Hidden, Unacknowledged, Acquaintance, and Date Rape: Looking Back, Looking Forward

Mary P. Koss[1]

In this commentary, I have been asked to reflect on two articles that have been among the most highly cited publications in *Psychology of Women Quarterly* (*PWQ*) over its first 35 years, "The Hidden Rape Victim: Personality, Attitudinal, and Situational Characteristics" (Koss, 1985) and "Stranger and Acquaintance Rape: Are There Differences in the Victim's Experience?" (Koss, Dinero, Seibel, & Cox, 1988; please find the original articles at http://pwq.sagepub .com/content/12/1/1 and http://pwq.sagepub.com/content/9/ 2/193). Looking back, I have made decisions that were motivated both by unselfish and selfish motives. In terms of the former, initially I had not been drawn to academia; instead I sought a practice job where I could help people. My mentor, however, was insistent that I would help more people through scholarship than using other facets of clinical psychology. Thus, I embarked on a research academic career with the naive belief that changes in attitudes, policy, law, treatment, and prevention were simply awaiting the right data. I was concerned about getting published and assumed the rest of the "help people" equation automatically followed. Among my more selfish motives were the desire for professional legitimacy and personal affirmation. Learning that these two articles had been influential was deeply satisfying but that recognition was not achieved alone. The page limit of this commentary would be exhausted by acknowledging everyone who helped, and undoubtedly more people would be offended by omission than would feel honored by mention. To the Sexual Experiences Collaboration, other colleagues, those who have worked on projects, and the participants who gave their time to help others, please know that part of your life became part of mine and part of my impact is yours.

One of the biggest heart thuds I have ever experienced was on the morning of June 13, 1993 when I opened the *New York Times Sunday Magazine*. There I saw the cover art and the headline, "Rape Hype Betrays Feminism," heralding an excerpt of Katie Roiphe's book, *The Morning After: Sex, Fear, and Feminism* (1994, re-issued 2008). The piece focused on perceived flaws in rape research and the harm they have purportedly done, particularly the 1985 and 1988 *PWQ* articles by my colleagues and me, as well as an intervening article (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987). Roiphe's thesis restated points more accurately attributed to an academic, Neil Gilbert,

who widely disseminated them in conservative public media outlets and nonpeer-reviewed professional outlets beginning with "The Phantom Epidemic of Sexual Assault" (e.g., 1991b, 1997, 2005; for the rebuttal see Cook & Koss, 2005). In brief, the criticisms of this research were that rape was defined too broadly (because Gilbert incorrectly asserted that prevalence estimates included incidents of sexual coercion, which are also measured by the Sexual Experiences Survey (SES) but not included in rape estimates) and that unwanted sex when intoxicated and unable to consent should not be considered rape despite its inclusion in most state rape laws. Instead, Roiphe argued that rape victimization should hinge on victims' self-perceptions irrespective of whether they report experiencing the behaviors that constitute rape as legally defined. Similarly, Hoff Sommers (1994) wove Gilbert's thoughts throughout her book, *Who Stole Feminism? How Women Have Betrayed Women*. In her review of the book, Harrison (1994, p. 85), noted that the villains were characterized as "'gender feminists' who willfully . . . distort information on women's status to keep their lock on government and foundation money. Their dark agenda includes silencing sensible 'equity feminists,' who celebrate women's achievements and who seek, in partnership with men, to make the few minor adjustments needed for perfect equity." I certainly did not set out to become a villain when I prepared my work for *PWQ*, but I do take comfort from Winston Churchill's (n.d.) words: "You have enemies? Good. That means you've stood up for something, sometime in your life."

Given this background, I focus here on situating these two *PWQ* articles both in the past and in the present by highlighting (a) the intellectual context in which we began our work; (b) our use of language; (c) definitions of research questions, design, and methodology; and (d) dissemination of

[1] Mel and Enid Zuckerman College of Public Health, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA

Corresponding Author:
Mary P. Koss, Mel and Enid Zuckerman College of Public Health, University of Arizona, 1295 N. Martin Street, Tucson, AZ 85724, USA
Email: mpk@u.arizona.edu

knowledge. Other more comprehensive reviews and critical analyses are available (Koss et al., 2007; Koss & White, 2008; Koss, White, & Kazdin, 2011; White, Koss, & Kazdin, 2011), and a more personal video biography entitled, "Mary Koss: The Power of Voice" is available on YouTube (http://www.youtube.com). Although I have been productive throughout my career, no other work has had the impact of these two articles, which I began in my late 20s. A great part of their influence traces to a coalescence of bringing some relevant skills to the right place at the right time, and because no publicity really is bad publicity.

Intellectual Context

My work on sexual assault began in 1976 when a senior colleague handed me an unfunded grant proposal and invited me to resubmit it as principal investigator. Embedded within a mass of hilariously offensive experiments involving padded bras was a passing suggestion to measure sexual aggression and victimization among college students. I had recently read journalist Susan Brownmiller's book, *Against our Will: Men, Women and Rape* (1975, re-issued 1993). Using what few data were available at the time, she carefully documented that the scope of rape was underestimated. The challenge of finding these unmeasured rapes pulled me in, and I drew on my doctoral research involving the validity of obviously worded, face-valid self-report items in assessing life crises. I rewrote the grant application, and after initial disappointment, I was awarded National Institutes of Health (NIH) grants in 1978 and 1983 to support development of the SES as well as conduct local student surveys and interviews at Kent State University (which provided the 1985 data) and a national study that generated the data reported in 1987 and 1988. A small set of early literature shaped these articles, including Kanin's (1957) groundbreaking work with dating-courtship surveys; Amir's (1971) now discredited study of victim-precipitated rape; Weis and Borges' (1973) defense of the legitimate rape victim; Burgess' clinical observations of rape victims in crisis (e.g., Burgess & Holmstrom, 1974); Bart's (1979) studies of rape avoidance and feminist analysis of rape; Kilpatrick, Resnick, Rugiero, Consoscenti, and McCauley's (2007) body of sexual assault research begun in 1977; Burt's (1980) work on rape supportive attitudes and myth acceptance; and an empirical reverse records check that found only 54% of known victims admitted to an interviewer that they had been raped (Curtis, in Walker & Brodsky, 1976).

One of my funniest memories about the project that generated the 1988 article is the National Institute of Mental Health site visit at the *Ms.* Magazine office in New York. The launch of the national study of college students was contingent on receiving federal funding. The site visit chair was adamant that although the federal government might be willing to fund our collaboration to do research, he would not support the magazine to fulfill a dissemination plan. I remember Editor Gloria Steinem's response, "So let me get this straight. The government is willing to fund finding a cure for cancer, but they are not willing to tell anyone about it."

Language

Attention to language is a central tenet of feminist methodology across disciplines. Four terms in the titles of the 1985 and 1988 articles merit examination: *hidden rape*, *unacknowledged rape*, *acquaintance rape*, and *date rape*. I used the term "hidden rape" consistently, starting with an NIH grant in 1976. A hidden rape victim was defined in the abstract of the 1985 article as one who had never disclosed her assault to police or a rape crisis center, and I noted that 10–50% of rapes were never reported according to information available at that time. However, I was discouraged by the editor of *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* from using it in the title of the first publication (Koss & Oros, 1982). He felt hidden rape was sensational, not professional, and implied intentionality. The published title, "The Sexual Experiences Survey: A Research Instrument Investigating Sexual Aggression and Sexual Victimization," displays the negotiated scientific jargon. Using hidden rape in the 1985 *PWQ* title was an act of rebellion that has surely gone unnoticed. Yet subsequently, my confidence was undermined, and I generally avoided the term thereafter.

What I struggled to call hidden rape is today incorporated into the term *rape attrition*. Rape attrition refers to the loss of cases of rape as they progress through the criminal justice system (for example, see Anders & Christopher, 2011; Daly & Bonhours, 2011). The first step of rape attrition as used in the criminology literature is failure to report the crime to police. From the perspective of the 1985 article, the initial stage of attrition is the victim's failure to realize that her victimization qualifies as rape according to legal definitions. Rape attrition is passive language equivalent to a physician describing a domestic violence victim as a woman hit in the head by a brick. I do not think the 1985 definition conveys the extent to which I attributed intentionality to the processes that keep rape hidden from official records. I believe even more strongly now (and data have accumulated to substantiate) that an array of attitudes and behaviors, statutory guidelines, and institutional processes keep the true scope of rape hidden and maintain the illusion that our legal system effectively deters rape (Daly & Bouhours, 2010; Koss, 2009; Koss, Bachar, Hopkins, & Carlson, 2004). For some insight on hidden rape in public and scholarly discourse, I did a search of "hidden rape" as a term, which returned 6,710 links on Google (http://www.Google.com) and 768 on Scholar Google (http://www.scholar.google.com). These results were returned after specifying that titles including the word "camera" be excluded. Without the exclusion, the results also reference material on secret videotaping of rape using hidden cameras, which diverges from the original conceptualization of hidden rape. In comparison, rape attrition returns in Google and Scholar Google are 409 and 44, respectively. It is a

tribute to the impact of *PWQ* that the 1985 article is the first entry listed in searches for hidden rape on both search engines.

Turning our attention to unacknowledged rape, the roots of this term lie in methodology and interpretation of results. The SES developed for the 1985 study presented behaviorally specific questioning as a strategy to measure unwanted sexual experiences without using the word rape. Subsequent experimental comparisons have demonstrated that behaviorally specific language detects 11 times more incidents than items containing "rape" (Fisher & Cullen, 2000). The initial SES concluded with the less desirable question, "Have you been raped?" The item was intended as a content validity check. A moderate level of agreement was expected with the behaviorally specific questions constituting rape. Instead, 57% of the women responding affirmatively to the SES behaviorally specific rape questions denied they had been raped (45% of stranger rape victims and 77% of acquaintance rape victims). The conclusion that women could report experiencing behaviors constituting rape but not perceive themselves as raped was a lightbulb moment revealing an alternative interpretation of what initially looked like a dismaying measurement problem. However, at least one *PWQ* reviewer insightfully suggested that asking respondents whether they have been raped using a yes/no format imposed a false dichotomy on what might be more nuanced self-perceptions.

The 1988 article should have more clearly highlighted that the measurement of rape acknowledgement was changed. Respondents were offered four potential self-perceptions of victimization: "I don't feel I was victimized," "I believe I was a victim of serious miscommunication," "I believe I was a victim of a crime other than rape," and "I believe I was a victim of rape." Phrased in these ways, 55% of stranger incidents that were classified as rape were similarly perceived by the victims; the corresponding figure for acquaintance rapes was 23%. Critics charged that my overruling of women's own perceptions was damning evidence of politically motivated data distortion. Overlooked or ignored was the reality that virtually all of the rapes left women feeling victimized. The vast majority selected choices that contained the word "victim" (92% of stranger and 89% of acquaintance incidents). Although Fisher, Daigle, and Cullen (2003) concluded that rape acknowledgement studies were riddled with measurement problems, their own survey carried out for the National Institute of Justice (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000) using a yes/no response format identical to the *PWQ* article classified over half of rape victims as unacknowledged compared to 57% in Koss (1985). I still agree with *PWQ*'s reviewers that a dichotomous response format oversimplifies and constrains; even the four choices offered in the 1988 study could not sufficiently reflect the subtle differences in how rape is perceived by diverse women.

Additional terms in the article titles are acquaintance rape and date rape. Acquaintance rape is defined in the Merriam Webster online dictionary (http://www.merriam-webster.com)

as "rape committed by someone known to the victim. The first known use of acquaintance rape is 1979." Date rape is "rape committed by the victim's date; broadly, acquaintance rape . . . first known use of date rape 1975" (http://www.merriam-webster.com). Using search engines to reflect discourse reveals that the term *acquaintance rape* generates over 93,000 Google returns and 6,350 on Scholar Google. Koss et al. (2007) recently identified concerns that the term date rape may have lost currency as mores change toward what are called *hooking up* and social network-organized *hanging out*. Common discourse is not decisive. Search for "date rape" results in over 1 million links on Google and 14,400 on Scholar Google. The comparable numbers for "hooking up + rape" are also over 1 million hits on Google with 1,500 on Scholar Google (without the + rape search modifier, links are returned for hooking up electronic equipment and laboratory apparatus). Greater scientific attention to date rape is predictable because the term is older. The fate of hooking up will unfold in coming years. However, there are other topics in rape where science has debunked overheated public discourse such as Kilpatrick and colleagues' (2007) study of drug and alcohol facilitated rape. Regarding dating versus hooking up, a recent scientific survey of more than 14,000 college students showed that by the senior year of university, 69% of heterosexual students were in a committed relationship that had lasted longer than 6 months (Armstrong, Hamilton, & England, 2010).

A final observation about language is that the SES used in both studies was gendered. It asked women only about victimization by men; men were asked only about perpetration against women. I deeply regret that at any time in the past I thought it was appropriate to defend a research initiative that prevented LGBT people from reporting their experiences of same-sex victimization and precluded inquiry into sexual aggression perpetration by women and men's sexual victimization. The SES Collaboration (Koss et al., 2007) more fully addresses gendered measurement.

Questions, Design, and Measurement

The criticism of the 1985 and 1988 studies as data distortion to fit a feminist agenda is ironic to me because 25 years ago I was well-intentioned, but the evidence of feminist methodology is not strong. Apart from selecting the topic of inquiry, including contextual as well as individual-level predictors and attending to language, I note absent exemplars of feminist methods such as use of multiple methods, inclusion of participants' own thoughts and words, assessment of other forms of violence and adversity across the lifespan, and attention to the intersections of status group membership with vulnerability to victimization, and access to services. Feminist methodology has long identified social construction across scientific fields. Research is value-laden in the choice of what to study, which data to collect, how to measure and analyze them, and why results are interpreted as they are. An important distinction exists between advocacy research and pursuing

studies relevant to advocates. A universe of research questions exists; academics can fruitfully concern themselves with the ideas and priorities of other disciplines, advocates, service providers, policymakers, and funders.

I cringed over my use of the word "subject" in the 1985 article. Not only is this word depersonalizing, it is also a scientifically inaccurate term for observational studies. Better choices are participants or respondents, as used in the 1988 article. The statistical approach in the articles was not as bad as I feared, although it insufficiently squeezes meaning from the data according to contemporary standards. Rape researchers often feel (and are in fact reminded by reviewers) that their work falls short of best practices. In the final chapter of their edited volumes, Koss et al. (2011) conclude that the field of violence against women and children presents unique constraints. We strongly challenge prevailing thought that formal experiments including clinical trials are gold standard evidence and any other approach is lacking. We point readers to resources that elaborate the array of qualitative and quantitative designs and modern statistical approaches available. These can produce equally strong conclusions and are better suited to the realities of community-based research on violence against women and children. A broader definition of methodology in 1985 would have empowered me to use qualitative methods. Today I would also do better quantitative work that includes testing theoretically or empirically based mediators of acknowledging an experience as rape, reporting it, and seeking services and that uses the results to bolster initiatives to increase disclosure.

I am still a strong proponent of standardized measurement to facilitate accumulation of knowledge across studies and applaud updating scales (e.g., Bohner, Siebler, & Schmelcher, 2006; Koss et al., 2007; Ullman, Townsend, Filipas, & Starzynski, 2007). Despite its revision, the SES has been the focus of contemporary debate over the validity of behaviorally specific self-reports (cf. Fisher, 2009; contrast with Cook, Gidycz, Koss, & Murphy, 2011; Koss et al., 2007). The version of the SES used in the 1988 article has a 29-year track record and has been cited in 816 related articles according to the Web of Knowledge Web of Science (Retrieved February 1, 2011 from http://apps.isiknowledge.com) and in 1,260 studies according to Google Scholar. Both use and longevity imply significant scrutiny by dissertation committees and peer review. The American Association for the Advancement of Science takes the position that peer review is the best process in science to correct any potential errors.

Of more concern to me is the insufficient attention to what women themselves have to say about rape. The value of illuminating theory, measurement, and research design with language, themes, and personal narratives is obvious (cf. Armstrong et al., 2010 or Bletzer & Koss, 2004 in context of Yuan, Koss, Polacca, & Goldman, 2006). The use of personal narrative in the framing of results is also relevant. The discourse in some fields is predominantly among peers, whereas in others the results are of immediate interest to the general public including subsets of people who are ill or have been traumatized. In the work I have done with American Indian Tribes on rape and physical assault, every presentation and article proposed for submission goes for prereview to a person designated in a memorandum of understanding with the tribe (e.g., Yuan, Eaves, Koss, Polacca, Bletzer, & Goldman, 2010). Under these circumstances, one views language differently. The envisioned audience now includes the people who provided the data, whose lives are being publicized, and who have an interest in deriving something beyond contributing to scholarship.

Rereading these articles recalls the 1985 computer printouts and seeing numbers indicating that highly victimized women had more sexual partners. Over the years, I have reviewed many reports of this well-replicated finding where it is labeled promiscuity. Despite the omnipresent disclaimer that one cannot attribute causality in observational data, the word promiscuity implies causality (and thus blame) solely through language. I typically ask myself when interpreting results: What are the competing interpretations? What happens when findings are looked at from the perspective of aftereffects instead of precursors? How would one explain the findings when talking to victims themselves? And, as an aspiration, what practice, prevention, or policy implications justify the time and effort of all parties, not just investigators?

Knowledge Dissemination

My 1985 study sought to identify which women, if any, were most vulnerable to rape and which were likely to keep it hidden even from themselves. Low, moderately, and highly victimized women were compared on a large number of variables representing what were at the time considered potential vulnerability markers for victimization. Dating behaviors, personality traits, rape-supportive attitudes, and situational characteristics of the crime such as relationship, force, resistance, and clarity of nonconsent were included. After multivariate analysis, univariate comparisons showed a clear pattern. Significant differences were reported for none of seven attitude measures, neither of two personality scales, only one (number of partners) of five dating behaviors, and fully 12 of 17 situational characteristics of the victimization. Among women who had been raped, those most likely to fail to acknowledge victimization even to themselves were more likely to be in a romantic relationship with the perpetrator and had shared prior consensual intimacy.

Our 1988 study narrowed our focus to comparing acquaintance to stranger rape on the situational and contextual characteristics of the victimization. Variables internal to the victims themselves were not included due to prior lack of support for their significance. In our 1988 study, stranger and acquaintance rape victims differed significantly from each other on fully 21 of 28 variables examined. For example, women raped by men they knew were eight times less likely to seek crisis services or report to the police and two times less likely to tell anyone at all. The finding that acquaintance

rape was very likely to be unacknowledged was replicated. Furthermore, acquaintance rape victims also perceived their experience differently than stranger rape victims, which became apparent when they were offered more expanded responses than a yes/no forced choice. Despite no differences in their physical resistance or likelihood of having drunk alcohol prior to the victimization, those victims who knew the offender were twice as likely to view their victimization as a result of miscommunication (51% vs. 22%) and half as likely to acknowledge the incident as rape (23% vs. 55%).

Community activists and members of the media drew these results into what ultimately resulted in a fruitful, although at times a painful, public dialogue. For advocates and antirape activists, these results explained how a pandemic of rape could exist without public awareness. They generally supported existing beliefs that any woman could be raped and quantified a particular set of circumstances that create vulnerability. The results directly exposed the fallacy of assertions that certain women with particular personalities or attitudes in some way bring rape upon themselves. Without outreach from advocates and journalists, I would have considered that the *PWQ* publications completed my work. Today, I am more attuned to information exchange among the constituencies devoted to studying, responding to, and ending sexual violence, and those who facilitate these efforts through policy. Yet, often the very features that make research more elegant and impressive to our peers make it less useful to this much larger group of people who are concerned with services and social change.

In the 1985 and 1988 articles, I see aspects that may not win points for statistical acumen, but nonetheless contributed to their influence. There are tables of descriptive-level data expressed in widely understood metrics (most importantly, percentages). Analysis of public media and internet dialogue on date and acquaintance rape shows that it has often been framed around simple percentages. Two common examples are "one in four college women have been raped" or "more than half of rape victims do not label their assault as rape." Wandersman et al. (2008) have written extensively about the research-to-practice gap. His group observes that achieving best practices begins with good science, but that it is incumbent on scientists to synthesize and distill their work to facilitate application in the field. As a peer reviewer today, I often ask authors to create a take-home message to appear in the conclusion section. Essentially, I want them to include one or two simple, quotable sentences in common language that they want people to remember.

Today, young academics are pressured to be concerned with their journal impact factors and citation analyses. I have come to question excessive reliance on these criteria for academics who embrace community engagement, community action research, and feminist methodologies. I would like to support my thoughts with a diffusion analysis of the 1988 article and then advance some concrete suggestions to transfer knowledge more broadly and to the people in a position to take action. The 1988 *PWQ* article generated 9,410 returns on Google and 202 total citations (average of eight per year) according to the Institute of Science Web of Knowledge (Retrieved February 1, 2011 from http://apps. isiknowledge.com). Compare these figures to those for "The Psychological Consequences of Sexual Trauma" by Yuan, Koss, and Stone (2006) published online through a nonprofit resource funded by the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. This article is short, accessible, aimed at students, victims, and all those who professionally engage with sexual assault. It was peer-reviewed both by academics and practitioners and viewed 10,164 times last year (October, 2009–September, 2010; Casey Keene, personal communication, January 31, 2011). At that rate, this article will outpace in less than half the time the trade book, *I Never Called it Rape: The Ms. Report on Recognizing, Fighting and Surviving Date and Acquaintance Rape* (Warshaw, 1988/1994). This book focused in great part on the 1988 article (disclaimer, I wrote an afterword with the study methodology for the book). Still in print, it is ranked currently as Amazon's 17th bestselling book on rape.

By no means am I downplaying journal publication. Peer review is the essence of quality control in science. Inaccuracy and inconsistency are major limitations of the Internet. To illustrate, I searched date rape on *Wikipedia* (Retrieved February 1, 2011 from http://en.wikipedia.org). The search returned an article that primarily addresses drug-facilitated rape with information that is out-of-date despite having last been revised on January 29, 2011. I also uncovered a link to the one in four statistic whose roots are in the study reported in the 1985 article. There you will find the following assessment: "Mary Koss was a quack of the first degree and the misuse of her fraudulent statistics is a grave crime of propaganda" (Retrieved February 1, 2011 from http://en. wikipedia.org/ wiki/Talk%3ARape/Archive_3#Mary_Koss _and_the_.22One_in_four.22_statistic). Stephanie Shields and the Division 35 Task Force on Feminist Psychology and Women's Studies similarly found that the *Wikipedia* entry on feminist psychology was riddled with errors, and they took leadership in recently posting a thorough revision (Retrieved February 1, 2011 from http://en.wikipedia.org/ wiki/Feminist_psychology). The urgency of engagement is high when considered in the context of a recent *New York Times* analysis of *Wikipedia*'s contributor list that articulated concerns over the biases that may be present throughout the entries because only 13% of its contributors are women (Cohen, 2011).

The *Wikipedia* material on the one in four statistic is a meticulously documented overview written by a person who identifies her/himself as a "survivor." I hope it was a healing experience and the replies not too dispiriting. However, my strongest feeling is that academics and their students should be exerting more energy to contribute scientific accuracy to the Internet and correcting widely consulted sources such as *Wikipedia*. Journal publication should be seen as the beginning and not the end point of synthesizing and communicating

research. I have already suggested that authors include applications of their findings whenever appropriate to the data. Every time an article is accepted or a chapter prepared for an edited book, each of us could commit to the few extra hours it takes to create a short synthesis in common language intended for posting on the Internet. One organization attempting to develop a site for this type of information resource is the National Partnership to End Interpersonal Violence Across the Lifespan (NPEIV), which is ''an overarching network of state, regional, and national interdisciplinary, multicultural organizations, agencies, and coalitions united .... To make the prevention of interpersonal violence a national priority and to encourage healthy relationships by linking science, practice, policy, and advocacy'' (NPEIV, 2010).

Something I have learned from the public health discipline is to look for ways in which existing resources can be enlisted to work toward common goals. Many of us are teachers, and we thus have a new workforce report to us every semester of every year. We require students to write research papers, and these undoubtedly are useful in teaching them critical thinking and the ability to express themselves in writing. As a variation on the traditional research paper assignment, students could be directed to monitor course-relevant sections of the Internet and post comments with documented links to correct information. Many websites are well-intentioned but lack resources or access available through university libraries. Other sites present views that distort information for their own purposes. Both types of sites are worthy of our attention. Students could be assigned to write or update *Wikipedia* entries. Alternately, they could prepare research syntheses in common language and manageable length with links to original sources. Grading is a task that could be made analogous to peer review. Student work that is of sufficient quality to submit for posting at a site such as NPEIV could be awarded extra credit. These activities promise no less skill development than traditional course requirements. Many people are doing exciting work on how technology could be used in academia. I advocate for increasing the value placed by academics on competence in using new media.

I close with a final personal experience. Very early in my career, before these articles were written, Elaine Hilberman Carmen was a discussant at a presentation I did for federal funders. I obsessively critiqued all extant sources of data on rape incidence and prevalence, and naturally ended with ''more research is needed.'' Elaine stood to discuss, created a pregnant pause, and then in a drill sergeant voice hung one sentence in the air, ''What is it going to take to convince you people?'' This single sentence has stayed with me throughout my career. Deconstructing it would be an article in itself. I have now concluded that the answer to her question is that it will take a relentless effort sustained over years to facilitate a multidirectional information exchange with those who can use science to achieve real-world objectives.

References

Amir, M. (1971). *Patterns of forcible rape.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Anders, M. C., & Christopher, F. S. (2011). A socioecological model of rape survivors' decisions to aid in case prosecution. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *35*, 92–106. doi: 10.1177/0361684310394802

Armstrong, E. Q., Hamilton, L., & England, P. (2010). Is hooking up bad for young women? *Contexts*, *9*, 22–27.

Bart, P. (1979). Rape as a paradigm of sexism in society: Victimization and its discontents. *Women's Studies International Quarterly*, *2*, 347–357. doi: 10.1016/S0148-0685(79) 91564-1

Bletzer, K. V., & Koss, M. P. (2004). Narrative constructions of sexual violence as told by female rape survivors' populations of the southwestern United States: Scripts of coercion, scripts of consent. *Medical Anthropology*, *23*, 113–156. doi: 10.1080/01459740490448911

Bohner, G., Siebler, F., & Schmelcher, J. (2006). Social norms and the likelihood of raping: Perceived rape myth acceptance of others affects men's rape proclivity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *32*, 286–297. doi: 10.1177/0146167205280912

Brownmiller, S. (1975). *Against our will: Men, women, and rape.* New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Burgess, A. W., & Holmstrom, L. L. (1974). Crisis and counseling requests of rape victims. *Journal of Nursing Research*, *12*, 196–202.

Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *38*, 217–230. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.38.2.217

Cohen, N. (2011, January 30). Define gender gap? Look up Wikipedia's contributor list. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com

Cook, S. L., & Koss, M. P. (2005). More data have accumulated supporting date and acquaintance rape as significant problems for women. In D. L. Loeske, R. J. Gelles, & M. M. Cavanaugh (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence* (2nd ed., pp. 97–112). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cook, S. S., Gidycz, C., Koss, M. P., & Murphy, M. (2011). Emerging issues in the measurement of rape victimization. *Violence Against Women*, *17*, 201–218.

Daly, K., & Bouhours, B. (2010). Rape and attrition in the legal process; A comparative analysis of five countries. *Criminal Justice: A Review of Research*, *39*, 565–650.

Fisher, B. S. (2009). The effects of survey question wording on rape estimates: Evidence from a quasi-experimental design. *Violence Against Women*, *15*, 133–147. doi: 10.1177/1077801208329391

Fisher, B. S., & Cullen, F. T. (2000). Measuring the sexual victimization of women: Evolution, current controversies and future research. *Measurement and Analysis of Crime and Justice*, *4*, 317–390.

Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. (2000). *The sexual victimization of college women* (NCJ No. 182369). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Fisher, B. S., Daigle, L. E., & Cullen, F. T. (2003). Acknowledging sexual victimization as rape: Results from a national-level study. *Justice Quarterly*, *20*, 535–574. doi: 10.1080/07418820300095611

Gilbert, N. (1991a). The phantom epidemic of sexual assault. *Public Interest*, *103*, 54–65.

Gilbert, N. (1991b, June 27). The campus rape scare. *Wall Street Journal*, p. A14.

Gilbert, N. (1997). Advocacy research and social policy. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and justice: A review of research* (Vol. 22, pp. 101–148). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Gilbert, N. (2005). Advocacy research overstates the incidence of date and acquaintance rape. In D. R. Loeseke, F. J. Gelles, & M. M. Cavanaugh (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence* (2nd ed., pp. 117–130). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Harrison, C. (1994). [Review of the book *Who stole feminism: How women have betrayed women*, by Christina Hoff Sommers]. *Library Journal, 119*, 85. Retrieved from http://www.amazon .com/Who-Stole-Feminism-Women-Betrayed/dp/0684801566

Hoff Sommers, C. (1994). *Who stole feminism? How women have betrayed women.* New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Kanin, E. J. (1957). Male aggression in dating-courtship relations. *American Journal of Sociology*, *63*, 197–204. doi: 10.1086/222177

Kilpatrick, D. G., Resnick, H. S., Rugiero, K. J., Consoscenti, L. M., & McCauley, J. (2007). *Drug-facilitated, incapacitated, and forcible rape: A national study*. Retrieved from http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/219181.pdf

Koss, M. P. (1985). The hidden rape victim: Personality, attitudinal, and situational characteristics. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *9*, 193–212. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.1985.tb00872.x

Koss, M. P. (2009). Restorative justice for acquaintance rape and misdemeanor sex crimes. In J. Ptacek (Ed.), *Feminism, restorative justice, and violence against women* (pp. 218–238). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Koss, M. P., Abbey, A., Campbell, R., Cook, S., Norris, J., Testa, M., . . . White, J. (2007). (). The revised sexual experiences survey. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *31*, 357–370. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00385.x

Koss, M. P., Bachar, K., Hopkins, C. Q., & Carlson, C. (2004). Expanding a community's justice response to sex crimes through advocacy, prosecutorial, and public health collaboration: Introducing the RESTORE program. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *19*, 1435–1463.

Koss, M. P., Dinero, T. E., Seibel, C., & Cox, S. (1988). Stranger, acquaintance, and date rape: Is there a difference in the victim's experience? *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *12*, 1–24. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.1988.tb00924.x

Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. J., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization among a national sample of students in higher education. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *55*, 162–170. doi: 10.1037/0022-006X.55.2.162

Koss, M. P., & Oros, C. J. (1982). The sexual experiences survey: A research instrument investigating sexual aggression and sexual victimization. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *50*, 455–457. doi: 10.1037/0022-006X.50.3.455

Koss, M. P., & White, J. W. (2008). National and global agendas on violence against women: Historical perspective and consensus. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *78*, 386–393. doi: 10.1037/a0014347

Koss, M. P., White, J., & Kazdin, A. E. (2011). Violence against women and children: Perspectives and next steps. In M. Koss, J. White, & A. Kazdin (Eds.), *Violence against women and children* (Vol. 2, pp. 261–306). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. doi: 10.1037/12308-013

National Partnership to End Interpersonal Violence Across the Lifespan. (2010). Retrieved from http://www.uncg.edu/psy/npeiv/

Roiphe, K. (1994). *The morning after: Sex, fear, and feminism.* Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Ullman, S. E., Townsend, S. M., Filipas, H. H., & Starzynski, L. L. (2007). Structural models of the relations of assault severity, social support, avoidance coping, self-blame, and PTSD among sexual assault survivors. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *31*, 23–37.

Walker, M. J., & Brodsky, S. L. (Eds.). (1976). *Sexual assault: The victim and the rapist.* Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Wandersman, A., Duffy, J., Flaspohler, P., Noonan, R., Lubell, K., Stillman, L., . . . Saul, J. (2008). Bridging the gap between prevention research and practice: The interactive systems framework for dissemination and implementation. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *41*, 171–181. doi: 10.1007/s10464-008-9174-z

Warshaw, R. (with afterword by M. P. Koss). (1988/1994). *I never called it rape: The Ms. report on recognizing, fighting, and surviving date and acquaintance rape.* New York, NY: Harper-Collins.

Weis, K., & Borges, S. (1973). Victimology and rape: The case of the legitimate victim. *Issues in Criminology*, *8*, 71–115.

White, J., Koss, M. P., & Kazdin, A. (2011). Conclusions and next steps. In J. White, M. P. Koss, & A. Kazdin (Eds.), *Violence against women and girls: Mapping the problem* (Vol. 1, pp. 287–310). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Yuan, N.P., Eaves, E.R., Koss, M.P., Polacca, M., Bletzer, K., & Goldman, D. (2010). Something like the common cold: Community perceptions of American Indian drinking. *Substance Abuse and Management, 45*, 1909-1929.

Yuan, N., Koss, M. P., Polacca, M., & Goldman, D. (2006). Risk factors for rape and physical assault among Native American tribes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *21*, 1556–1590. doi: 10.1177/0886260506294239

Yuan, N., Koss, M. P., & Stone, M. (2006). *The psychological consequences of sexual trauma*. Retrieved February 1, 2011 from http://www.vawnet.org/category/Documents.php?docid=349&category_id=488