Despite increased awareness of sexual violence against women (e.g., Basile, 2002) and associated legal reforms over the past few decades (e.g., McGregor, 2005), people commonly minimize women's experiences of rape as "just sex" (Gavey, 2005). For example, Beres (2007) described a case in which a rape victim pleaded with an armed perpetrator to use a condom; the court perceived the victim's attempt to protect her sexual health as consent to engage in sex. As this anecdote shows, observers often view victims as at least partly responsible for being raped (Weiss, 2009; Xenos & Smith, 2001). When making sense of rape scenarios, observers disproportionately focus on victim behaviors, including how victims were dressed (Farris, Treat, Viken, & McFall, 2008), whether they consumed alcohol (Abbey, 2002), and how strongly they resisted unwanted sexual advances (Ryckman, Kaczor, & Thornton, 1992).

This focus on victims can be explained by the fact that sexual consent among legal adults is presumed unless there is sufficient evidence to the contrary (Schulhofer, 1998). In other words, the default legal position is that sexual consent exists, a striking presumption "without analogy in law" (McGregor, 2005, p. 104). Accordingly, if a rape occurs in the absence of active resistance from the victim, observers commonly perceive that the victim agreed to or "wanted" the rape (Ryckman et al., 1992). Indeed, the definition of "forcible rape" used by the Federal Bureau of Investigation to collect statistics in their Uniform Crime Report mentions specifically the use of force by the perpetrator: "carnal knowledge of a female forcibly and against her will" (U.S. Department of Justice, 2009, para. 1). In contrast, other types of crime victims are not required to resist their assailants or be forcibly threatened (Schulhofer, 1998). For example, if a drunkenly incapacitated woman is unable to prevent someone from taking her wallet, it is likely that she will not be seen as having "consented." Likewise, subsequent claims by the perpetrator that the wallet was a gift, a loan, or was freely given would presumably not seem credible. These examples indicate that violations of women's property rights are viewed differently than violations of women's sexual rights, including the right to refuse sex (Schulhofer, 1998).
Curiously, when perceptions of sexual and property right violations are directly compared, the existing literature shows that observers do not minimize sexual violations. Kanekar, Pinto, and Mazumdar (1985) found that male rapists were perceived as deserving longer prison sentences than male thieves, which suggests that rape was perceived to be the more severe violation. In terms of responsibility, Brems and Wagner (1994) found that female victims of rape were perceived by observers as being less responsible for the crime than female victims of theft. These results may seem paradoxical given the literature documenting how sexual violations are often minimized. However, this apparent paradox could be due to fact that Brems and Wagner (1994) and Kanekar et al. (1985) compared rape and theft committed by strangers to the victim.

The type of relationship between a victim and perpetrator may influence observers’ perceptions of crimes, especially those of a sexual nature. Most rapes are perpetrated by acquaintances rather than strangers (e.g., McGregor, 2005). Victim blaming and perceived responsibility for rape has been shown to be greater for rape by nonstrangers than for rape by strangers. Studies of observers’ rape perceptions consistently show that as the degree of intimacy between a female victim and male perpetrator increases, the perceived severity of rape decreases (Frese, Moya, & Megías, 2004). For example, observers perceived rape perpetrated by a spouse to be less serious than rape perpetrated by a stranger (Monson, Byrd, & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1996). Additionally, observers perceived men who perpetrated intimate partner rape as deserving less severe punishment than men who raped a neighbor (Ben-David & Schneider, 2005).

Sexual expectations for behavior within intimate relationships may explain minimization of rape within such relationships. That is, observers perceive that a woman involved in an intimate dating relationship is presumed to have a history of consensual sex with her partner (Ewoldt, Monson, & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2000), and some people may believe that previous consensual sex with a partner nullifies an individual’s future rights to refuse sex with that partner (Shotland & Goodstein, 1992). Accordingly, observers tend to minimize rape when the victim and the perpetrator are in an intimate relationship at the time of the violation (e.g., Ben-David & Schneider, 2005; Frese et al., 2004).

We designed the current research to extend previous research comparing perceptions of rape and theft (Brems & Wagner, 1994; Kanekar et al., 1985). Because past studies comparing these crimes have focused on perpetration by strangers only, we examined perceptions of rape and theft across different types of perpetrator-victim relationships. In the current research, crime minimization was defined in terms of the perceived seriousness of the crime, victim responsibility for the crime, and reasonable punishment or prison time for the perpetrator. A criminal act was minimized by observers who perceived that the crime was not serious, the victim was responsible for the event, and/or the perpetrator deserved little or minimal punishment.

We examined whether and to what degree two factors promoted observers’ minimization of crimes against women: violation type (rape versus theft) and victim-perpetrator relationship context (friend versus partner). First, we hypothesized that participants would perceive rape as a more serious crime than theft, but not when the perpetrator of rape was an intimate dating partner (Hypothesis 1). Although stranger rape was perceived as more serious than stranger theft (e.g., Brems & Wagner, 1994), the more intimate the relationship between perpetrator and victim, the less serious a rape was perceived to be (e.g., Ben-David & Schneider, 2005). Therefore, we expected a significant violation type by relationship context interaction such that subjects would perceive rape by a friend as more serious than either rape by a partner or any theft.

Similarly, we hypothesized that participants would perceive rape victims as less responsible for the crime than victims of theft, except when the crime was committed by an intimate partner (Hypothesis 2). Although victims of theft by strangers have been perceived as more responsible than victims of rape by strangers in past research (Brems & Wagner, 1994), victim responsibility for rape increases as a victim’s level of intimacy with a perpetrator increases (e.g., Frese et al., 2004). As such, we expected to find a violation type by relationship context interaction; we predicted that victims of friend rape would be perceived as less responsible than victims of partner rape or victims of theft.

Finally, we hypothesized that participants would perceive perpetrators of rape as deserving longer prison sentences than perpetrators of theft, except when the perpetrator of rape was an intimate partner (Hypothesis 3). Kanekar et al. (1985) found that perpetrators who committed stranger rape were judged as deserving longer sentences than perpetrators who committed stranger theft. On
the other hand, Ben-David and Schneider (2005) found that perpetrators received less severe punishments for rape when they were in a more intimate relationship with the victim. Expanding on these past studies, we expected to find a violation type by relationship context interaction such that perpetrators of friend rape would be perceived as deserving a more severe punishment than either perpetrators of partner rape or perpetrators of theft.

**Method**

**Participants**

We collected data from 65 undergraduates (67.7% women; \( n = 44 \)) at a small liberal arts college in Western New York. All participants were between the ages of 18 and 22 (\( M = 19.54, SD = 1.12 \)). The majority of participants self-identified as White (78.5%, \( n = 51 \)); other participants identified as Asian (10.8%, \( n = 7 \)), Hispanic (7.7%, \( n = 5 \)), or other (3.1%, \( n = 2 \)). Students from all classes were represented, including freshmen (29.2%, \( n = 19 \)), sophomores (40.0%, \( n = 26 \)), juniors (15.4%, \( n = 10 \)), and seniors (15.4%, \( n = 10 \)).

**Materials**

The present study used scenario materials similar to the scenario used in Abrams, Viki, Masser, and Bohnet (2003). In the Abrams et al. scenario, the female victim and male perpetrator met for the first time at a party, went to her house, kissed each other, and then the perpetrator forcibly raped the victim. In contrast, in the current study, the female victim and male perpetrator already knew each other and were studying in the victim’s room when the perpetrator committed the crime against the unwilling victim. Type of violation was manipulated by specifying that the perpetrator had sex with the victim (rape) or took her wallet (theft) despite the victim’s lack of consent. Type of relationship was manipulated such that the victim and perpetrator had either known each other for three months or had been dating for three months. In all other respects, the scenarios across conditions were identical (see Appendix).

Participants responded to questions about perceived seriousness of the crime, perceived victim responsibility for the crime, and perceptions of reasonable punishment (prison time). Additionally, participants responded to questions about the realism of the scenario and a manipulation check question. Participants also provided information regarding demographic variables, including their age, gender, race, and year in school. Lastly, they responded to questions about rape myth acceptance.

Perceived seriousness of the crime was assessed with an item from the Rape Responsibility Questionnaire (Deitz & Byrnes, 1981). This item was “How serious is this incident?” Possible responses to this item ranged from 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely). Higher scores reflected greater perceived seriousness.

Perceptions of victim responsibility were assessed with an item from Mason, Riger, and Foley (2004). Participants were asked, “How responsible do you think each of these people is for the incident that occurred?” Although participants indicated how responsible both parties were for the incident, the focus for the current research was on perceived victim responsibility. Possible scores assigned to each party ranged from 0% to 100%, where the sum of responsibility scores for totaled 100%. Higher percentages assigned to the victim indicated greater perceived victim responsibility.

Perceptions of reasonable punishment (prison time) were assessed with a single item from Feather and Souter (2002). The item was “What would be an appropriate time for [the perpetrator] to spend in prison, if any?” Participants responded to this item on a nine-point scale (0 = none, 1 = 1 day, 2 = 14 days, 3 = 1 month, 4 = 2 months, 5 = 6 months, 6 = 1 year, 7 = 2 years, 8 = 3 years). Higher scores reflected a belief in the appropriateness of a longer prison sentence.

We evaluated scenario realism with three items from Katz, Moore, and Tkachuk (2007). The items included “How likely do you think it is that similar situations occur among college students generally?”, “How much does this scenario reflect situations that go on in the real world?”, and “How likely do you think it is that similar situations occur among female college students?” For each item, possible responses ranged from 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely). Responses to each of the individual items were averaged to compute a composite variable of scenario realism. Higher scores reflected greater realism. Katz et al. found that this measure was reliable (Cronbach’s \( \alpha = .86 \)). In the present study, the estimate of internal consistency also was good (Cronbach’s \( \alpha = .91 \)).

One question served as a manipulation check for the relationship context manipulation. Specifically, participants were asked, “Before this incident, how close were Kathy and Jason?” Participants rated closeness on a 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely) scale, with higher scores reflecting greater closeness. The manipulation check question was intended to assess whether study participants meaningfully differenti
We assessed rape myth acceptance with the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (IRMAS; Payne, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999). This 45-item measure assesses seven components of rape myth acceptance, including whether for it; It wasn’t really rape; He didn’t mean to; She wanted it; She lied; Rape is a trivial event; Rape is a deviant event. Each item was rated on a scale from 1 (not at all agree) to 7 (very much agree). Responses to each of the individual items were averaged to compute a composite variable of acceptance of rape myths. Higher scores reflected greater rape myth acceptance. Payne et al. (1999) reported evidence for psychometric properties of this scale, including evidence for the reliability of the composite scale (Cronbach’s α = .93). The estimate of internal consistency also was good in the present sample (Cronbach’s α = .93).

Procedure
Undergraduates were recruited online from a voluntary human subject pool for a study of “Judgments of Heterosexual Conflict.” Data collection sessions were held in on-campus classrooms. Participants sat in columns with every other column of seats left empty to ensure privacy. Student researchers followed a script that introduced the study and discussed informed consent. Participants then provided written informed consent. Participants were randomly assigned to one of four scenarios involving a man perpetrating a crime against a woman. Surveys were ordered on a rotating repeating basis such that each condition was represented once before the order was repeated. Two sets of surveys (prearranged in rotating, repeating order of conditions) were distributed. Women received surveys from the top of one stack and men received surveys from the top of the other stack. The distribution of the surveys ensured random assignment to conditions and allowed for equivalent proportions of male and female participants assigned to each condition. Participants submitted completed surveys to a slotted box in the front of the room to ensure anonymity. Data collection sessions lasted no longer than 45 min. Participants were compensated with course credit. The participants received a full written debriefing.

Results
The study used a 2 x 2 factorial design with type of violation (rape or theft) and relationship context (friend or partner) as the between-subjects factors. The dependent variables were perceived seriousness of the crime, perceived victim responsibility for the crime, and perceptions of reasonable punishment for the perpetrator.

In terms of type of violation, 34 participants were randomly assigned to the rape condition, and 31 participants were assigned to the theft condition. Thirty-four participants were randomly assigned to the friend condition, and 31 participants were randomly assigned to the partner condition. A series of 2 x 2 ANOVAs indicated no differences between groups in terms of demographic variables or rape myth acceptance, which was low within the sample (M = 2.28, SD = 0.75, range 1.18 to 4.10). These results indicated that random assignment produced comparable groups. However, the groups did differ in terms of scenario realism. Specifically, there was a main effect of type of violation, F(1, 61) = 7.63, p = .008, η² = .11. Rape scenarios were perceived as significantly more realistic (M = 5.56) than were the theft scenarios (M = 4.60). There was also a main effect of relationship context, F(1, 61) = 5.36, p = .02, η² = .08, such that the partner scenarios were perceived as significantly more realistic (M = 5.52) than were the friend scenarios (M = 4.72). Realism did not differ as a function of the interaction of violation x context, F(1, 61) = 0.94, p = .34.

Due to significant between-groups differences in scenario realism, we conducted correlation analyses to determine whether realism might confound between-group differences in the study’s dependent variables. Results indicated that perceived realism scores were not significantly correlated with any dependent variable, except with prison time, r(64) = .29, p = .02, so we controlled for realism only in analyses testing the hypotheses about prison sentence.

To ensure that participants differentiated between the friend and partner conditions, a 2 (type of violation) x 2 (relationship context) ANOVA was conducted with perceived closeness as the dependent variable. As expected, a main effect of context emerged, F(1, 61) = 7.75, p = .007, η² = .11. Participants correctly differentiated between the conditions and perceived the victim to be significantly closer to her partner (M = 4.84) than to her friend (M = 4.01).

The first hypothesis was that participants would perceive the rape scenario as more serious than the theft scenario, but not when the perpetrator of the crime was an intimate partner (Hypothesis 1). To test this hypothesis, a 2 (type of violation) x 2
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(relationship context) ANOVA was conducted with perceived seriousness as the dependent variable. Results of this analysis revealed partial support for this hypothesis. A main effect of type of violation was found, such that the rape scenarios were perceived as more serious ($M = 6.68$) than the theft scenarios ($M = 4.84$), $F(1, 61) = 31.37$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .34$. These means indicated that the participants found the situation to be at least relatively serious. However, there was no main effect of context, $F(1, 61) = 1.16$, $p = .29$, and no expected interaction effect, $F(1, 61) = 0.94$, $p = .34$. Participants did not perceive rape perpetrated by a friend as more serious than rape perpetrated by a partner.

In contrast, we found no support for the hypothesis that rape victims would be perceived as less responsible than victims of theft, except for when the crime was perpetrated by an intimate partner (Hypothesis 2). A 2 (type of violation) x 2 (relationship context) factorial ANOVA with perceived victim responsibility as the dependent variable revealed no main effect for type of violation, $F(1, 61) = 1.02$, $p = .32$. Therefore, there was no difference in how responsible participants perceived victims were for rape compared to theft. Additionally, there was neither a significant main effect of relationship context, $F(1, 61) = 1.02$, $p = .27$, nor the expected violation x context interaction effect, $F(1, 61) = 2.48$, $p = .12$. Victims of rape perpetrated by an intimate partner were not perceived to be significantly more responsible than victims of rape perpetrated by a friend. The overall sample mean for perceived victim responsibility for the incident was low ($M = 10.00$, $SD = 12.69$, range 0 to 50).

The last hypothesis was that perpetrators of rape would be perceived as deserving longer prison sentences than would perpetrators of theft, except when the perpetrator was an intimate partner (Hypothesis 3). To test this hypothesis, a 2 (type of violation) x 2 (relationship context) ANCOVA was conducted with length of prison time as the dependent variable and scenario realism as the covariate. Results of this analysis revealed that realism was not a significant covariate, $F(1, 59) = 2.27$, $p = .14$. As expected, there was a main effect of type of violation; the perpetrator of rape was perceived as deserving longer prison time ($M = 5.12$) than was the perpetrator of theft ($M = 2.19$), $F(1, 59) = 25.52$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .30$. A main effect for relationship context was also found, such that the friend perpetrator was perceived as deserving a longer prison sentence ($M = 4.38$) than was the partner perpetrator ($M = 2.93$), $F(1, 59) = 10.04$, $p = .04$, $\eta^2_p = .12$. In contrast, there was no significant violation x relationship context interaction, $F(1, 59) = 1.95$, $p = .17$. The means for the four conditions indicated relatively low lengths of prison time, given that a score of 3 represented one month of jail time and a score of 4 represented two months of jail time. Therefore, although participants viewed incidents as serious and responsibility was not attributed to the victim, participants did not perceive that the perpetrator deserved a long prison sentence.

Discussion

Our research extends the existing crime perception literature by examining observer minimization as a function of type of violation (rape or theft) and relationship of the victim to the perpetrator (friend or partner). Overall, crimes involving theft were minimized more than crimes involving rape. Specifically, participants perceived rape as more serious than theft and rapists as deserving a longer prison sentence than thieves. Relationship context was significantly related only to prison time; perpetrators who were a friend to the victim were perceived as deserving more prison time than the partner perpetrator, indicating greater minimization for either type of crime perpetrated by an intimate partner.

The current findings are consistent with previous literature comparing stranger rape and theft (e.g., Brems & Wagner, 1994; Kanekar et al., 1985) and extend these comparisons to crimes perpetrated by acquaintances. Rape may be seen as more serious than theft because, as proposed by Stylianou (2002), crimes that involve physical harm to the victim are perceived as more serious and there are potential physical health consequences of rape but not theft. Unexpectedly, the context of the victim-perpetrator relationship did not significantly influence perceived crime seriousness. As indicated by several studies (e.g., Ben-David & Schneider, 2005; Monson, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, & Binderup, 2000), when the intimacy of the relationship between the perpetrator and victim increased, rape was perceived as less serious. However, results from our study were not consistent with these past studies. Divergent findings might be due to the fact that we compared the behaviors of friends versus dating partners whereas past studies, such as Monson et al. (2000), have examined rape across more dissimilar relationships (e.g., strangers or neighbors vs. spouses). Alternatively, our null result may be due to the relatively high perceptions...
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for crime seriousness across the sample. This null result also could be the result of limited statistical power. Observed power estimates at an alpha level of $p = .05$ were low for the main effect of context (.19) and interaction effects (.16). A power level of .80 is considered to be ideal (Cohen, 1988).

Consistent with our hypothesis, and similar to past research (Kanekar et al., 1985), participants perceived the perpetrator of rape as deserving a longer prison sentence than the perpetrator of theft. Although not hypothesized, relationship context also significantly influenced perceptions of prison time such that participants perceived the friend perpetrator as deserving a longer prison sentence than the partner perpetrator. This result converges with previous research on rape (e.g., Ben-David & Schneider, 2005), which has found that perpetrators who were intimately involved with victims received less severe punishments than other perpetrators. The current research suggests that this minimization of crimes by intimate partners extends to property violations as well.

In our study, participants perceived increased closeness with partners as compared to friends. Therefore, participants may have perceived a greater acceptability for the partner perpetrator to act on his desires because of norms and expectations about women’s roles in heterosexual relationships, such as the traditional sex role belief that women should be subservient and put others above their desires and ambitions (Murnen & Byrne, 1991; Rodman Aronson & Schaler Buchholz, 2001). Unwanted sex and sexual coercion are more likely to occur in situations with long-term couples and couples with partners who are very familiar with each other (Jackson, Cram, & Seymour, 2000; Murnen, Perot, & Byrne, 1989). When examining variations in relationship context, Faulkner, Kolts, and Hicks (2008) reported that women participants were slower to end a simulated sexual coercion scenario when the perpetrator was considered a long-term relationship partner as opposed to a first date or a teaching assistant from their college classes. On the other hand, participants may have been more likely to view the friend as violating social norms for acceptable behavior within a relationship because he was not perceived to be as close to the victim.

Finally, our hypothesis regarding perceived victim responsibility yielded null results. Perceived victim responsibility did not differ either as a function of type of violation or relationship to the victim. The small sample size and the relative lack of variability on the single item responsibility variable both may have resulted in a lack of statistical power to support this hypothesis. Again, at an alpha level of $p = .05$, observed power estimates for both main (.17 for violation type and .20 for context) and interaction (.34) effects for victim responsibility were low. These figures are below the ideal power level of .80 (Cohen, 1988).

Although researchers have reported sex differences in participant responses to crime scenarios (Basile, 2002; Ewoldt et al., 2000), the literature provides conflicting data regarding sex differences in participant responses to rape and theft scenarios. Kanekar et al. (1985) reported sex differences in that women perceived that longer prison sentences were necessary for perpetrators than did men. In contrast, Brems and Wagner (1994) found no sex differences. In the current study, we did not find sex differences for perceptions of seriousness, victim responsibility, or reasonable punishment, either in main effects or interactions with type of violation or relationship context. Differences in perceptions of rape and crime scenarios as a function of participant sex bear further examination.

There were several limitations in the current research. First, as the sample was small and homogenous, results may not generalize to more diverse samples. Additionally, past research involving similar theft scenarios (Sanderson, Zanna, & Darley, 2000) manipulated the severity of theft to be high severity theft (i.e., $15,000) or low severity theft (i.e., $200). Therefore, the theft in the current study (i.e., wallet) involved a low-magnitude property violation. Furthermore, a more realistic scenario in which a theft occurs may be perceived differently by participants. Although it is difficult to conceive of a property violation that might be comparable to rape, future research may examine property violations of varying magnitudes, as in Sanderson et al. (2000), within the context of dating as compared to friendship relationships in order to determine if manipulation of the theft severity influenced the results.

Additionally, the current study’s results may also have been influenced by overall low rape myth acceptance scores across the sample. Past research (e.g., Xenos & Smith, 2001) has shown that individuals who were high in rape myth acceptance were more likely to minimize rape. Therefore, the greater minimization of theft across the sample may be due in part to overall low rape myth acceptance. Future research studies including participants with more diverse levels of rape myth acceptance are
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needed. Furthermore, considering past research has found that experiences of participants influence their perceptions (Basile, 2002), future researchers may also consider asking participants about their experiences with crime (rape or theft) in addition to perceptions of crime minimization.

Despite the aforementioned limitations, our research adds to the literature by replicating and extending results of past research about perceptions of stranger rape (e.g., Brems & Wagner, 1994; Kanekar et al., 1985) to rape by intimate partners and friends. Additionally, the present study extends previous literature on perceptions of crime by documenting the relative minimization of theft in intimate victim-perpetrator relationships. Results indicated that the more intimate the victim-perpetrator relationship is, the shorter the prison sentence that is perceived as reasonable for the perpetrator. The current research highlights how crimes by partners in heterosexual relationships are minimized, perhaps reflecting a larger societal norm of accepting negative behavior from intimate partners that may not be accepted from others. Understanding this minimization is important to framing societal and legal responses to crimes and to shaping individual-level responses to abuse and sexual assault victims. It can often be difficult for victims to come forward if they fear that their experiences will be minimized or disbelieved (Sable, Danis, Mauzy, & Gallagher, 2006). Only by further examination of crime minimization can society begin to understand more about why minimization exists and how to ensure that all crime victims receive the support and justice that they deserve.
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APPENDIX

SCENARIO A (RAPE, FRIEND)

Jason and Kathy are both college juniors attending the same school. They have known each other for 3 months and now have a couple of classes together. One night, they decide to study for their chemistry exam in Kathy’s room and spend the night talking and laughing. Then, Jason tells Kathy that he can’t concentrate anymore because he is only thinking about Kathy. He asks Kathy to have sex with him, but Kathy says no, she needs to study. Jason insists, saying that they’ve known each other for a while and it’s really not a big deal. Jason reaches for her pants, and as he begins to open them, Kathy asks him to stop. Jason gets mad. He says that he will not take no for an answer. Although Kathy repeatedly says no, Jason has sex with her anyway.

SCENARIO B (RAPE, PARTNER)

Jason and Kathy are both college juniors attending the same school. They have been dating for 3 months and now have a couple of classes together. One night, they decide to study for their chemistry exam in Kathy’s room and spend the night talking and laughing. Then, Jason tells Kathy that he can’t concentrate anymore because he is only thinking about Kathy. He asks Kathy to have sex with him, but Kathy says no, she needs to study. Jason insists, saying that they’ve been dating for a while and it’s really not a big deal. Jason reaches for her pants, and as he begins to open them, Kathy asks him to stop. Jason gets mad. He says that he will not take no for an answer. Although Kathy repeatedly says no, Jason has sex with her anyway.

SCENARIO C (THEFT, FRIEND)

Jason and Kathy are both college juniors attending the same school. They have known each other for 3 months and now have a couple of classes together. One night, they decide to study for their chemistry exam in Kathy’s room and spend the night talking and laughing. Then, Jason tells Kathy that he can’t concentrate anymore because he is only thinking about food. He asks Kathy to give him money for food, but Kathy says no, she needs to study. Jason insists, saying that they’ve known each other for a while and it’s really not a big deal. Jason reaches for her purse, and as he begins to open it, Kathy asks him to stop. Jason gets mad. He says that he will not take no for an answer. Although Kathy repeatedly says no, Jason leaves with all her money anyway.

SCENARIO D (THEFT, PARTNER)

Jason and Kathy are both college juniors attending the same school. They have been dating for 3 months and now have a couple of classes together. One night, they decide to study for their chemistry exam in Kathy’s room and spend the night talking and laughing. Then, Jason tells Kathy that he can’t concentrate anymore because he is only thinking about food. He asks Kathy to give him money for food, but Kathy says no, she needs to study. Jason insists, saying that they’ve been dating for a while and it’s really not a big deal. Jason reaches for her purse, and as he begins to open it, Kathy asks him to stop. Jason gets mad. He says that he will not take no for an answer. Although Kathy repeatedly says no, Jason leaves with all her money anyway.
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