CHAPTER 6

"It's Worth the Fight!": Women Resisting Rape

Christina M. Dardis[*,†,‡], **Sarah E. Ullman**[§], **Leanne R. Brecklin**[§]
[*]Towson University, Towson, MD, United States
[†]Women's Health Sciences Division of the National Center for PTSD, VA Boston Healthcare System, Boston, MA, United States
[‡]Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, MA, United States
[§]University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL, United States

Is it worthwhile to fight back in response to a would-be rapist? On the basis of decades of research dedicated to the subject, we assert that resistance is associated with increased likelihood of rape avoidance and may confer benefits in other ways as well. Whereas the benefit of resistance is becoming clearer based on the empirical research, efforts to increase rape resistance education are often met with criticism, particularly due to concerns about how women's resistance might lead to escalation of offender violence or victim injury. Accordingly, this chapter provides an overview of the research documenting the effectiveness of self-defense/rape resistance strategies, discusses what is effective and what is not, explains the benefits and potential drawbacks of resistance, and explores the factors that facilitate and limit the use of resistance. Finally, the chapter concludes with a discussion of the future directions of research on the efficacy of victim resistance and self-defense training and on the ways to increase women's knowledge and usage of effective resistance strategies.

Both historically and politically, expectations surrounding women's resistance are contradictory. From a legal perspective, victim resistance was formerly compulsory (and unique to the crime of rape) because the 18th-century English law (which was carried over to the United States) required that women must resist their attackers "earnestly" or "to the utmost" in order to be considered victims (Schulhofer, 1998). At the same time, using physical resistance is counter to gender norms of passivity. From the standpoint that women "can't" successfully resist a perpetrator, the police historically advised women not to resist, citing concerns that women who resisted would only experience greater injury, and instead encouraged women to try to play along or talk their way out of sexually violent situations (Storaska, 1975). Whereas injury is one potential risk of resistance,

Sexual Assault Risk Reduction and Resistance
https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-805389-8.00006-2

whether resistance leads to injury, rape avoidance, or other outcomes merits empirical analysis. Importantly, the authors agree that perpetrators of sexual aggression are solely responsible for their conduct and that interventions should target primary prevention of sexual violence perpetration. Ideally, programs to prevent sexual violence would be effective enough that women do not have to concern themselves with learning self-defense and rape resistance strategies. Unfortunately, we have not yet reached a time in which women can rely fully on perpetrator-focused prevention efforts. Whereas the authors firmly believe that rape prevention efforts targeting perpetrators are imperative, we also believe that it is incumbent upon us to assist women in defending themselves from sexual aggression however possible. If resistance strategies are effective in deterring rape, it is our responsibility to make knowledge of such strategies available to women to increase their own safety and to provide opportunities for women to learn these strategies. By providing practice in utilizing resistance strategies, self-defense training may help women to overcome traditional gender role demands of "passivity" and feel more efficacious in resisting offenders.

EVIDENCE FOR EFFECTIVENESS OF SELF-DEFENSE/RAPE RESISTANCE STRATEGIES IN RAPE AVOIDANCE

A growing field of research documents the effectiveness of self-defense and rape resistance strategies as they relate to rape avoidance (for reviews, see Ullman, 1997, 2007; Gidycz & Dardis, 2014). Earlier research suggests that between 66% and 87% of women use some form of resistance in response to rape (Clay-Warner, 2002; Fisher, Daigle, Cullen, & Santana, 2007; O'Neal & Kaiser, 2015; Tark & Kleck, 2004; Ullman & Knight, 1991). This generally converges with the results from a sample of sex offenders incarcerated in Canada, in which 68% of the offenders reported that their victims resisted (Leclerc & Cale, 2015). Overall, using any form of resistance is associated with lower rates of rape completion across a number of studies (Clay-Warner, 2002; O'Neal & Kaiser, 2015; Tark & Kleck, 2014), including within a metaanalysis, in which resistance of any form was associated with an over six times greater likelihood of rape avoidance (Wong & Balemba, 2016). Within a national survey, only 19% of rapes were completed after some form of victim resistance compared with 88% completion when the victim did not resist (Tark & Kleck, 2014). Though the rate of resistance strategies varies across studies, between 35% (Clay-Warner, 2002) and 39% (Fisher et al., 2007) of victims report using more than one type of resistance strategy.

Table 6.1 Categories and examples of resistance strategies

	Forceful	Nonforceful
Physical	Kicking Punching Scratching Wrestling Shoving Biting Martial Arts Using a weapon	Pulling away from offender Fleeing or running away Avoiding offender Removing offender's hands Struggling Shielding oneself
Verbal	Screaming for help Yelling at offender Threatening offender	Crying Begging Pleading with offender Trying to reason with offender

Types of resistance strategies are generally categorized along two dimensions: whether forceful or nonforceful and whether verbal or physical (see Table 6.1). Specifically, *forceful physical* responses include strategies such as wrestling, punching, scratching, shoving, biting, kicking, or using martial arts, whereas *nonforceful physical* responses include strategies such as struggling, fleeing, pulling away, or shielding oneself. *Forceful verbal* responses include strategies such as screaming for help or yelling at or threatening the offender, whereas *nonforceful verbal* responses include crying, begging, or pleading with the offender.

RESISTANCE STRATEGIES GENERALLY FOUND TO BE EFFECTIVE IN DETERRING RAPE

Whereas the use of resistance overall is associated with rape avoidance across a number of studies, some strategies do appear to be more effective than others in deterring rape. Research consistently shows that physical forms of resistance—forceful or nonforceful—are effective in deterring rape (see Edwards et al., 2014; Fisher et al., 2007; Guerette & Santana, 2010; O'Neal & Kaiser, 2015; Tark & Kleck, 2014; Ullman, 1997, 2007; Wong & Balemba, 2016). Resistance that occurs immediately (i.e., earlier on in the assault) is also more effective than less immediate resistance (Ullman, 1997). A sample of incarcerated sex offenders also reported that physical resistance by a victim was associated with reduced rape completion (Leclerc & Cale, 2015).

Under certain circumstances, forceful verbal resistance can also be effective in decreasing the progression of sexual violence (Edwards et al., 2014; Guerette & Santana, 2010; Ullman, 1997, 2007; Wong & Balemba, 2016).

However, some research using multivariate analyses indicates that physical resistance may still be superior to verbal resistance in deterring rape (Clay-Warner, 2002). Nonetheless, forceful verbal resistance may be particularly effective in the context of primarily verbal offender attack strategies, such as verbal pressure (i.e., coercion) or rude remarks (Edwards et al., 2014; Fisher et al., 2007; Ullman, 1997, 1998, 2007). Among a sample of undergraduate women, Fisher et al. (2007) found that victims often matched the strategies of their offenders; for example, victims often responded to forceful offender strategies with forceful resistance and to nonforceful offender strategies (e.g., sexual coercion, unwanted sexual contact without force) with nonforceful strategies, often referred to as the "parity thesis." Fisher et al. (2007) found that such matching was most effective in avoiding completion of sexual violence, such that forceful resistance to forceful offender action was effective. However, Fisher and colleagues also found that forceful physical victim responses to verbally coerced sexual contact were associated with increased *completion* of verbally coerced unwanted sexual contact, whereas nonforceful verbal resistance was associated with decreased likelihood of verbally coerced unwanted sexual contact. It appears that not matching the level of force with the offender was associated with negative outcomes. Of note, the sequence of events (i.e., order in which perpetrator acts and victim reacts) was not controlled in this study, and victims tended to use more than one resistance strategy. Recently, Edwards et al. (2014) found mixed support for the parity thesis among a sample of undergraduate women. Specifically, women often matched nonforceful or verbal tactics by the perpetrator with their own verbal resistance; however, they also most commonly used nonforceful and verbal tactics to respond to forceful and physical offender strategies rather than matching them with physical responses. Balemba, Beauregard, and Mieczkowski (2012) performed semistructured interviews with a sample of sex offenders who have served at least 2 years in a Canadian federal penitentiary, to attempt to address the parity thesis and determine whether violent perpetrator force and violent victim resistance were associated with escalation of perpetrator force. Although they did find that perpetrators responded violently to forceful physical victim resistance, the strongest predictor of a violent reaction to the victim's resistance was the perpetrator's initial use of force and violence. Thus, victims' use of forceful resistance was generally matched to a high degree of initial force, and perpetrators' behavior was dependent on their own prior behavior, perhaps more than the victim's behaviors. However, the authors did not assess actual injury to the victim or rape avoidance as outcomes.

RESISTANCE STRATEGIES GENERALLY FOUND TO BE INEFFECTIVE IN DETERRING RAPE

In contrast to physical and forceful verbal strategies that show evidence of effectiveness in deterring rape, nonforceful verbal resistance is related to rape completion across a number of studies (Edwards et al., 2014; Furby & Fischhoff, 1992; Tark & Kleck, 2014; Ullman, 1997, 2007). Tark and Kleck (2014) found in a national study that nonforceful verbal strategies such as arguing, reasoning, or pleading with the offender increased the odds of rape completion by a factor of 4.5. Edwards et al. (2014) found that nearly 60% of women who experienced assaults by forceful offenders used nonassertive resistance such as pleading, crying, or pretending to be asleep, which were less effective in deterring sexual violence than were assertive physical and verbal responses. Theoretically, nonforceful verbal strategies such as begging or pleading with the perpetrator may coincide with ways that rapists who are motivated by power or control motives hope that women will respond. However, only one quantitative study of empirically validated rapist types examined whether the victim's resistance had differential effects on rape and injury outcomes according to the rapist type (Ullman & Knight, 1995). The study showed that victims resisting sadistic rapists were no more likely to be physically injured than women resisting other rapist types (Ullman & Knight, 1995), and there were no differences in rape completion by rapist type. The level of offender violence across rapist types predicted the level of physical injury regardless of the victim's resistance. Thus, historical advice to women to avoid fighting back in case the perpetrator might be a sadist who would get excited in response to their fighting and injure women more severely has not been empirically supported.

Whereas attacks often lead humans to enter a "fight or flight" stage that engages the individual emotionally and physically to respond to threat, a "freeze" response is also identified in situations of rape, often referred to as "tonic immobility," in which victims feel paralyzed and are unable to respond (Galliano, Noble, Travis, & Puechl, 1993). Gidycz, Van Wynsberghe, and Edwards (2008) found that 39% of their sample reported some experience of immobility in response to sexual violence. Whereas a "freeze" response is natural for some, immobility is associated with increased rape completion (Ullman, 2007). Childhood sexual victimization (Gidycz et al., 2008; Stoner et al., 2007) and prior adolescent/adult victimization (Gidycz et al., 2008) are associated with increased immobility in response to sexual threat and passive resistance responses. Thus, "freeze" responses may partially account for the frequent finding that women with a history of sexual violence are

less likely to resist offenders forcefully (Brecklin, 2011). The role of tonic immobility and prior victimization on rape resistance is discussed more fully in the chapter written by Jeanette Norris et al. in this volume.

WOMEN'S PERCEPTIONS OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF RESISTANCE STRATEGIES

Several studies document women's perceptions of the effectiveness of resistance strategies. Women's perceptions may or may not match empirical evidence of effectiveness; however, women's perceptions are important to the extent that they facilitate women's resistance or present as barriers to women's resistance. In a study assessing college women's perceptions of resistance and intentions to resist in the case of a hypothetical stranger rape, Easton, Summers, Tribble, Wallace, and Lock (1997) found that 84% of women perceived that they could use at least one method to resist a would-be rapist, including "scream" (84%) and "harm their genitals" (81%). However, when the hypothetical offender had a weapon, women were more likely to perceive that resistance was a "bad idea," less likely to report intentions to resist, and more likely to believe that resistance would increase the likelihood of harm and completed rape. Importantly, the offender in this study was a hypothetical stranger, and it is unclear whether women would report similar perceptions in response to an acquaintance or intimate partner offender.

Cobbina's (2013) qualitative research among formerly incarcerated women suggested that psychological strategies such as "outsmarting" or "deceiving" the offender or "playing mind games" were used by 14% of victims and were perceived to be associated with rape avoidance (Cobbina, 2013). However, the author emphasized that these incidents largely occurred in the context of high-risk settings such as prostitution and in the context of threat with a weapon. These strategies were very risky, often involving calling the offender's bluff in the face of a weapon (e.g., "Go ahead and kill me then") (Cobbina, 2013). Though perceived as effective to these women, deceit and "psychological" forms of avoidance could be very risky and have not received much empirical study. In addition, the majority of rapes do not occur in the context of weapon use (Guerette & Santana, 2010). At the present time, there is no statistical evidence to suggest that the aforementioned forms of "psychological avoidance" are more effective than forceful resistance strategies.

Though not empirically studied as a resistance strategy utilized in response to rape, Cuminsky and Brewster (2012) asked undergraduate women

to rate the perceived effectiveness of either pepper spray or a cell phone in keeping them safe in a situation of potential sexual assault. Participants did imagine their cell phones to be weapons of self-defense, and the group who rated the effectiveness of cell phones as self-defense rated it as more effective in deterring rape than did those who rated pepper spray as a form of self-defense. Whereas cell phones could be used to alert bystanders to intervene, the authors point out that it seems that women are inclined to defend themselves psychologically (holding a phone) rather than feeling equipped to physically defend themselves and thus may over-rely on their phones rather than using their own abilities. The use of cell phones as a form of self-defense merits further investigation because this method may not be effective in preventing rape and may prevent women from actively considering other more effective self-protective strategies.

BEYOND RAPE AVOIDANCE: BENEFITS OF RESISTING RAPE

There are several additional benefits to the use of rape resistance strategies (see Brecklin, 2011 for a review). In addition to overall rape avoidance, some strategies may be effective in decreasing the severity of victimization (e.g., Fisher et al., 2007; Ullman & Knight, 1993). For example, in a national survey of undergraduate women, Fisher et al. (2007) found that significantly more women who experienced attempted rape had used forceful physical strategies than did women who experienced completed rape (67% vs 37%), suggesting that use of forceful physical resistance may decrease the severity of victimization. The distinction between attempted and completed rape is consequential because victims of attempted rape report better physical and psychological health than do victims of completed rape (Brecklin & Ullman, 2005). It is likely that research to date underestimates the rate at which resistance strategies lead to rape avoidance and deescalation because attempted rapes are less likely to be reported to the police (Rennison, 2002), and there may be less public awareness of the potential benefits of resistance. Whereas accounts of successful resistance do exist in some forms (e.g., the book *Her Wits About Her*; Caignon & Groves, 1987), these accounts are not as frequently publicized as are accounts of victim helplessness. In a systematic analysis of 16 US newspapers across a calendar year, Hollander and Rodgers (2014) found that most articles did not report on attempted rape or on resistance strategies in their coverage—or they only noted that the woman who experienced completed rape did not resist. In a powerful demonstration, they present a survivor's personal account of her rape, which

included empowered and assertive physical resistance, juxtaposed with the media's narrative of her experience, which highlighted instead the survivor's helplessness and lack of agency.

Successfully avoided rape also may not come to mind on surveys inquiring about sexual victimization experiences; that is, rape is an event that happens, whereas resistance leads to the absence of something "happening," a "nonevent" (Cermele, 2010). Cermele (2010) discusses how women are often given information prior to the script of rape, such as advice or strategies to avoid rape altogether (e.g., do not walk alone at night), and perhaps information about the end of the script, such as support and resources following rape. However, "the middle of the script is a little fuzzy," with little discussion for women's options about what to do once rape is attempted, which may convey a sense of futility ("If avoidance fails, the script ends with rape, and the rape ends in one of two ways: at the whim or desire of the perpetrator, or with outside intervention," p. 1164). For women to choose resistance, scripts that counteract notions of helplessness and provide models demonstrating assertive and successful response must be readily available to women.

In addition to decreased severity of completed sexual violence, women who resist rape report fewer physical and psychological symptoms postassault (Golding, 1999; Kilpatrick, Saunders, Amick-McMullan, & Best, 1989; Koss, Woodruff, & Koss, 1991; Ullman & Brecklin, 2002, 2003) and more rapid psychological improvement (Bart & O'Brien, 1985). Further, women who report greater resistance efforts are more likely to label themselves as victims (for a review, see Littleton, Rhatigan, & Axsom, 2007) and to disclose to formal support sources, including mental health professionals (Campbell, Wasco, Ahrens, Sefl, & Barnes, 2001; Ullman & Filipas, 2001). Unfortunately, data also suggest that rape victims tend to be blamed more by others when they waited for a longer time to resist the offender's advances and receive more sympathy from others when they display more active resistance (Brown & Testa, 2008; Pollard, 1992). These findings highlight the importance of debunking societal rape myths that dismiss the seriousness of experiences of sexual violence that do not include forceful resistance by the victim.

FEARED DRAWBACKS OR COSTS TO RESISTANCE

Despite concerns that the use of resistance strategies would increase women's self-blame when rape is completed, research does not support this conclusion; rather, one study found that victims who resisted reported

decreased self-blame (Rozee & Koss, 2001). In two separate studies, Gidycz et al. further found that women who experienced sexual victimization following a rape resistance and self-defense program evidenced less self-blame and more perpetrator blame than did women who had not completed the rape resistance and self-defense course (Gidycz et al., 2015; Gidycz, Rich, Orchowski, King, & Miller, 2006).

Another feared drawback to resistance is that women who resist will be more likely to experience physical injury. A recent metaanalysis concluded that use of any resistance was associated with increased injury, with physical resistance more strongly associated with injury than verbal resistance (Wong & Balemba, 2016). However, the authors acknowledged that this metaanalysis included just six studies, four of which were conducted in the 1970s. In addition, the metaanalysis, like many of its constituent studies, did not take into account the temporal sequence of events. That is, victims may not experience more injury following resistance; rather, victims may use resistance strategies in response to physically injurious acts from the offender. This is in line with the parity thesis described above (see section "Resistance Strategies Generally Found to Be Effective in Deterring Rape"), in which victims tend to match the strategies of offenders.

When the sequence of resistance and injury is taken into account, several studies suggest that the use of forceful resistance does not lead to an increase in victim injury (Kleck & Sayles, 1990; Ullman, 1998; Ullman & Knight, 1992; Zoucha-Jensen & Coyne, 1993; and more recently, Guerette & Santana, 2010; Tark & Kleck, 2014). For example, Guerette and Santana (2010) found that just 21% of the injuries victims incurred occurred during or after resistance. Tark and Kleck (2014) found that whereas 36.9% of women were injured during rape and 25.2% were injured during sexual assault, only 8.0% of rape victims and 5.6% of sexual assault victims were injured *after* using resistance strategies. Serious injuries (e.g., broken bones, knife, or stab wounds) were even less common, with just 1.4% of rape victims and 1.0% of sexual assault victims seriously injured *after* using resistance strategies. However, women who did resist reported much lower rates of rape completion (54%) than did women who did not resist (88%; Tark & Kleck, 2014), a finding replicated in the metaanalysis by Wong and Balemba (2016; see section "Evidence for Effectiveness of Self-Defense/Rape Resistance Strategies in Rape Avoidance"). Further, it is important to consider other benefits of rape avoidance (i.e., decreased psychological injury, see section "Beyond Rape Avoidance: Benefits of Resisting Rape") relative to potential physical injuries (Galliano et al., 1993; Rozee & Koss, 2001).

Ultimately, women should be informed of the risks as well as the benefits of resistance so that they can make informed decisions.

FACTORS THAT FACILITATE AND LIMIT THE USE OF RESISTANCE STRATEGIES

Given the potential benefits of resistance mentioned above, it is important to understand the reasons why women may or may not resist in potentially risky situations. By gaining an understanding of the factors that facilitate or limit women's use of resistance in response to would-be rapists, it is hoped that important targets of intervention can be identified, which, if addressed, could promote women's ability to respond assertively, if desired.

FACTORS THAT FACILITATE THE USE OF RESISTANCE STRATEGIES

A number of factors are associated with increased use of rape resistance strategies, which generally include situational and cognitive/emotional factors. First, with regard to situational factors, and consistent with the "parity thesis" described earlier, increased aggression by the offender is associated with more assertive responding (e.g., Fisher et al., 2007; Turchik, Probst, Chau, Nigoff, & Gidycz, 2007). Gidycz et al. (2008) found that the use of physical restraint against the victim was associated with increased assertive resistance. In addition, more aggression in the context of multiple offenders ("gang" rape) is associated with increased use of assertive strategies (Woodhams & Cooke, 2013). Among cross-sectional studies of undergraduates, assertive forms of resistance were more likely when women felt confident or were less self-conscious about using resistance strategies (Gidycz et al., 2008; Nurius, Norris, Young, Graham, & Gaylord, 2000). Confidence and intentions to use assertive responses as reported at baseline were also prospectively associated with the use of both forceful verbal and forceful physical resistance strategies in response to victimization over a 2-month follow-up in one study (Turchik et al., 2007). Resistance was also facilitated by increased anger among victims (Nurius, 2000) and resentment toward the offender (Nurius, Norris, Macy, & Huang, 2004), as well as a lack of concern about the offender's judgments (Nurius et al., 2004). Finally, as detailed in a number of chapters in this volume, completion of self-defense training does appear to be a facilitator of resistance strategies. In several studies, women who complete resistance/self-defense training report increased use of rape resistance strategies and assertive sexual communication

when encountering risky situations or potential perpetrators following program participation (Gidycz et al., 2015, 2006; Hollander, 2014; Orchowski, Gidycz, & Raffle, 2008; Rowe, Jouriles, McDonald, Platt, & Gomez, 2012; Senn et al., 2015; Senn, Gee, & Thake, 2011; Sinclair et al., 2013).

FACTORS THAT LIMIT THE USE OF RESISTANCE STRATEGIES

Factors that limit the use of resistance strategies in response to rape can also be divided into situational and cognitive/emotional forms. One situational aspect associated with lower use of resistance strategies is the offender-victim relationship. In several studies, having a prior relationship with the offender is associated with less forceful resistance (Edwards et al., 2014; Macy, Nurius, & Norris, 2007; Turchik et al., 2007; Ullman, 1997, 2007) and with higher rates of rape completion (Guerette & Santana, 2010). Prior relationships also appear to impact victims at a cognitive/emotional level, as Turchik et al. (2007) found that concerns about relationship preservation at baseline were associated with increased use of nonforceful resistance strategies at a 7-month follow-up. Importantly, this does not mean that resistance strategies cannot be useful in avoiding rape in situations in which the victim and the offender have a prior relationship, as studies suggest that resistance strategies utilized against intimate partners are equally effective at deterring rape (Tark & Kleck, 2014). In their recent review of partner sexual violence, Logan, Walker, and Cole (2015) concluded that whereas we know women resist less in such incidents, little is known about particular resistance tactics that may be most effective in partner sexual assaults.

Alcohol use by the offender at the time of the assault is associated with an increase in victims' use of self-protective strategies, particularly physical responses (Ullman, 1997, 2007) in most studies (for exceptions, see Ullman & Knight, 1993; Ullman, Karabatsos, & Koss, 1999). Ullman (1997, 2007) theorizes that this may occur either (a) because the victim perceives that she will be more likely to be able to resist an intoxicated offender due to his impairment or (b) because intoxicated offenders may attack with more initial violence that is met with greater victim resistance. Indeed, rapes in which only the offender was drinking were related to greater rape completion (Brecklin & Ullman, 2002) and victim injury (Ullman & Brecklin, 2000). However, one study suggests that offender alcohol use does not limit the effectiveness of resistance strategies (Tark & Kleck, 2014).

In contrast, victim alcohol use is associated with decreased resistance (Macy, Nurius, & Norris, 2006; Testa, VanZile-Tamsen, Livingston, &

Buddie, 2006; Ullman et al., 1999). Experimental studies suggest that alcohol intoxication interferes with sexual assault risk perception (Stoner et al., 2007; Testa, Livingston, & Collins, 2000), even at blood alcohol levels well below those that would occur in the context of binge drinking (Stoner et al., 2007). Among undergraduate samples, women who were drinking at the time of rape report increased self-blame as well as tonic immobility and passive rather than assertive resistance (Macy et al., 2006; Nurius et al., 2004; Stoner et al., 2007). Though these studies were cross-sectional and retrospective, it is possible that women who drink alcohol prior to an assault resist less or that the combination of alcohol use and acquaintance perpetrators leads to lower resistance, leading to greater completion of rape and increased postassault self-blame. Stoner et al. (2007) administered alcohol to undergraduate women to reach various levels of intoxication and presented them with hypothetical interactions with sexually aggressive men, finding that uncertainty about how to respond mediated the relationship between alcohol use and resistance strategies. Specifically, with increasing levels of intoxication (as measured by the blood alcohol level), women reported increasing uncertainty about how to respond, leading to more polite resistance (e.g., apologizing, make excuses for not having sex).

Several other situational factors, including the presence of multiple offenders and the presence of weapons, may affect the use of resistance strategies. With regard to multiple offenders, Woodhams and Cooke (2013) found that as the number of offenders increased, victim resistance decreased. Whereas some research suggests that women are generally less able to avoid rape completion in multiple-offender cases (Ullman, 2007; Ullman et al., 1999), Tark and Kleck (2014) found that the effectiveness of self-protective behaviors did not differ based on the number of offenders. Weapon use is associated with greater rape completion (Ullman, 2007), perpetrator violence (Balemba et al., 2012), and physical injury (O'Neal & Kaiser, 2015), even in the context of women's self-defense strategies (Clay-Warner, 2002). However, examining situational characteristics and resistance from the perspective of sex offenders, Leclerc and Cale (2015) found that whereas weapon use did increase victims' performance of sexual behaviors on offenders, the presence of weapons was not associated with completed penile penetration. Ullman and Knight (1993) also found that forceful resistance by the victim was associated with less severe victimization outcomes regardless of whether a weapon was present. Further, in a sample of rapes reported to the Los Angeles Police and Sheriff's Departments, O'Neal and Kaiser (2015) found that weapon use by the perpetrator increased the risk

of injury by 460%. However, resistance by a *victim using a weapon* such as a knife or gun is associated with decreased rape completion (Guerette & Santana, 2010; Kleck & Sayles, 1990; Tark & Kleck, 2014), with no significant effect on injury (Guerette & Santana, 2010; Kleck & Sayles, 1990; Tark & Kleck, 2004, 2014). More research is needed on rape resistance in the context of different types of weapons.

The presence of a bystander is another situational characteristic that may affect resistance. In general, having a bystander present at the time of the assault decreased the odds of completion in several studies (Guerette & Santana, 2010; Ullman, 1997, 2007). Specifically, Guerette and Santana (2010) found that a bystander's presence decreased the odds of rape completion by 45%. However, it is less clear how bystanders affect victim resistance strategies. The presence of bystanders was associated with the use of nonforceful resistance strategies in one study (Skogan & Block, 1983) but not in another (Clay-Warner, 2003). In a qualitative study, Cobbina (2013) found that forceful physical strategies in combination with bystander intervention led to deescalation and decreased injury.

In this volume, Jeannette Norris et al. detail the role of cognitive and emotional barriers in responding to risky situations and potential perpetrators. These factors include embarrassment, fear of peer group rejection for resisting (Norris, Nurius, & Dimeff, 1996; Ullman, 2007), and conflict and uncertainty about how to respond to rape (Stoner et al., 2007). One individual characteristic of the victim that has received much attention in the resistance and self-defense literature is the victim's history of prior sexual abuse. Overall, research supports the notion that women with a history of victimization are less likely to use assertive resistance strategies and more likely to use indirect methods of resistance in response to an assault than are women without a history of prior sexual victimization (see Brecklin, 2011, for a review). In vignette studies, Yeater, McFall, and Viken (2011) found that women with increasingly severe histories of sexual violence responded less effectively to increasing sexual pressure within vignettes, suggesting that women with a history of victimization may experience unique barriers to resistance compared with women without a history of sexual victimization. In a virtual reality paradigm, undergraduate women responded to increasing sexual coercion from a virtual "acquaintance." Women with a sexual assault history, compared with women without such a history, were less angry and used fewer angry words in response to initial unwanted sexual advances, particularly when such advances were flirtatious and flattering rather than overtly hostile (Jouriles, Rowe, McDonald, & Kleinsasser, 2014). This is

important given that anger is a facilitator of assertive resistance (Nurius, 2000). One reason for less assertive responding may be due to tonic immobility because women with a history of child and adolescent/adult sexual victimization display more immobile reactions to rape than do women who have not been previously victimized (see section "Resistance Strategies Generally Found to Be Ineffective in Deterring Rape"). It may be that women with a history of sexual violence are triggered by these experiences and begin to dissociate, making it difficult to respond assertively.

There is some evidence that decreased sexual assertiveness among women with a history of adult sexual victimization mediates the relationship between a history of sexual victimization and revictimization (Kelley, Orchowski, & Gidycz, 2016). There is also evidence that women with a history of sexual victimization do make self-protective plans in attempts to avoid rape. Specifically, Gilmore et al. (2016) examined women's use of "protective behavioral strategies" (PBS) that women plan to use to attempt to decrease the likelihood of victimization (e.g., planning to meet a date in public, planning which resistance strategies one would use in the moment). Surprisingly, they found that a history of sexual victimization was not associated with the use of self-protective strategies over a 3-month interim. However, as expected, the use of PBS at baseline was associated with decreased sexual assault severity over the 3-month interim. The authors suggest that these results provide preliminary evidence that women with a history of sexual victimization are equally as likely to plan ahead to use protective strategies as are women without a history of sexual victimization but appear to experience more barriers to assertive situational responding once an assault begins. Such barriers need investigation in future research in order to inform risk reduction programs for women with a history of sexual victimization.

NEXT STEPS IN RESISTANCE RESEARCH

Given the efficacy of resistance strategies in rape avoidance and associations with other positive outcomes, some programming efforts have been directed toward teaching self-defense and rape resistance strategies. Despite some promising findings with risk reduction efforts (see the chapter by Charlene Senn, Jocelyn Hollander, and Christine Gidycz in this volume), in order to best inform such efforts, additional research is needed to determine which resistance strategies are effective under which specific circumstances. For example, the interaction between known perpetrators and alcohol use

is important to investigate, given that the majority of campus rapes occur under such conditions. Whereas it is likely that desire to preserve a relationship may continue to preclude the use of forceful physical resistance among some women, there may be strategies that women find more palatable that can also be effective (e.g., particular forceful verbal strategies), and determining what works in these situations and providing an arsenal of options would be beneficial.

The majority of the resistance literature is based on large samples from the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) at various time intervals since the 1990s. The use of a large national sample is a strength of this research. However, the sample is limited by its retrospective design and difficulty in determining the temporal ordering of resistance and injury. The NCVS is also framed as a survey about "crime," such that it may only capture incidents perceived as true crimes, likely leaving out sexual assault that does not fit a definition of a stereotypical rape (e.g., intimate partners, in the presence of alcohol, with less physical force). Research is needed that carefully assesses episodes of sexual violence including temporal sequencing to disentangle the issues of offender attack, victim resistance, and injury. In addition, while the NCVS includes nationally representative data of individuals aged 12 years and over, it is unknown whether the results based on the survey generalize to other populations, such as undergraduate college students, or those in various kinds of relationships (i.e., marital rape vs date rape). It is also imperative that continued work be trauma informed (see Anne DePrince and Kerry Gagnon's chapter in this volume, as well as Brecklin, 2011). Women with a history of sexual victimization are at high risk of revictimization and may have specific difficulties with risk recognition, immobility, trauma symptoms, or other factors that interfere with their use of resistance strategies that must be specifically addressed in this population. Prevention programs should be tailored to meet the needs of this group. For example, sexual assault victims could benefit from a combination of therapy and self-defense training. These complementary approaches could help ameliorate any emotional distress that results from training participation, provide validation for their experiences, and at the same time offer strategies to prevent revictimization.

Whereas we believe that it is critical to disseminate the research on the efficacy of women's resistance to sexual violence, strategies directed toward decreasing the perpetration of sexual violence are also vital. Critics of sexual assault resistance and self-defense often allege that such approaches put the onus on victims rather than addressing larger sociocultural issues that

influence sexual perpetration (e.g., misogyny, gender role beliefs, and rape myths). We do agree that a larger discourse is needed to shift general attitudes and beliefs about sexual violence and its victims, and we believe that sexual assault resistance approaches can contribute to this discourse, by emphasizing women as complex, strong, powerful, and less vulnerable, and by empowering women to protect themselves. We believe that widespread cultural change can occur when women resist and when women's resistance efforts are made visible (Cermele, 2010; Hollander & Rodgers, 2014). One method by which self-defense and risk reduction programming can work to construct this new narrative of resistance is through the observation of fellow participants successfully defending themselves during mock simulations. Brecklin and Middendorf (2014) found that this vicarious experience was important for increasing women's confidence about using self-defense skills. Further, we agree with others who suggest that empowerment-based self-defense and resistance programs can lead to "newfound awareness of one's own verbal, social emotional, and physical power" and combat the "narrative of the inherent weakness of women and other victims and insurmountable strength of men and other perpetrators at both the personal and the political levels" (Jones & Mattingly, 2016, p. 264). Further, whereas bystander intervention education approaches that emphasize others to interrupt potentially violent situations on behalf of the victim may prove beneficial, we believe that though victims can be benefited by heroic others who intervene, women can themselves perform personal acts of heroism to combat offenders even in the absence of bystanders. Women's resistance to rapists powerfully counteracts patriarchal narratives of women's helplessness and the need for a male hero or "knight in shining armor" to save a "damsel in distress." Women's resistance and bystander intervention by others need not be mutually exclusive; rather, multiple strategies are likely needed to stop rape.

Importantly, training on the use of resistance strategies can provide valuable tools for rape avoidance, but it is ultimately women's choice whether or not to resist. Women should not be punished or held accountable for their decisions *not to* resist or their inability to resist (e.g., tonic immobility), as women's personal assessments of the risks and benefits to resisting in any given situation should be honored and respected. In addition to the possibility of tonic immobility, other circumstances could lead to difficulty utilizing resistance strategies. For example, women with disabilities, who experience elevated rates of physical and sexual violence (e.g., Brownridge, 2006), may experience challenges in the use of some self-protective strategies. Thus, it is important for self-defense and risk reduction programs to be

sensitive to the needs of this group. Ballan and Freyer (2012) discuss ways to adapt resistance strategies to meet the needs of women with specific sensory, physical, developmental, and psychological disabilities. Meg Stone's chapter in this volume also provides an additional discussion of programming efforts for individuals with disabilities. Future research is needed to examine the effectiveness of resistance strategies among women with disabilities. In addition, there is limited research assessing resistance strategies among the LGBT population. One existing study by Moore and Waterman (1999) assessed resistance strategies among a small sample of 123 undergraduate heterosexual and LGBT men and women and found that out of the 21 victims (17 of whom were women), just one (a bisexual man) was victimized by a woman. Self-protective behaviors (assessed using a researcher-created scale) were used more frequently by those who dated men in general (heterosexual women, bisexual individuals, and gay men) and by those with exposure to rape prevention education material (defined by reading articles or books on sexual assault or attending courses in which rape prevention was discussed). Additional research examining the use and effectiveness of resistance strategies is needed among LGBT samples. Finally, we believe that the existing evidence in support of the overall positive effects of assertive resistance strategies, particularly physical resistance and perhaps forceful verbal resistance, should be disseminated as a legitimate option for women to decrease the likelihood of completed rape.

METHODS TO INCREASE WOMEN'S USE OF RAPE RESISTANCE

Given the existing evidence supporting the use of rape resistance strategies in decreasing rape completion and other negative outcomes of sexual violence, we believe that a critical next step is to find methods by which we can increase women's use of rape resistance. First, the effectiveness of rape resistance is not well publicized, and this information should be incorporated into college rape education programs, including the benefits with regard to rape avoidance, as well as other psychological benefits of rape resistance education (for a review of benefits of self-defense training for female participants, see Brecklin, 2008). Self-defense and risk reduction classes should be expanded and made available to more young adults within and outside of the university setting (e.g., in community centers, high schools), and efforts to recruit more women into these classes should be made. In programs, women should be encouraged to plan ahead for potential situations

of sexual violence, particularly those with known perpetrators in which women may struggle with discomfort regarding forceful resistance. Working through several strategies or a menu of options may assist these women in considering a variety of strategies they could use, and role play of these strategies in courses should be encouraged. We agree with others (for a review, see McCaughey & Cermele, 2015) who argue that self-defense programs should be disseminated because of their effectiveness and that self-defense programs aim for intervention at a similar point in time during an assault (i.e., immediately before or during sexual violence) as bystander intervention programs and should therefore also be considered primary prevention. Self-defense programs are not antithetical to bystander intervention programs or programs that specifically target men (Gidycz & Dardis, 2014) and could be used comprehensively to target sexual assault reduction because women should be empowered to intervene on their own behalf in addition to empowering bystanders to intervene in the service of their peers. Experts believe that multipronged approaches are needed that could include bystander training for both men and women as well as programs that specifically target resistance and formal self-defense strategies for women and social norms related to violence and masculinity for men (Gidycz & Dardis, 2014; Gidycz, Dowdall, & Marioni, 2002; Rozee & Koss, 2001). These programs should be targeted toward single-gender audiences to be most effective (Brecklin & Forde, 2001; Breitenbecher, 2000; Schewe & O'Donohue, 1993). Given the effectiveness of forceful resistance strategies, as well as the emerging literature on the effectiveness of self-defense and risk reduction training, we believe that these programs themselves are "worth the fight" and that funding should made available for their continued development, dissemination, and implementation.

REFERENCES

Balemba, S., Beauregard, E., & Mieczkowski, T. (2012). To resist or not to resist? The effect of context and crime characteristics on sex offenders' reaction to victim resistance. *Crime and Delinquency*, *58*, 588–611. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128712437914.

Ballan, M. S., & Freyer, M. B. (2012). Self-defense among women with disabilities: An unexplored domain in domestic violence cases. *Violence Against Women*, *18*, 1083–1107. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801212461430.

Bart, P. B., & O'Brien, P. H. (1985). *Stopping rape: Successful survival strategies*. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon.

Brecklin, L. R. (2008). Evaluation outcomes of self-defense training for women: A review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *13*, 60–76. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2007.10.001.

Brecklin, L. R. (2011). The benefits of self-defense training for sexual assault survivors. In T. Bryant-Davis (Ed.), *Surviving sexual violence: A guide to recovery and empowerment* (pp. 276–295). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Brecklin, L. R., & Forde, D. R. (2001). A meta-analysis of rape education programs. *Violence and Victims*, *16*, 303–321. Retrieved from http://www.ingentaconnect.com/contentone/springer/vav/2001/00000016/00000003/art00005.

Brecklin, L. R., & Middendorf, R. K. (2014). The group dynamics of women's self-defense training. *Violence Against Women*, *20*, 326–342. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801214526044.

Brecklin, L. R., & Ullman, S. E. (2002). The roles of victim and offender alcohol use in sexual assaults: Results from the national violence against women survey. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, *63*, 57–63. https://doi.org/10.15288/jsa.2002.63.57.

Brecklin, L. R., & Ullman, S. E. (2005). Self-defense or assertiveness training and women's responses to sexual attacks. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *20*, 738–762. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260504272894.

Breitenbecher, K. H. (2000). Sexual assault on college campuses: Is an ounce of prevention enough? *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, *9*, 23–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-1849(05)80036-8.

Brown, A. L., & Testa, M. (2008). Social influences on judgments of rape victims: The role of the negative and positive social reactions of others. *Sex Roles*, *58*, 490–500.

Brownridge, D. A. (2006). Partner violence against women with disabilities: Prevalence, risk, and explanations. *Violence Against Women*, *12*, 805–822. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801206292681.

Caignon, D., & Groves, G. (Eds.), (1987). *Her wits about her: Self-defense success stories by women*. New York: Harper and Row.

Campbell, R., Wasco, S. M., Ahrens, C. E., Sefl, T., & Barnes, H. E. (2001). Preventing the "second rape": Rape survivors' experiences with community service providers. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *16*, 1239–1259. https://doi.org/10.1177/088626001016012002.

Cermele, J. A. (2010). Telling our stories: The importance of women's narratives of resistance. *Violence Against Women*, *16*, 1162–1172. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801210382873.

Clay-Warner, J. (2002). Avoiding rape: The effects of protective actions and situational factors on rape outcome. *Violence and Victims*, *17*, 691–705. https://doi.org/10.1891/vivi.17.6.691.33723.

Clay-Warner, J. (2003). The context of sexual violence: Situational predictors of self-protective actions. *Violence and Victims*, *18*, 543–556. https://doi.org/10.1891/vivi.2003.18.5.543.

Cobbina, J. E. (2013). Victimization and resistance strategies among female offenders. *Deviant Behavior*, *34*, 464–482. https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2012.748621.

Cuminsky, K. M., & Brewster, K. (2012). Mobile phones or pepper spray? Imagined mobile intimacy as a weapon of self-defense for women. *Feminist Media Studies*, *12*, 590–599. https://doi.org/10.10080/14680777.2012.741893.

Easton, A. N., Summers, J., Tribble, J., Wallace, P. B., & Lock, R. S. (1997). College women's perceptions regarding resistance to sexual assault. *Journal of American College Health*, *46*, 127–131. https://doi.org/10.1080/07448489709595598.

Edwards, K. M., Probst, D. R., Tansill, E. C., Dixon, K. J., Bennett, S., & Gidycz, C. A. (2014). In their own words: A content-analytic study of college women's resistance to sexual assault. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *29*, 2527–2547. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260513520470.

Fisher, B. S., Daigle, L. E., Cullen, F. T., & Santana, S. A. (2007). Assessing the efficacy of the protective action-sexual victimization completion nexus. *Violence and Victims*, *22*, 18–42. https://doi.org/10.1891/vv-v22i1a002.

Furby, L., & Fischhoff, B. (1992). *Rape self-defense strategies: A review of their effectiveness*. Unpublished manuscript. Department of Engineering and Public Policy, Carnegie Mellon University.

Galliano, G., Noble, L. M., Travis, L. A., & Puechl, C. (1993). Victim reactions during rape/sexual assault: A preliminary study of the immobility response and its correlates. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *8*, 109–114. https://doi.org/10.1177/088626093008001008.

Gidycz, C. A., & Dardis, C. M. (2014). Feminist self-defense and resistance training for college students: A critical review and recommendations for the future. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, *15*, 322–333. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838014521026.

Gidycz, C. A., Dowdall, C. L., & Marioni, N. L. (2002). Interventions to prevent rape and sexual assault. In J. Petrak & B. Hedge (Eds.), *The trauma of adult sexual assault: Treatment, prevention, and policy* (pp. 235–260). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Gidycz, C. A., Orchowski, L. M., Probst, D. R., Edwards, K. M., Murphy, M., & Tansill, E. (2015). Concurrent administration of sexual assault prevention and risk reduction programming: Outcomes for women. *Violence Against Women*, *21*, 780–800. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801215576579.

Gidycz, C. A., Rich, C. L., Orchowski, L., King, C., & Miller, A. K. (2006). The evaluation of a sexual assault self-defense and risk reduction program for college women: A prospective study. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *30*, 173–186. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2008.00425.x.

Gidycz, C. A., Van Wynsberghe, A., & Edwards, K. M. (2008). Prediction of women's utilization of resistance strategies in a sexual assault situation: A prospective study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *23*, 571–588. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260507313944.

Gilmore, A. K., Maples-Keller, J. L., Pinsky, H. T., Shepard, M. E., Lewis, M. A., & George, W. H. (2016). Is the use of protective behavioral strategies associated with college sexual assault victimization? A prospective examination. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. Advance Online Publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516628808.

Golding, J. M. (1999). Sexual assault history and long-term physical health problems: Evidence from clinical and population epidemiology. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *8*, 191–194. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.00045.

Guerette, R. T., & Santana, S. A. (2010). Explaining victim self-protective behavior effects on crime incident outcomes: A test of opportunity theory. *Crime & Delinquency*, *56*, 198–226. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128707311644.

Hollander, J. (2014). Does self-defense training prevent sexual violence against women? *Violence Against Women*, *20*, 252–269. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801214526046.

Hollander, J. A., & Rodgers, K. (2014). Constructing victims: The erasure of women's resistance to sexual assault. *Sociological Forum*, *29*, 342–364. https://doi.org/10.1111/socf.12087.

Jones, A. L. E., & Mattingly, K. (2016). Empowerment, social justice, and feminist self-defense: The benefits of incorporating embodied empowerment skills in social work practice. *Journal of Women and Social Work*, *31*, 263–270. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886109916634164.

Jouriles, E. N., Rowe, L. S., McDonald, R., & Kleinsasser, A. L. (2014). Women's expression of anger in response to unwanted sexual advances: Associations with sexual victimization. *Psychology of Violence*, *4*, 170–183. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033191.

Kelley, E. L., Orchowski, L. M., & Gidycz, C. A. (2016). Sexual victimization among college women: Role of sexual assertiveness and resistance variables. *Psychology of Violence*, *6*, 243–252. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039407.

Kilpatrick, D. G., Saunders, B. E., Amick-McMullan, A., & Best, C. L. (1989). Victim and crime factors associated with the development of crime-related post-traumatic stress disorder. *Behavior Therapy*, *20*, 199–214. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7894(89)80069-3.

Kleck, G., & Sayles, S. (1990). Rape and resistance. *Social Problems*, *37*, 149–162. https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.1990.37.2.03a00020.

Koss, M. P., Woodruff, W. J., & Koss, P. G. (1991). Criminal victimization among primary care medical patients: Incidence, prevalence, and physician usage. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, *9*, 85–96. https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.2370090110.

Leclerc, B., & Cale, J. (2015). Weapon use and sexual abuse outcomes: A multivariate and conjunctive analysis of sexual offenses against women. *Security Journal*, *28*, 54–70. https://doi.org/10.1057/sj.2012.42.

Littleton, H. L., Rhatigan, D. L., & Axsom, D. (2007). Unacknowledged rape: How much do we know about the hidden rape victim? *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment, & Trauma*, *14*, 57–74. https://doi.org/10.1300/J146v14n04_04.

Logan, T. K., Walker, R., & Cole, J. (2015). Silenced suffering: The need for a better understanding of partner sexual violence. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, *16*, 111–135. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838013517560.

Macy, R. J., Nurius, P., & Norris, J. (2006). Responding in their best interests: Contextualizing women's coping with acquaintance sexual aggression. *Violence Against Women*, *12*, 478–500. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801206288104.

Macy, R. J., Nurius, P. S., & Norris, J. (2007). Latent profiles among sexual assault survivors: Implications for defensive coping and resistance. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *22*, 543–565. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260506298841.

McCaughey, M., & Cermele, J. (2015). Changing the hidden curriculum of campus rape prevention and education: Women's self-defense as a key protective factor for a public health model of prevention. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, *18*, 287–302.

Moore, C. D., & Waterman, C. K. (1999). Predicting self-protection against sexual assault in dating relationships among heterosexual men and women, gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals. *Journal of College Student Development*, *40*, 132–140. Retrieved from https://muse.jhu.edu/journal/238.

Norris, J., Nurius, P. S., & Dimeff, L. A. (1996). Through her eyes: Factors affecting women's perception of and resistance to acquaintance sexual aggression threat. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *20*, 123–145. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1996.tb00668.x.

Nurius, P. S. (2000). Risk perception of acquaintance sexual aggression: A social-cognitive perspective. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *5*, 63–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1359-1789(98)00003-2.

Nurius, P. S., Norris, J., Macy, R. J., & Huang, B. (2004). Women's situational coping with acquaintance sexual assault. *Violence Against Women*, *10*, 450–478. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801204264367.

Nurius, P. S., Norris, J., Young, D. S., Graham, T. L., & Gaylord, J. (2000). Interpreting and defensively responding to threats: Examining appraisals and coping with acquaintance sexual aggression. *Violence and Victims*, *15*, 187–208. Retrieved from http://www.ingentaconnect.com/contentone/springer/vav/2000/00000015/00000002/art00005.

O'Neal, E. N., & Kaiser, K. A. (2015). Resistance strategies and sexual assault outcomes: Do measurement decisions influence empirical findings? *Criminology, Criminal Justice, Law & Society*, *16*, 56–73. Retrieved from https://ccjls.scholasticahq.com/article/311-resistance-strategies-and-sexual-assault-outcomes-do-measurement-decisions-influence-empirical-findings.

Orchowski, L. M., Gidycz, C. A., & Raffle, H. (2008). Evaluation of a sexual assault risk reduction and self-defense program: A prospective analysis of a revised protocol. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *32*, 204–218. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2008.00425.x.

Pollard, P. (1992). Judgments about victims and attackers in depicted rapes: A review. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *31*, 307–326. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1992.tb00975.x.

Rennison, C. M. (2002). *Rape and sexual assault: Reporting to police and medical attention, 1992–2000*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Rowe, L., Jouriles, E. N., McDonald, R., Platt, C. G., & Gomez, G. S. (2012). Enhancing women's resistance to sexual coercion: A randomized controlled trial of the DATE program. *Journal of American College Health*, *60*, 211–218. https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2011.587068.

Rozee, P. D., & Koss, M. P. (2001). Rape: A century of resistance. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *25*, 295–311. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-6402.00030.

Schewe, P. A., & O'Donohue, W. (1993). Sexual abuse prevention with high-risk males: The roles of victim empathy and rape myths. *Violence and Victims*, *8*, 339–351. Retrieved from http://www.ingentaconnect.com/contentone/springer/vav/1993/00000008/00000004/art00003.

Schulhofer, S. J. (1998). *Unwanted sex: The culture of intimidation and the failure of law*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Senn, C. Y., Eliasziw, M., Barata, P. C., Thurston, W. E., Newby-Clark, I. R., Radtke, H. L., & Hobden, K. L. (2015). Efficacy of a sexual assault resistance program for university women. *New England Journal of Medicine*, *372*, 2326–2335. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMsa1411131.

Senn, C. Y., Gee, S., & Thake, J. (2011). Emancipatory sexuality education and sexual assault resistance. Does the former enhance the latter? *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *35*, 72–91. https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684310384101.

Sinclair, J., Sinclair, L., Otieno, E., Mulinge, M., Kapphahn, C., & Golden, N. (2013). A self-defense program reduces the incidence of sexual assault in Kenyan adolescent girls. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *53*, 374–380. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2013.04.008.

Skogan, W. G., & Block, R. (1983). Resistance and injury in non-fatal assaultive violence. *Victimology*, *8*, 215–226. Retrieved from http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:http://www.skogan.org/files/Resistance_Injury_Non-Fatal_Assault.Victim_1984.pdf.

Stoner, S. A., Norris, J., George, W. H., Davis, K. C., Masters, N. T., & Hessler, D. M. (2007). Effects of alcohol intoxication and victimization history on women's sexual assault resistance intentions: The role of secondary cognitive appraisals. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *31*, 344–356. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00384.x.

Storaska, F. (1975). *How to say no to a rapist and survive*. New York, NY: Random House.

Tark, J., & Kleck, G. (2004). Resisting crime: The effects of victim action on the outcomes of crimes. *Criminology*, *42*, 861–909. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2004.tb00539.x.

Tark, J., & Kleck, G. (2014). Resisting rape: The effects of victim self-protection on rape completion and injury. *Violence Against Women*, *20*, 270–292. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801214526050.

Testa, M., Livingston, J. A., & Collins, R. L. (2000). The role of women's alcohol consumption in evaluation of vulnerability to sexual aggression. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology*, *8*, 185. https://doi.org/10.1037/1064-1297.8.2.185.

Testa, M., VanZile-Tamsen, C., Livingston, J. A., & Buddie, A. M. (2006). The role of women's alcohol consumption in managing sexual intimacy and sexual safety motives. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, *67*, 665–674. https://doi.org/10.15288/jsa.2006.67.665.

Turchik, J. A., Probst, D. R., Chau, M., Nigoff, A., & Gidycz, C. A. (2007). Factors predicting the type of tactics used to resist sexual assault: A prospective study of college women. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *75*, 605–614. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.75.4.605.

Ullman, S. E. (1997). Review and critique of empirical studies of rape avoidance. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *24*, 177–204. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854897024002003.

Ullman, S. E. (1998). Does offender violence escalate when rape victims fight back? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *13*, 179–192. https://doi.org/10.1177/088626098013002001.

Ullman, S. E. (2007). A 10-year update of "Review and critique of empirical studies of rape avoidance". *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *34*, 411–429. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854806297117.

Ullman, S. E., & Brecklin, L. (2002). Sexual assault and suicidal behavior in a national sample of women. *Suicide and Life-threatening Behavior*, *32*, 117–130. https://doi.org/10.1521/suli.32.2.117.24398.

Ullman, S. E., & Brecklin, L. (2003). Sexual assault history and health-related outcomes in a national sample of women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *27*, 46–57. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-6402.t01-2-00006.

Ullman, S. E., & Brecklin, L. R. (2000). Alcohol and adult sexual assault in a national sample of women. *Journal of Substance Abuse*, *12*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0899-3289(00)00036-5.

Ullman, S. E., & Filipas, H. H. (2001). Correlates of formal informal support seeking in sexual assault victims. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *16*, 1028–1047. https://doi.org/10.1177/088626001016010004.

Ullman, S. E., Karabatsos, G., & Koss, M. P. (1999). Alcohol and sexual assault in a national sample of college women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *14*, 603–625. https://doi.org/10.1177/088626099014006003.

Ullman, S. E., & Knight, R. A. (1991). A multivariate model for predicting rape and physical injury outcomes during sexual assaults. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *39*, 724–731. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/labs/journals/j-consult-clin-psychol/.

Ullman, S. E., & Knight, R. A. (1992). Fighting back: Women's resistance to rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *7*, 31–43. https://doi.org/10.1177/088626092007001003.

Ullman, S. E., & Knight, R. A. (1993). The efficacy of women's resistance strategies in rape situations. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *17*, 23–38. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1993.tb00674.x.

Ullman, S. E., & Knight, R. A. (1995). Women's resistance strategies to different rapist types. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *22*, 263–283. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854895022003005.

Wong, J. S., & Balemba, S. (2016). Resisting during sexual assault: A meta-analysis of the effects on injury. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *28*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/javb.2016.03.010.

Woodhams, J., & Cooke, C. (2013). Suspect aggression and victim resistance in multiple perpetrator rapes. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *42*, 1509–1516. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-013-0136-7.

Yeater, E. A., McFall, R. M., & Viken, R. J. (2011). The relationship between women's response effectiveness and a history of sexual victimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *26*, 462–478. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260510363425.

Zoucha-Jensen, J. M., & Coyne, A. (1993). The effects of resistance strategies on rape. *American Journal of Public Health*, *83*, 1633–1634. Retrieved from http://ajph.aphapublications.org/doi/abs/10.2105/AJPH.83.11.1633?utm_source=TrendMD&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=Am_J_Public_Health_TrendMD_0.