the prison setting reporting the assault ($M = 6.49$). Participants indicated a high expectation of female victims reporting the offense, regardless of setting. Participants indicated that female victims in the prison setting ($M = 6.93$) and female victims in the university setting ($M = 6.92$) should report the incident.

Table 2. Effects of offense setting and victim's gender on participants' expectation of reporting behavior.

Setting of Offense	Expectation of Reporting Behavior			
	N	Male Victim	N	Female Victim
Prison	61	6.49 (.09)	29	6.93 (.13)
University	65	6.90 (.08)	70	6.92 (.08)

Means are identified with standard error in parentheses.
Higher means indicate greater expectation of victims reporting the offense.

An ANOVA on the expectation of reporting behavior dependent variable yielded a statistically significant main effect for gender of the participant [$F(1, 221) = 4.09, p < .05$]. Mean comparisons indicate that female participants generally had a greater expectation of victim's reporting behavior ($M = 6.91$) than male participants ($M = 6.73$). The gender of the victim also had a statistically significant main effect on expectations of reporting the assault [$F(1, 221) = 4.09, p < .05$]. A comparison of the group means indicate that participants had stronger beliefs about female victims reporting the assault

($M = 6.91$) than male victims ($M = 6.73$). No other significant main effects or interactions emerged.

Perceived Seriousness of the Offense

An ANCOVA on perceived seriousness of the assault rendered a marginally significant main effect for authority status of the offender [$F(1, 202) = 3.27, p = .072$]. A comparison of group means indicates that participants perceived the assault as more serious when the victim was assaulted by an authority figure ($M = 6.83$) as opposed to a peer offender ($M = 6.65$). No other significant main effects or interactions were found for perceptions of seriousness of the offense.

Attribution of Formal Criminal Charge to the Offender

Although not statistically significant, the ANCOVA results for attributions of formal charges reveal some evidence of a two-way interaction between participants' level of authoritarianism and setting of the offense [$F(2, 202) = 2.14, p = .121$]. As shown in Table 3, high authoritarians had stronger beliefs about the offender receiving a formal charge if they were in a university setting ($M = 6.87$) as opposed to a prison setting ($M = 6.39$). However, the opposite trend emerged for low authoritarians (i.e. low authoritarians had stronger beliefs about an offender receiving a formal charge when the assault happened in a prison [$M = 6.84$] as opposed to a university [$M = 6.69$]).

Table 3. Effects of level of authoritarianism and setting of offense on attribution of a formal charge to the offender.

Level of Authoritarianism	N	Attribution of Formal Charge		
		Prison Setting	N	University Setting
Low	33	6.84 (.15)	43	6.69 (.13)
Medium	30	6.83 (.16)	46	6.90 (.13)
High	27	6.39 (.17)	46	6.87 (.13)

Means are identified with standard error in parentheses.

Higher means indicate stronger beliefs about the offender receiving a formal criminal charge.

Although not statistically significant at conventional levels (i.e. $p < .05$), there is also some evidence of a two-way interaction effect of setting of the offense and the victim's gender on attributions of formal charges [$F(1, 202) = 2.57, p = .111$]. As shown in Table 4, participants had stronger beliefs about the offender receiving a formal criminal charge when the victim was a male university student ($M = 6.87$) as opposed to a male prison inmate ($M = 6.54$). Interestingly, participants generally had stronger beliefs about offenders receiving a formal charge when the victim was a female inmate ($M = 6.98$) as opposed to a female college student ($M = 6.78$).

Table 4. Effects of victim's gender and setting of offense on attribution of a formal charge to the offender.

Victim's Gender	<u>Attribution of Formal Charge</u>			
	N	Prison Setting	N	University Setting
Male	44	6.53 (.11)	64	6.87 (.11)
Female	46	6.98 (.16)	71	6.78 (.11)

Means are identified with standard error in parentheses.

Higher means indicate stronger beliefs about the offender receiving a formal criminal charge.

CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION

Findings

This study was conducted to understand how characteristics of victims and offenders influence individuals' perceptions of sexual assault scenarios. Specifically, this study examined perceptions of victims, offenders, and sexual assault in institutional settings with reference to the offender's authority status and the victim's gender. Further, this study aimed to examine authoritarian attitudes toward victim blaming and attribution of responsibility to the victim, beliefs about the victim's expected reporting behavior, and the overall seriousness of the offense. The findings of the current study reflect how context of situations matter in how individuals are perceived by others. Authoritarianism, gender of participants and victims, authority status of offenders, and offense setting impact how victims are perceived. These findings are discussed below, cross-referenced with the initial hypothesized outcomes and corresponding literature review.

It was hypothesized, based on Adorno et al.'s (1950) identification of the authoritarian personality, that high authoritarian participants would be less likely to attribute a formal charge to authority offenders than low authoritarian participants. This hypothesis was intended to test the attribution of the offender's responsibility as opposed to the victim's responsibility. The results of the current study are consistent with previous research (Feather, 2006; Feather, 1996) in that high authoritarians as opposed to low authoritarians were generally more likely to attribute responsibility to the victim for the assault, regardless of the authority status of the offender.

Supplementing the implications of this finding, participants generally felt that the assault was more serious when the offender was an authority figure as opposed to a peer; however, there is evidence to suggest that high authoritarians were more likely to attribute a formal charge unto an offender within the university setting as opposed to the prison setting. Low authoritarians had stronger beliefs about the offender receiving a formal charge in the prison setting as opposed to the university setting. This finding suggests that, while participants' level of authoritarianism appears to impact their perception of the victim, level of authoritarianism only impacted participants' perception of offenders when discussed in terms of the offense setting. This could reflect high authoritarians' underlying beliefs about power dynamics and that, when in a university setting, high authoritarians perceive abuse of power as worse than abuse of power in correctional settings – perhaps because of the “law-breaking” nature of the victims in the correctional setting. It may also be possible, however, that because of participants' immediate experience with the college setting (as a college student sample), high authoritarians are defensively attributing more responsibility unto the authority figure in the university condition (Shaver, 1970). Considering that low authoritarians' beliefs are stronger regarding offenders in the prison setting receiving a formal charge as opposed to the university setting, this finding may reflect less victim-blaming practices and greater recognition of risk for abuse of power in the correctional institution.

A second expected finding is that male participants would perceive male victims of sexual assault less harshly than female victims of sexual assault. In addition to this, it was further hypothesized that female participants would be less likely to negatively perceive female victims of sexual assault as opposed to male victims. Statistically

significant main effects indicated that participants generally had stronger beliefs that female victims as opposed to male victims should report their victimization, regardless of offense setting and authority status of the offender. Interestingly, female participants indicated stronger beliefs about reporting than male participants, suggesting that reporting behavior was more important to female participants than male participants. This may be a function of empathetic emotion and relating to the “victim” identity (Judson et al., 2013).

Once offense setting was taken into consideration, a marginally significant finding indicated that participants had stronger beliefs about female inmates, male students, and female students reporting their victimization than male victims in the prison setting. Interestingly, this finding reflects possible gender stereotyping and may reflect the stereotypical perception of a popularized “prison rape” scenario (Yamawaki, 2007; Polimeni, Hardie & Buzwell, 2000). Stereotypical beliefs about men suggest that they should be superior to and stronger than women, and that admitting sexual victimization may compromise this strength. Homophobic reactions, along with gender stereotypes, may have influenced this finding as well (Yamawaki, 2007; Polimeni, Hardie & Buzwell, 2000).

It was also hypothesized that high authoritarians would be more sympathetic with regard to overall perceptions of victims in the societal setting as opposed to the prison setting. This hypothesis was supported by high authoritarians’ indication that victims in the university condition should report their assault to authorities and that the offender in the university setting should be formally charged. Again, this finding may reflect participants’ direct and immediate experience with the university condition. High

authoritarian participants may be defensively attributing more responsibility to the authority figure in the university setting because of their personal similarity to the offender and victim (Shaver, 1970).

Limitations

As true of many studies, there are several limitations associated with the current study that restrict its substantive conclusions. Several of these limitations involve concerns about limited external and ecological validity due to the artificial laboratory setting. Because college students and correctional officers are substantively different populations, generalizing the perceptions of authoritarian college students may not accurately represent the perceptions of authoritarian correctional officers. Also, because the student sample may have had more direct experience with the university setting (comparison group) as opposed to the prison setting (experimental), students may have been more aware of and familiar with the university culture than the prison culture. Again, this may jeopardize the ecological validity of the study.

The scenario may have also been too salient or unambiguous to render many significant effects. It is important to note that the participants rated all sexual assault scenarios similarly, regardless of setting and victim/offender attributes. Due to the seriousness attributed to the scenarios, the vignette descriptions may have been so direct and unambiguous that they nullified the magnitude and statistical significance of some of the observed effects. In future research, the scenario descriptions should be changed to reflect a more ambiguous sexual assault, or types of assault as a separate manipulation altogether. Making this change would allow for analysis regarding perceptions of differing assaults and their impact across the other observed variable interactions.

Further, the consensual nature of the offense was somewhat ambiguous as well, reflecting a more realistic portrayal of sexual assaults that may occur in institutional settings. Future research may also consider the different perceptions associated with coerced (non-forced) sex and physically forced sex combined with offense setting and victim's gender. This inquiry may render different results with regard to perceptions of victims and offenders.

Questions in the final survey should be revisited to strengthen the internal validity of the results. While questions regarding reporting and attributions of responsibility seemed to be direct, previous literature suggests that use of terms such as "blame" and "responsibility" should not be used interchangeably (Rye, Greatrix, & Enright, 2006; Jensen & Gutek, 1982). Asking questions to clearly differentiate between perceptions of these concepts would be useful for comprehensively understanding attributions toward victims. In addition to these items, more items relating to the overall perceptions of offenders should be analyzed for a more complete understanding not only of authority status, but also the acceptability of the offender's actions and their perceived authority status as opposed to strict conditional assignment.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

Considering the results of the current study, it is important to note many of the findings regarding perceptions of victims and offenders of sexual assaults. The current study reflected a general belief pattern that assaults in the university setting were perceived as more serious and more report-worthy than assaults in the prison setting. This is problematic for prison policy implementation. The Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 is intended to protect inmates from sexual assaults; however, the individuals perceiving victims of sexual assault (often of a highly authoritarian nature) do not necessarily perceive the assaulted inmates as victims (Cornahan & MacFarland, 2007). Gender stereotypes and popularized notions of what “prison rape” looks like may contribute to the differences in attributions of responsibility. PREA does not consider these perceptions, and further, misunderstands the concepts of victimization, coercion, power dynamics, gender differences amongst inmates, and limitations in reporting victimization in highly stratified institutions like prisons.

Critique of the Prison Rape Elimination Act

The Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 has various deficits that limit its overall execution and effectiveness. The previous literature highlights why perceptions of victims and offenders are important, and thus, illustrate where the limitations of PREA exist. The following section will articulate, in particular, deficits in the policy intended to address sexual victimization in prisons.

1) Assumption of Demographic Neutrality

A primary limitation of PREA is the assumption that all inmates' experiences are similar. This lack of distinction between unique groups and populations limits not only the effectiveness of the federal policy, but also the comprehensive analysis needed in the academic literature. Various demographic characters, such as inmate gender, sex, age, correctional setting type (police custody, mental health facility, jail, prison, etc.), correctional location (state/federal, rural/urban), and the interplay of all factors combined influence the unique factors that construct the confinement culture. While confinement, as an idea, is easily generalizable, the differing demographic characteristics within each facility/element of confinement make demographic-neutral policies such as PREA difficult to consistently and effectively enforce. This also facilitates the use of inherent biases within the application/enforcement process. With further training, biases derived from the individuals enforcing the policy based on sexism, homophobia, age, mental health status, etc. may not be so heavily emphasized.

2) PREA Training: Understanding Who is Protected and the Role of Staff Enforcement

While identifying sexual acts in correctional settings might seem simple, the definitions established by PREA mystify who is under the protection of PREA, how PREA is to be implemented, and how those implementing the policy should address issues of sexual violence. Training for "confinement" staff is not standardized by the federal policy, and allows states to determine the extent of said training and how often training takes place. Training is required to happen "periodically" (117 STAT. 976), which can be interpreted in a vast number of ways. Training may or may not discuss psychological consequences of sexual victimization, differences in exhibiting and

manifesting signs of victimization based on gender and age differences, and what it means for individuals in a temporary or permanent confined setting to develop a victim identity – all essential components of enforcing the federally-mandated “prevention, investigation, and punishment of prison rape” on behalf of correctional staff (117 STAT. 976).

Staff accountability is also inconsistently defined and enforced. According to PREA language, correctional staff are required to actively “prevent, investigate, and punish” those who engage in prison rape. While identifying blatant physical assaults might seem obvious, understanding cultural differences, namely between men’s and women’s prisons, would increase the likelihood of identifying coerced physical assaults and consensual sex acts. Without proper training, it may be difficult for correctional officers to identify said actions, and thus, difficult to enforce the correctional staff accountability standards of “deliberate indifference to the substantial risk of sexual assault” (PREA, 2003).

3) Federal Expectations and State Influence

PREA excuses custodial, medical, and health care personnel from actions considered sexually inappropriate (such as fondling or penetrating an inmate’s physical body for medical purposes). While this verbiage is noted in the federal policy, state policy can amend this language by adding clauses that somewhat change the original intention of the federal policy. For example, Nevada state law only defines voluntary sexual conduct in prisons and does not address involuntary sexual conduct. Interestingly, inmates cannot technically “consent” to sexual conduct while incarcerated due to prison policies, and because Nevada law does not distinguish between consensual and coerced

sex, this creates a great amount of discretion on behalf of the correctional officers administering disciplinary action in these cases.

The NRS 212.187 statute further notes that “[voluntary sexual conduct] does not include acts of a person who has custody of a prisoner or an employee of the institution in which the prisoner is confined that are performed to carry out the necessary duties of such a person or employee.” This is language present in Nevada law, but not PREA. Although the intent of the statute appears to condemn correctional staff from committing these voluntary acts with inmates and protect them from allegations of sexual abuse, this verbiage opens a metaphorical door for abuse of power and misconduct. This is an issue primarily in women’s prisons.

4) Bureau of Justice Statistics Sampling and Data Collection

PREA federally mandates the Bureau of Justice Statistics conduct an annual research project on the prevalence of prison rape in the United States. The mandated research methodology specifies that a “random sample of no less than 10% of all federal, state, and county prisons, and a representative sample of municipal prisons” (117 STAT. 975) must be surveyed every year to gauge who is being victimized and the rate at which victimization is occurring.

Based on the PREA definition of “prison”, a representative sample of surveyed facilities must include secured mental health facilities and juvenile care facilities (not necessarily secured, correctional facilities). Based on this idea, BJS should include these entities in their sampling frame, yet BJS only openly reports statistics on prisons and jails. This phenomenon suggests an inconsistency regarding which facilities are to be surveyed and how the dissonance between definitions may skew the annual report.

Secondly, the likelihood of reporting any type of crime, especially personal crimes such as sexual assaults, is a general limitation of research (Wong & Van de Schoot, 2012; Fitzgerald, Swan & Fischer, 1995; Jensen & Gutek, 1982). Considering this, and combining this idea with the unique cultures in men's and women's prisons, many inmates will never report their victimization due to fear of retaliation from the perpetrator (i.e. another inmate or an authority figure) or fear of further targeting (Wong & Van de Schoot, 2012; Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 2002). The language of PREA and the methodology of the BJS assume inmates' willingness to report. BJS addresses this issue in their annual reports by suggesting that individuals who do not report and individuals who over report will 'balance out' so to say –overall, providing a somewhat accurate prevalence rate of sexual victimization in prisons. This is a highly problematic assumption; BJS researchers are essentially speculating that there are an equal number of individuals not reporting and over-reporting, and that these instances explain substantively similar phenomena - potentially skewing the annual results.

Future Research Directions

Because previous research has assessed perceptions of victims and offenders in terms of singular characteristics, it is important to recognize that the current study discusses the interactions of gender (participant and hypothetical victim), setting of offense, and perceivers' levels of authoritarianism. Future research might explore the perceptions of individuals based on high risk factors for sexual assault in the prison setting (i.e. sexual orientation, sexual identity, gender identity, etc.). This may shed light on perceptions of not only men and women as victims and offenders, but also individuals that identify as transgender, agender, intergender, etc. Further, future research might

explore these factors while incorporating authoritarian perceptions of these groups. This, in turn, may expand the understanding of demographic characteristics, like sexual and gender identity, as more continuous rather than dichotomous variables.

Further research is needed in the area of correctional policy, correctional officer training, and real-world perceptions of inmates who have been victimized. While a limitation of the current study is its artificiality, follow-up research might explore the perceptions of correctional officers and inmates with regard to sexual assault. This would provide stronger external and ecological validity while providing evidence of policy and training effectiveness, or lack thereof.

An additional direction for future research would include exploring the similarities and differences amongst similar institutionalized cultures, such as the prison, police, military, and educational cultures. While these cultures may have different purposes, the institutional attitudes and functionality may overlap in various areas – especially with regard to authoritarianism. Sexual victimization in these cultures, as shown in the current project, may be perceived differently based upon the institution. These comparisons and contrasts may articulate a more modern version of Goffman’s idea of institutionalization – that while some institutions are condemned in American society, others are glorified. These differing institutional frameworks should be examined, and cross-referenced, for a more complete understanding of institutionalization.

Summary

While PREA research methodology is not perfect, PREA does attempt to shed light on the severity of sexual assaults in U.S. correctional facilities. Although academic

literature is, for the most part, unable to identify effective PREA programs versus ineffective programs, the current research project suggests that perceptions of victims and offenders is important when considering sexual assault policy implementation. PREA must be amended to consider the impact of correctional officer training and how authoritarian attitudes may interfere with effective policy implementation.

Based on the findings within the current project, it is clear that perceptions of offenders and victims differ based on demographic and situational characteristics. Keeping this in mind, it is important to note that while PREA appears to apply to all “confined” individuals equally, many inmates are not protected by the federal policy and live within a reality of fear and withdrawal because of this lack of protection. Sexual victimization in institutionalized settings renders severe physical and psychological consequences, and while the prison culture perpetuates such phenomena, this should be neither the expectation nor the standard of the U.S. correctional system. These ideas should be further explored and documented.

Future research should focus heavily on not only male and female groups, but groups that may not clearly fit into dichotomous categories. These groups should be studied in the field to gain more generalizable information about correctional officer perceptions and inmates’ experiences. Further, future research should examine correctional officer perceptions of sexual assaults more closely with regard to enforcing policies. Focusing on conducting research that speaks not only to attitudes of certain groups, but also the behavior that follows from those attitudes is needed with regard to correctional officer treatment of sex crime victims in prison. This would, in turn, inform correctional policy and reinforce the need for extensive correctional officer training.

Policy implications to be derived from this research include amendments to current PREA language implementing training and education standards for correctional staff. Staff should be educated about gender differences in the prison environment, psychological consequences of imprisonment, what it means to identify as a victim – especially in an environment such as prison. Further, acknowledging gender differences in correctional staff training regarding the likelihood of abusive histories, familial relationships, and the psychological consequences of victimization, may help correctional staff better understand the inmate culture and incidents of sexual abuse in prisons.

More comprehensive and consistent training for correctional staff would ultimately facilitate greater access to justice for sexually victimized inmates. The standard of U.S. incarceration should not encompass fear of victimization while being incarcerated. Considering rates and types of victimization in U.S. prisons (Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 2006), training correctional officers to recognize signs of sexual coercion, victimization, and how these phenomena occur may provide a more complete understanding of the issue and a safer environment for inmates.

While the impact of such assaults may appear limited to the prison environment, many inmates will inevitably be returned to the community. Sexual victimization in men and women's prisons ultimately impacts the community on multiple levels; Public health and mental health are compromised by the victimization of inmates in the U.S. prison system (Freudenberg, 2001). Many of these individuals with experiences of sexual victimization while incarcerated will return to the community with various physical and psychological ailments – compromising the likelihood of success during the re-entry process and the well-being of the community. Sexual victimization in U.S. prisons is a

critical area of research, with implications impacting the prison culture, our incarcerated population, and the community at large.

APPENDIX A

Authoritarianism (Social Issues) Survey

This survey measures general public opinion concerning a variety of social issues. You will probably find that you agree with some of the statements and disagree with others, to varying extents. Please indicate your reaction according to the following scale:

Write the number in the space provided next to each question:

- | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1 if you very strongly disagree | 5 if you slightly agree |
| 2 if you strongly disagree | 6 if you strongly agree |
| 3 if you slightly disagree | 7 if you very strongly agree |
| 4 if you feel you are undecided | |

1. _____ The way things are going in this country, it's going to take a lot of "strong medicine" to straighten out the troublemakers, criminals, and perverts.
2. _____ It is wonderful that young people today have greater freedom to protest against things they don't like and to "do their own thing."
3. _____ It is always a better to trust the judgment of the proper authorities in government and religion than to listen to the noisy rebel-rousers in our society, who are trying to create doubt in people's minds.
4. _____ People should pay less attention to the Bible and other old traditional forms of religious guidance, and instead develop their own personal standards of what is moral and immoral.
5. _____ It would be best for everyone if the proper authorities censored magazines and movies, and the internet, to keep trashy material away from the youth.
6. _____ It may be considered old-fashioned by some, but having a decent, respectable appearance is still the mark of a gentleman, and especially a lady.
7. _____ The sooner we get rid of the traditional family structure where the father is the head of the family and the children are taught to obey authority automatically, the better. The old-fashioned way has a lot wrong with it.
8. _____ There is nothing wrong with premarital sexual intercourse.
9. _____ The facts on crime, sexual immorality, and the recent public disorders show we have to crack down harder on deviant groups and troublemakers if we are going to save our moral standards and preserve law and order.
10. _____ There is nothing sick or immoral in somebody's being a homosexual.

11. _____ It is important to protect fully the rights of radicals and deviants.
12. _____ Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
13. _____ Rules about being "well-mannered" and respectable are chains from the past, which we should question very thoroughly before accepting.
14. _____ Everyone has a right to his/her own life-style, religious beliefs, and sexual preferences, so long as it doesn't hurt others.
15. _____ "Free speech" means that people should even be allowed to make speeches and write books urging the overthrow of the government.
16. _____ Some of the worst people in our country nowadays are those who do not respect our flag, our leaders, and the normal way things are supposed to be done.
17. _____ In these troubled times laws have to be enforced without mercy, especially when dealing with the agitators and revolutionaries who are stirring things up.
18. _____ Atheists and others who have rebelled against the established religions are no doubt every bit as good as virtuous as those who attend church regularly.
19. _____ Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.
20. _____ The self-righteous "forces of law and order" threaten freedom in our country a lot more than most of the groups they claim are "radical" and "godless."
21. _____ The courts are right in being easy on drug users. Punishment would not do any good in cases like these.
22. _____ If a child starts becoming unconventional and disrespectful of authority, it is his parents' duty to get him back to the normal way.
23. _____ In the final analysis, the established authorities, like parents and our national leaders, generally turn out to be right about things, and all the protesters don't know what they're talking about.
24. _____ A lot of our rules regarding modesty and sexual behavior are just customs which are not necessarily any better or holier than those which other people follow.
25. _____ There is absolutely nothing wrong with nudist camps.
26. _____ The real keys to the "good life" are obedience, discipline, and sticking to the straight and narrow.

27. _____ It is best to treat dissenters with leniency and an open mind, since new ideas are the lifeblood of progressive change.
28. _____ The biggest threat to our freedom comes from those who are out to destroy religion, ridicule patriotism, corrupt the youth, and in general undermine our whole way of life.
29. _____ Students in high school and university must be encouraged to challenge their parents' way, confront established authorities, and in general criticize the customs and traditions of society.
30. _____ One reason we have so many troublemakers in our society nowadays is that parents and other authorities have forgotten that good old-fashioned physical punishment is still one of the best ways to make people behave properly.

APPENDIX B

Just World Beliefs (JWB) Scale

Below you will find a series of statements. Please read each statement carefully and indicate whether you agree or disagree with each statement using the following scale.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly disagree strongly agree

- _____ I've found that a person rarely deserves the reputation they have.
- _____ Basically, the world is a just place.
- _____ People who get "lucky breaks" have usually earned their good fortune.
- _____ Careful drivers are just as likely to get hurt in traffic accidents as careless ones.
- _____ It is a common occurrence for a guilty person to get off free in American courts.
- _____ Students almost always deserve the grades they receive in school.
- _____ People who keep in shape have little chance of suffering a heart attack.
- _____ The political candidate who sticks up for their principles rarely gets elected.
- _____ It is rare for an innocent person to be wrongly sent to jail.
- _____ In professional sports, many fouls and infractions never get called by the referee.
- _____ By and large, people deserve what they get.
- _____ When parents punish their children, it is almost always for good reasons.
- _____ Good deeds often go unnoticed and unrewarded.
- _____ Although evil people may hold political power for a while, in the general course of history, good wins out.
- _____ In almost any business or profession, people who do their job well rise to the top.
- _____ American parents tend to overlook the most to admirable qualities in children.
- _____ It is often impossible for a person to receive a fair trial in the United States.

_____ People who meet with misfortune have often brought it on themselves.

_____ Crime doesn't pay.

_____ Many people suffer through absolutely no fault of their own.

APPENDIX C

Final Survey

Please respond to the following items by circling the most appropriate answer.

1. Where did the assault take place?

Apartment Closet Laundry Room Bathroom Classroom Office

2. What was Taylor Johnson's gender?

Male Female

3. Who was the aggressor in the assault?

Pilot Professor Student Inmate Politician Guard

4. Do you believe Steve Davis should be formally charged with committing a crime?

Yes No

On a scale of 1-7, please respond to the following items by circling the most appropriate answer.

5. How serious was the assault that Steve Davis committed?

(Not serious at all) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Highly seriously)
(Neutral)

6. How emotionally harmed was Taylor Johnson?

(Not harmed at all) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Seriously harmed)
(Neutral)

7. How physically harmed was Taylor Johnson?

(Not harmed at all) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Seriously harmed)
(Neutral)

8. To what degree is the Taylor Johnson responsible for what happened?

(Not responsible at all) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Highly responsible)
(Neutral)

9. How acceptable were Steve Davis's actions?

(Not acceptable at all) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Highly acceptable)
(Neutral)

10. What level of authority does Steve Davis hold over Taylor Johnson?

(No authority at all) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (High authority)
(Neutral)

11. How likely is Taylor Johnson to contract a sexually transmitted disease?

(No likely at all) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Highly likely)
(Neutral)

12. Steve Davis committed a crime against Taylor Johnson.

(Strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Strongly Agree)
(Neutral)

13. Taylor Johnson is a victim of a crime.

(Strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Strongly Agree)
(Neutral)

14. Steve Davis should be formally charged with committing a crime against Taylor Johnson.

(Strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Strongly Agree)
(Neutral)

15. Taylor Johnson should report the incident to the proper authorities.

(Strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Strongly Agree)
(Neutral)

APPENDIX D

Demographic Questionnaire

The following questionnaire will ask questions about you and your personal experiences. You are free to skip any question you do not wish to answer.

1. Age: _____

2. Gender: M F

3. Race/Ethnicity:

- _____ Hispanic or Latino
- _____ Black or African American
- _____ Caucasian
- _____ Asian
- _____ American Indian
- _____ Alaskan Native
- _____ Pacific Islander
- _____ Other (please specify: _____)

4. Political Affiliation:

- _____ Democrat
- _____ Republican
- _____ Independent
- _____ Libertarian
- _____ Green Party
- _____ Other (please specify: _____)

5. Are you currently in a relationship? Yes No

5a. If yes, are you in a relationship with any of the following?
(circle all that apply)

- a. Fellow student
- b. Co-worker in a similar work-related position as you
- c. Someone in a position of authority over you (i.e. work supervisor, teacher, religious leader, etc.)
- d. A person who is older than you by 5 years or more
- e. None of the above categories apply

6. Are you affiliated with any branch of military?

Yes No

6a. If yes, which? _____

7. Is anyone in your immediate family affiliated with any branch of military?

Yes No

7a. If yes, which? _____

8. Are you affiliated with any branch of law enforcement?

Yes No

8a. If yes, which? _____

9. Is anyone in your immediate family affiliated with any branch of law enforcement?

Yes No

9a. If yes, which? _____

10. Have you ever spent time in prison?

Yes No

10a. If yes, how long? _____

11. Has anyone in your immediate family ever spent time in prison?

Yes No

11a. If yes, how long? _____

The following questions ask about sensitive personal information. You can skip any questions you do not wish to answer.

12. Have you ever been a victim of a crime?

Yes No

If yes, please identify the type of crime: _____

13. Have you ever been verbally threatened with sexual violence?

Yes No

14. Have you ever had sex with someone when you didn't want to?

Yes No

15. Have you ever been physically forced to have oral sex, anal sex or sexual intercourse?

Yes No

APPENDIX E

Main Effects

Dependent Variables	<u>Coding</u>	<u>Grand Means (N)</u>	Victim Responsibility	Victim Reporting	Seriousness of Offense	Formal Charge of Offender
Victim Responsibility	1 – 7	2.1 (224)	–	–	–	–
Victim Reporting	1 – 7	6.8 (224)	–	–	–	–
Seriousness of Offense	1 – 7	6.8 (224)	–	–	–	–
Formal Charge of Offender	1 – 7	6.8 (224)	–	–	–	–
Independent Variables	–	–	–	–	–	–
Setting	0 = Prison 1 = College	–	2.0 (.164) 2.2 (.127)	6.7 (.073) * 6.9 (.057) *	6.8 (.061) 6.7 (.047)	6.7 (.097) 6.8 (.075)
Authority Status of Offender	0 = Authority 1 = Peer	–	1.8 (.128) ** 2.4 (.160) **	6.9 (.057) 6.7 (.072)	6.8 (.048) * 6.7 (.060) *	6.8 (.075) 6.7 (.094)
Victim Gender	0 = Male 1 = Female	–	2.0 (.130) 2.2 (.157)	6.7 (.058) 6.8 (.071)	6.7 (.048) 6.8 (.059)	6.7 (.077) 6.8 (.093)
Low Authoritarianism	Score = 48 - 104	–	1.7 (.173) *	6.7 (.075)	6.8 (.065)	6.7 (.102)
Medium Authoritarianism	Score = 105 - 120	–	2.0 (.173) *	6.8 (.078)	6.8 (.065)	6.8 (.102)
High Authoritarianism	Score = 121 - 173	–	2.4 (.175) *	6.8 (.080)	6.7 (.065)	6.7 (.104)
Participant's Gender	0 = Male 1 = Female	–	2.2 (.145) 2.0 (.139)	6.7 (.065) * 6.9 (.062) *	6.8 (.054) 6.8 (.052)	6.8 (.086) 6.8 (.082)
Participant's Victim Status	0 = Yes 1 = No	–	1.9 (.147) 2.3 (.142)	6.7 (.066) 6.8 (.064)	6.8 (.055) 6.8 (.053)	6.7 (.087) 6.8 (.084)

* = ANCOVA of main effects statistically significant, $p < .05$

** = ANCOVA of main effects statistically significant, $p < .01$

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). The authoritarian personality.
- Altemeyer, B. (1996). *The authoritarian specter*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: London, England: Harvard University Press.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Posttraumatic stress disorder. Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders*. (4th ed.).
doi:10.1176/appi.books.9780890423349.
- Austin, J., & Irwin, J. (2012). *It's about time: America's imprisonment binge*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Begany, J. J., & Milburn, M. A. (2002). Psychological predictors of sexual harassment: Authoritarianism, hostile sexism, and rape myths. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 3(2), 119-126.
- Boxer, P., Middlemass, K., & Delorenzo, T. (2009). Exposure to violent crime during incarceration: effects on psychological adjustment following release. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36, 793-807.
- Carnahan, T., & McFarland, S. (2007). Revisiting the Stanford Prison Experiment: Could participant self-selection have led to the cruelty? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33(5), 603-614.
- Chapter 212: Offenses Relating to Prisons and Prisoners. (§) NRS 212.187. (2014).
- Chesney-Lind, M. (2006). Patriarchy, crime, and justice feminist criminology in an era of backlash. *Feminist Criminology*, 1(1), 6-26.
- Chesney-Lind, M., & Pasko, L. (Eds.). (2012). *The female offender: Girls, women, and*

crime. Sage.

Clemmer, D. (1940). *The prison community*. New Braunfels, Texas. Christopher Publishing House.

Connors, J., & Heaven, P.C. (1987). Authoritarianism and just world beliefs. *Journal of Social Psychology, 127*(3), 345-346.

Currie, E. (2013). *Crime and punishment in America*. New York, New York. Macmillan.

Dalbert, C. (2009). Belief in a just world. *Handbook of individual Differences in Social Behavior, 288-297*.

Dallou, M. (1996). Fighting prison rape: how to make your facility safer. *Corrections Today, 58*(7), 100-106.

Dumond, R. (2003). Confronting America's most ignored crime problem: the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003. *Journal of the American Academy Psychiatry and the Law, 31*(3), 354-360.

Dumond, R. (2000). Inmate sexual assault: the plague that persists. *The Prison Journal, 80*(4), 407-414.

Eigenberg, H. M. (1994). Male rape in prisons: Examining the relationship between correctional officers' attitudes toward male rape and their willingness to respond to acts of rape. In M. C. Braswell, R. H. Montgomery, Jr., & L. X. Lombardo (Eds.), *Prison violence in America* (2nd ed., pp. 145-165). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Feather, N. T. (1996). Reactions to penalties for an offense in relation to authoritarianism, values, perceived responsibility, perceived seriousness, and deservingness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*(3), 571.

- Feather, N. T. (2006). Deservingness and emotions: Applying the structural model of deservingness to the analysis of affective reactions to outcomes. *European Review of Social Psychology, 17*(1), 38-73.
- Fitzgerald, L.F., Swan, S., & Fischer, K. (1995). Why didn't she just report him? The psychological and legal implications of women's responses to sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Issues, 51*(1), 117-138.
- Freudenberg, N. (2001). Jails, prisons, and the health of urban populations: a review of the impact of the correctional system on community health. *Journal of Urban Health, 78*(2), 214-235.
- Furnham, A., & Boston, N. (1996). Theories of rape and the just world. *Psychology, Crime and Law, 2*(3), 211-229.
- Gardner, J. (1986). Attitudes about rape among inmates and correctional officers. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 47*(12), 4514-A.
- Goffman, E. (1961). On the characteristics of total institutions. In Symposium on preventative and social psychiatry (pp. 43-84).
- Greer, K. (2000). The Changing Nature of Interpersonal Relationships in a Women's Prison. *The Prison Journal, 80*, 442-468.
- Heaven, P.C., & Connors, J.R. (2001). A note on the value correlates of social dominance orientation and right-wing authoritarianism. *Personality and Individual Differences, 31*(6), 925-930.
- Hochstetler, A., Murphy, D., & Simons, R. (2004). Damaged goods: exploring predictors of distress in prison inmates. *Crime and Delinquency, 50*(4), 436-457.
- Jensen, I. W., & Gutek, B. A. (1982). Attributions and assignment of responsibility in

- sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Issues*, 38(4), 121-136.
- Jones, T., & Pratt, T. (2008). The prevalence of sexual violence in prison: the state of the knowledge base and implications for evidence-based correctional policy making. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 52, 280-295.
- Judson, S., Johnson, D. & Perez, A. (2013). Perceptions of adult sexual coercion as a function of victim gender. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*. Advance online publication.
- Kennedy, M. A. (2009). Psychological syndrome evidence. In D.A. Krauss & J.D.
- Kerley, K., Hochstetler, A., & Copes, H. (2009). Self-control, prison victimization, and prison infractions. *Criminal Justice Review*, 34, 553-568.
- Knowles, G. (1999). Male prison rape: A search for causation and prevention. *The Howard Journal*, 38(3), 267-282.
- Lahm, K. (2009). Physical and property victimization behind bars: a multilevel examination. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 53, 348-365.
- Lambert, A. J., Burroughs, T., & Nguyen, T. (1999). Perceptions of risk and the buffering hypothesis: The role of just world beliefs and right-wing authoritarianism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(6), 643-656.
- Lerner, M. J. (1980). The belief in a just world. (9-30). Springer US.
- Lieberman (Eds.), *Psychological Expertise in Court* (2nd ed., pp. 103-123). Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Listwan, S., Colvin, M., Hanley, D., Flannery, D. (2010). Victimization, social support,

- and psychological well-being: a study of recently released prisoners. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37(10), 1140-1159.
- Lyons, T. (2010). Self-reported psychological distress associated with steroid therapy for HIV. *International Journal of STD and AIDS*, 21(12), 832.
- Mariner, J. (2001). No escape: Male rape in U.S. prisons. New York: Human Rights Watch.
- McCorkle, R., Miethe, T., & Drass, K. (1995). The roots of prison violence: a test of the deprivation, management and "not-so-total" institution models. *Crime & Delinquency*, 41, 317-331.
- McGuire, M. (2005). The impact of prison rape on public health. *Californian Journal of Health Promotion*, 3(2), 72-83.
- Moster, A. & Jeglic, E. (2009). Prison Warden Attitudes Toward Prison Rape and Sexual Assault: Findings Since the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA). *The Prison Journal*, 89, 65-78.
- Pardue, A., Arrigo, B., & Murphy, D. (2011). Sex and Sexuality in Women's Prisons: A Preliminary Typological Investigation. *The Prison Journal*, 91, 279-304.
- Pasko, L. (2010). Damaged daughters: The history of girls' sexuality and the juvenile justice system. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 100(3), 1099-1130.
- Pinkerton, S., Galletly, C., & Seal, D. (2007). Model-based estimates of HIV acquisition due to prison rape. *The Prison Journal*, 87(3), 295-310.
- Phillips, J. (2001). Cultural construction of manhood in prison. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 2(1), 13-23.
- Polimeni, A. M., Hardie, E., & Buzwell, S. (2000). Homophobia among Australian

- heterosexuals: The role of sex, gender role ideology, and gender role traits. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, 5(4), 47-62.
- Rohde, D. (2001). A health danger from a needle becomes a scourge behind bars. *The New York Times* (August 6).
- Rye, B., Greatrix, S., & Enright, C. (2006). The case of the guilty victim: The effects of gender of victim and gender of perpetrator on attributions and responsibility. *Sex Roles*, 54(9-10), 639-649.
- Schneider, L. J., Ee, J. S. C., & Aronson, H. (1994). Effects of victim gender and physical vs. psychological trauma/injury on observers' perceptions of sexual assault and its aftereffects. *Sex Roles*, 30(11-12), 793-808.
- Severance, T. (2005). "You know who you can go to": Cooperation and exchange between incarcerated women. *The Prison Journal*, 85(3), 343-367.
- Shaver, K. (1970). Defensive attribution: Effects of Severity and relevance on the responsibility assigned for an accident. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 14, 101-113.
- Shaver, K. (1975). An introduction to attribution processes. Cambridge, Massachusetts. Winthrop Publishers, Inc.
- Shelden, R., Brown, W., Miller, K. & Fritzler, R. (2008). "Doing Time in American Prisons." *Crime and Criminal Justice in American Society*. Long Grove: Waveland Press, Inc., 2008. 285-309.
- Singer, M., Bussey, J., Song, L., & Lunghofer, L.(1995). The psychosocial issues of women serving time in jail. *Social Work*, 40, 103-113.
- Smith, R.E., Pine, C. J., & Hawley, M. E. (1988). Social Cognitions about adult male

- victims of female sexual assault. *Journal of Sex Research*, 24(1), 101-112.
- Struckman-Johnson, C., & Struckman-Johnson, D. (2002). Sexual coercion reported by women in three Midwestern prisons. *Journal of Sex Research*, 39(3), 217-227.
- Struckman-Johnson, C., & Struckman-Johnson, D. (2006). A comparison of sexual coercion experiences reported by men and women in prison. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 21(12), 1591-1615.
- Sykes, G. (1958). *The society of captives: A study of a maximum security prison*. Princeton University Press.
- Walker, W. D., Rowe, R. C., & Quinsey, V. L. (1993). Authoritarianism and sexual aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65(5), 1036.
- Walmsley, R. (2011). *World prison population*. International Centre for Prison Studies. Retrieved from <http://www.idcr.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/WPPL-9-22.pdf>
- Wolff, N., & Shi, J. (2009). Contextualization of physical and sexual assault in male prisons: Incidents and their aftermath. *Journal of Correctional Health Care*, 15(1), 58-77.
- Wong, T. M., & Van de Schoot, R. (2012). The effect of offenders' sex on reporting crimes to the police. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27(7), 1276-1292.
- Yamawaki, N. (2007). Rape perception and the function of ambivalent sexism and gender role traditionality. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22(4), 406-423.
- (2001). *United States: Overincarceration, drugs, and race*. Human Rights Watch. Retrieved from <http://www.hrw.org/legacy/wr2k1/usa/index.html>
- (2013). *Prison Rape Elimination Act (Sexual Violence in Correctional Facilities)*. Bureau

of Justice Statistics [BJS]. Retrieved from:

<http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=tp&tid=20>

(2013). *Women in the justice system*. The Sentencing Project.

Retrieved from <http://www.sentencingproject.org/template/page.cfm?id=138>

1.S. 1435--108th Congress: Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003. (2003). In

GovTrack.us (database of federal legislation). Retrieved November 5, 2012,

from <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-108publ79/html/PLAW->

[108publ79.htm](http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-108publ79/html/PLAW-108publ79.htm)

Amy M. Magnus
Curriculum Vitae

University of Nevada, Las Vegas
4505 S. Maryland Pkwy.
Las Vegas, Nevada 89154
magnusa2@unlv.nevada.edu
(702) 985-2251

Education

- University of Nevada, Las Vegas – August 2012 – present
Current Degree Program: Master's Degree (MA) in Criminal Justice
Cumulative GPA: 4.0
Graduation Date: August 2014
- University of Nevada, Las Vegas – August 2009 – May 2012
Bachelor's degree: Psychology BA (*cum laude*)
Minor: Criminal Justice
Minor: Philosophy
Cumulative GPA: 3.89
Graduation Date: May 2012

Employment

August 2012 – present

- Graduate Assistant – Department of Criminal Justice, UNLV
Academic advisors: Dr. Joel D. Lieberman, Dr. Emily I. Troshynski, and Dr. Randall Shelden

January 2011 – August 2012

- Undergraduate Research Assistant – Department of Criminal Justice, UNLV
Academic advisor: Dr. Joel D. Lieberman

Honors

- UNLV Dean's Honor List – Fall 2009 – present
- Alpha Phi Sigma Distinguished Service Award – May 2013
- UNLV Department of Criminal Justice Undergraduate Research Award – May 2012
- Philip J. Cohen Scholar Award – May 2012
- Alpha Phi Sigma 70th Anniversary Scholarship – May 2012
- State of Nevada Millennium Scholar – August 2009 – May 2012

Academic & Research Interests

- Corrections
- Sexual Violence
- Gender Studies
- Victimization
- Psychology and Law

Forthcoming Publications

- **Magnus, A.** & Troshynski, E. (Forthcoming, 2014). Supreme Court (U.S.) Cases on Corrections. In Bruce Arrigo, (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Corrections*.
- **Magnus, A.** & Troshynski, E. (Forthcoming, 2014). Prison Violence. In Bruce Arrigo, (Ed.), *The Sage Encyclopedia of Criminal Justice Ethics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Ltd.
- **Magnus, A.** & Troshynski, E. (Forthcoming, 2014). Institutionalization. In Bruce Arrigo, (Ed.), *The Sage Encyclopedia of Criminal Justice Ethics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Ltd.
- LaPota, H., Warren, C., **Magnus, A.** & Gomieo, N. (Forthcoming, 2014). Eating Pathology, Supplement Use, and Nutrition Knowledge in Collegiate Athletes.

Research Experience

September 2013 – May 2014

- Graduate Thesis Research Laboratory Supervisor
Research Topic: Authoritarian Perceptions of Sexual Violence in Prison
Duties: Oversee research lab for personal thesis data collection under the supervision of thesis committee: Dr. Joel D. Lieberman (Chair and Professor, Department of Criminal Justice), Dr. Emily I. Troshynski (Assistant Professor, Criminal Justice), Dr. Terence Miethe (Professor, Criminal Justice) and Dr. David Beisecker (Chair and Professor, Department of Philosophy).

October 2013 – January 2014

- Graduate Research Assistant for Dr. Alexis Kennedy
Research Topic: Sex Tourism and Human Trafficking
Duties: Conduct research studies and help with administration of research materials to undergraduate students.

June 2013 – present

- Graduate Research Assistant for Dr. Emily I. Troshynski and Professor Elizabeth MacDowell (William S. Boyd School of Law)
Research Topic: Domestic Violence Victims, Legal Aid Partnerships and Self-Help Accessibility
Duties: Conduct literature review and perform field observations at the Regional Justice Center in Las Vegas, Nevada. This research seeks to gain a sense of self-litigants' experiences with the judicial system and self-help resources with a focus on victims of domestic violence, their accessibility to and attitudes about justice.

Research Experience, cont'd

January 2013 – present

- Graduate Research/Interviewing Assistant for Dr. Alexis Kennedy
Research Topic: Juvenile Prostitution
Duties: Conduct interviews with sexually exploited girls from the Youth Advocacy Program and the Juvenile Detention Center in an attempt to understand the true nature of prostitution and victimization in Las Vegas. Successfully completed interview training under the supervision of Dr. Alexis Kennedy (Associate Professor, Criminal Justice).

August 2012 – present

- Criminal Justice Department Research Laboratory Manager for Undergraduate Participants
Duties: Oversee all research laboratories in the Criminal Justice Department. As a departmental requirement, all students enrolled in Introduction to the Administration of Justice are required to complete either a department research paper or participate in research studies offered by the department. Assigned credit to students for participation and worked one-on-one with each laboratory to ensure proper departmental requirements were being met. Worked with students to ensure their experiences with research were educational and meaningful.

January 2011 – present

- Laboratory Supervisor/Undergraduate and Graduate Research Assistant for Dr. Joel Lieberman
Research Topics: Jury Decision-Making, Mortality Salience, Actuarial vs. Clinical Testimony and Death Penalty Cases
Duties: Conduct research studies, analyze data in SPSS, and oversee team of five undergraduate research assistants. Managerial duties include scheduling, composition of research materials, and data entry under the supervision of Dr. Joel Lieberman.

August 2011 – May 2012

- Undergraduate Research Assistant for Dr. Cortney Warren and Dr. Holly LaPota UNLV - Department of Psychology – Body Image Laboratory
Duties: Assist in data management and analysis with SPSS. Research variables include body dissatisfaction, supplement use, and nutritional knowledge in collegiate athletes.

Research Presentations and Conferences

November 2013

- American Society of Criminology Conference: Roundtable Paper Chair and Discussant
Roundtable Paper Title: “Power over the Powerless: The Social and Cultural Context of Sexual Victimization in the American Male Prison System.” Solo-authored.

Research Presentations and Conferences (cont'd)

November 2013

- American Society of Criminology Conference: Roundtable Discussant and Chair
Roundtable Paper: "Power Over the Powerless: The Social and Cultural Context of Sexual Victimization in American Men's Prisons," solo-authored.

November 2013

- American Society of Criminology Conference: Poster Presentation
Poster Presentation Title: "Evaluating Pro Se Self-Litigant Services: Preliminary Findings and Future Directions," with Dory Mizrachi and Dr. Emily Troshynski.

November 2012

- American Society of Criminology Conference: Poster Presentation
Poster Presentation Title: "Death and Politics: The Role of Demographic Characteristics and Testimony Type in Death Penalty Cases Involving Future Dangerousness Testimony," with Miliakheala Heen and Dr. Joel Lieberman.

Teaching Experience

October 21st, 2013

- Guest Lecturer, Jury Decision-Making (CRJ 435)
Topic: Victim and Defendant Characteristics and Juror Decision-Making Processes

April 24th, 2013

- Invited Presenter, Introduction to the Administration of Justice (CRJ 104)
Topic: Behind Bars: The Life of an Inmate
Average student performance rating: 4.8 (on a 0-5 scale, 5 being the highest)

March 20th, 2013

- Guest Lecturer, Introduction to the Administration of Justice (CRJ 104)
Topic: Research Ethics

November 27th, 2012

- Invited Presenter, Introduction to the Administration of Justice (CRJ 104)
Topic: Behind Bars: The Life of an Inmate
Average student performance rating: 4.8 (on a 0-5 scale, 5 being the highest)

Professional Training

January 2014 – present

- Volunteer for HOPE for Prisoners
Duties: Oversee casework for all caseworkers and improve office organizations for all staff employees. I participate in intake form data entry, data organization, and data coding. I will be creating a computer literacy curriculum for participants to use and a written manual for the curriculum.

May 2013 – August 2013

- Volunteer for Nevada Youth Parole and Probation (100 hours)
Duties: Manage LaMont McGary's (Nevada Youth Parole Officer) caseload while working with families of children under Youth Parole in Nevada. I was responsible for contacting social services on behalf of youth parole as well as post-correctional placement for children on parole.

March 2013 – May 2013

- Target Corporation Research Project – Organized Retail Crime
Duties: Create a research project in collaboration with Target Corporation and the Department of Criminal Justice used to reduce organized retail crime in Target retail stores. I collected unofficial data over an eight-week period, developed a written proposal for Target Corporate Management, and presented material to Target Corporate Management and UNLV faculty at a seminar at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Target accepted my proposal as the winner and I was awarded the Target Scholarship.
Academic advisor: Dr. Tamara Madensen, UNLV Criminal Justice Associate Professor

July 2011 – August 2012

- Extern for District Court Judge Jessie Walsh – Department 10 (200 hours)
Duties: Develop and organize court/defendant files, maintain attorney files, aid in clerk duties, communicate with Clark County Detention Center about individuals in custody, and wrote case briefs. Responsibilities were performed under direct supervision of Judge Walsh, Office Manager Jeri Winter and Law Clerk Lucas Grower.

Service and Volunteer Work

September 2012 - November 2013

- Graffiti Clean-up (75 hours)
Duties: Painted walls marked with graffiti to improve the overall condition of multiple Las Vegas neighborhoods.

January 2010 – January 2012

- Planned Parenthood of Southern Nevada Volunteer (100 hours)
Duties: Prepared educational packets and aided in sex education presentations at junior high and high schools across Clark County. Assisted the public affairs office with daily organizational work and participated in phone banking.

March 2011

- Grassroots Lobby Days Participant on behalf of Planned Parenthood
Participated in a 4-day seminar and learned about legislation affecting reproductive health and rights including changes in birth control options, abortion services, and other women's health issues. Lobbied Congress in Carson City, Nevada.

Service and Volunteer Work, cont'd

April 2011 – June 2011

- Paul Culley Empowerment School Monthly Reading Guest (150 hours)
Duties: Read to elementary students as a once-a-week reading guest in various elementary classrooms. Emphasized the importance of reading, discussed how my experiences as a college student has been enriched by actively reading.

Academic Activities

March 2013 – present

- UNLV Alumni Association – Urban Affairs, Criminal Justice Section
Executive Board Member

May 2012 – present

- Alpha Phi Sigma – Theta Tau (Criminal Justice Honor Society)
President

August 2011 - present

- Alpha Phi Sigma – Theta Tau (Criminal Justice Honor Society)
Society Member

References

Available upon request.