



# Criminal justice system stakeholders' perspectives on rape myth acceptance interventions for jurors

Lara Flynn Hudspith<sup>a,\*</sup>, Nadia Wager<sup>b</sup>, Dominic Willmott<sup>c,d</sup>, Bernard Gallagher<sup>e</sup>

<sup>a</sup> University of British Columbia, 5955 University Blvd, Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z1, Canada

<sup>b</sup> Buckinghamshire New University, High Wycombe Campus, Queen Alexandra Road, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire, HP11 2JZ, United Kingdom

<sup>c</sup> Loughborough University, Epinal Way, Loughborough, Leicestershire LE11 3TU, United Kingdom

<sup>d</sup> SWPS University, Wroclaw, Poland

<sup>e</sup> University of Lancashire, Preston, Lancashire PR1 2HE, United Kingdom.

## ARTICLE INFO

### Keywords:

Rape myths  
Rape myth acceptance  
Jury decision-making  
Educational interventions  
Qualitative research  
Thematic analysis

## ABSTRACT

Conviction rates for Rape and Serious Sexual Offences (RASSO) cases remain low in England and Wales. Research suggests that juror belief in rape myths may be a key factor contributing to such rates owing to the significant impact they can have on jury decision-making. Given this, various proposals have been made as to how juror belief in rape myths could be addressed, including the provision of educational information regarding rape myths in the form of judicial directions or a standardised educational intervention. While stakeholder views have been explored with regards to juror belief in rape myths, limited research has considered their views regarding rape myth acceptance (RMA) interventions for jurors. In this qualitative study we sought to gain insight into the views of victim-survivors who have engaged with the criminal justice system, barristers, and Independent Sexual Violence Advisors/Advocates (ISVAs) regarding juror belief in rape myths and RMA interventions for jurors. Our results from the thematic analysis of 28 interviews highlight both that there is support for the proposal to develop and implement an RMA intervention for jurors, and stakeholder's views regarding key issues that should be considered in the design of such an intervention.

## 1. Introduction

In England and Wales, the conviction rate for rape fell to an all-time low in 2020, with only 2.6% of reported rapes resulting in a conviction (Topping & Bar, 2020). Furthermore, in 2021 the number of rape convictions stood at 1409, representing an almost 50% decrease from 2689 in 2016/17 (Victim's Commissioner, 2022). It is argued that juror belief in 'rape myths' and the impact that such beliefs can have on their decision-making is a key factor that may contribute to low conviction rates in rape and serious sexual offences (RASSO) cases (Leverick, 2020; Leverick et al., 2025; Willmott & Hudspith, 2024).

The concept of rape myths was first developed in the 1970s; authors discussed common false beliefs regarding rape using terms such as 'male myths of rape' (Brownmiller, 1975) or 'sexist myths/fallacies' (Schwendinger & Schwendinger, 1974). The concept was later formally defined by Burt (1980, p. 217) as 'prejudicial, stereotyped, or false beliefs about rape, rape victims and rapists'. Further definitions have incorporated the varied damaging functions of such myths. For instance,

Bohner (1998) similarly defined rape myths as 'descriptive or prescriptive beliefs about rape' adding that they 'serve to deny, downplay, or justify sexual violence...' (p. 14).

Mock-trial research has consistently shown that judgements of credibility, blame, and guilt may be influenced by rape myth beliefs. For example, the extent to which a complainant appears distressed when testifying in court has been shown to impact on mock-jurors' credibility ratings of complainants (Nitschke et al., 2019; Pals et al., 2024). Furthermore, factors such as complainants' "respectability", attractiveness, clothing, and intoxication level at the time of the assault, as well as their relationship to the defendant, have been shown to impact mock-juror attributions of blame (Gravelin et al., 2019; Martin & Monds, 2024; Pollard, 1992; Whatley, 1996). Mock-juror research has also found that those who score highly on measures of 'Rape Myth Acceptance' (RMA) are more likely to blame complainants and attribute more responsibility to them (Gravelin et al., 2019; Maeder et al., 2015; Romero-Sánchez et al., 2012; Stevens et al., 2024; Süssenbach et al., 2013; Vrij & Firmin, 2001; Zidenberg et al., 2019), and are less likely

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: [Lara.Hudspith@ubc.ca](mailto:Lara.Hudspith@ubc.ca) (L.F. Hudspith), [Nadia.Wager2@bucks.ac.uk](mailto:Nadia.Wager2@bucks.ac.uk) (N. Wager), [D.Willmott@lboro.ac.uk](mailto:D.Willmott@lboro.ac.uk) (D. Willmott).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2026.102675>

Received 31 January 2026; Received in revised form 19 April 2026; Accepted 20 May 2026

Available online 26 May 2026

0047-2352/© 2026 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

to reach a guilty verdict (Dinos et al., 2015; Lilley et al., 2023; Mcintosh & Davis, 2022; Thompson & Pozzulo, 2025; Pica et al., 2025).

Studies within which qualitative analyses of mock-juror deliberations have been conducted have further shown that rape myth beliefs can arise during discussions. Rape myth beliefs, such as beliefs that: false allegations are common; genuine victims would verbally and physically resist when assaulted, such that they sustain injuries, immediately report to police, have no further interaction with a perpetrator, and present as distressed when testifying in the courtroom; and rape is a crime of passion and is a consequence of uncontrollable sexual urges, have been endorsed by participants during deliberations across a series of mock-trial studies (Leverick, 2020; Leverick et al., 2025; Willmott et al., 2021).

Given the wealth of evidence to suggest that RMA impacts upon decision-making in RASSO trials, several proposals have been made as to how this issue could be addressed, including the introduction of expert witnesses or the pre-trial screening of jurors to potentially exclude individuals based on their rape myth beliefs (Willmott & Hudspith, 2024). In England and Wales, judicial directions regarding rape myths are provided to jurors on the judge's discretion. It has been argued that there is scope for further development of such directions, however, as their content can be considered limited. Temkin et al. (2018), for instance, noted that the directions do not cover myths regarding marital rape. This approach has also been criticised for being non-mandated or standardised as this has allowed for inconsistent use across places and cases (Law Commission, 2023; Temkin, 2010; Temkin et al., 2018). Beyond this, in his report, Gillen (2019) proposed that consideration should be given to providing jurors with a standardised, pre-trial educational video regarding rape myths, and the Law Commission (2023) explored this option as part of their review into the use of evidence in sexual offences trials.

Researchers have explored various criminal justice system (CJS) stakeholder's views surrounding the role of rape myths on jury decision-making in RASSO trials (Willmott & Hudspith, 2024). Indeed, research has been conducted with professionals who work at each stage of the CJS. Mixed findings have emerged from such studies. Gunby et al. (2010) conducted interviews with barristers in England and reported that most participants felt that jurors are affected by pre-existing beliefs in RASSO cases. Participants reported feeling as though jurors' perceptions of complainant credibility are affected by misconceptions and myths. Larcombe et al. (2015) conducted interviews with barristers and other CJS stakeholders in Australia and found they too felt that jurors rely upon rape myths, specifically when considering what constitutes grounds for reasonable belief in consent. Furthermore, Temkin and Krahe (2008) reported that barristers and judges in their sample believed that jurors' beliefs in rape myths were an issue, to the extent that they considered jurors to be a barrier to convictions. Carline and Gunby (2017), however, reported mixed views among jurors in their sample. Some felt that jurors were affected by rape myths, whereas others argued that jurors generally reach appropriate verdicts with their decisions unaffected by such myths.

More recently, in their 'End-to-End Rape Review' (HM Government, 2021), the UK Government administered surveys and conducted focus groups and interviews with Independent Sexual Violence Advisors/Advocates (ISVAs) and other support staff, members of the UK Police Service, Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) prosecutors, HM Courts and Tribunal Service (HMCTS) Witness Champions, barristers, defence solicitor-advocates, and judges. They concluded that many stakeholders perceived jurors' belief in rape myths to be problematic, leading to wrongful acquittals. Furthermore, many felt that jurors were affected by rape myths more so than individuals involved in other stages of the criminal justice response to rape. It was reported that given these views, many participants suggested that initiatives should be put in place to address jurors' misconceptions regarding RASSO cases.

The aim of this study was to explore stakeholder's views regarding juror RMA and RMA interventions for jurors in RASSO cases.

Specifically, we aimed to determine whether they believed that juror belief in rape myths was an issue and – to expand on previous research – specifically explore views as to how this issue might be addressed. We sought to explore the perspectives of not only barristers but also ISVAs, given that research into this important stakeholder group's views remains limited (Willmott & Hudspith, 2024). We also recruited victim-survivors for participation in interviews given the importance of incorporating their voice into research exploring the criminal justice response to rape and other sexual offences.

This study draws on stakeholder theory to conceptualise the criminal justice system as a multi-perspectival environment in which different actors hold distinct, and sometimes competing, interests in the prosecution of rape cases. Originating in the work of Freeman (1984), stakeholder theory posits that systems and organisations are shaped by the relationships between those who have a "stake" in their functioning. Applied to the context of RASSO trials, this approach enables an examination of how victim-survivors, barristers, and Independent Sexual Violence Advocates (ISVAs) differentially perceive and evaluate interventions aimed at addressing RMA among jurors. It provides a useful lens through which to analyse tensions between professional obligations, experiential knowledge, and justice outcomes, as well as the extent to which certain stakeholder perspectives are privileged within legal processes. Although stakeholder theory has not previously been applied to the criminal justice context (Mahajan et al., 2023), such application may facilitate an approach to decision-making that balances the desires and needs of the various stakeholders, promotes ethical and socially responsible policy and practice, permits creative innovation, and safeguards the legitimacy of the trial process for both defendants and complainants.

However, stakeholder theory alone is insufficient to account for the gendered and structural dynamics underpinning rape myths. As such, this study is also informed by feminist legal theory (e.g., MacKinnon, 1982), which foregrounds the ways in which legal institutions can reproduce and sustain gender inequalities. Feminist scholars have long argued that rape myths are embedded within legal reasoning and courtroom practices, shaping perceptions of credibility, consent, and harm. These myths do not operate merely at the level of individual attitudes but are institutionalised through adversarial practices, evidential expectations, and normative assumptions about "real" rape. From this perspective, the courtroom can be understood as a site in which gendered power relations are both enacted and contested.

Bringing these frameworks together allows for a more nuanced analysis of stakeholder perspectives on rape myth interventions. While stakeholder theory highlights whose voices are heard and whose interests are prioritised in shaping jury decision-making processes, feminist legal theory interrogates how those positions are structured by broader systems of gendered power. This combined approach enables the study to move beyond a descriptive account of differing viewpoints, towards a critical examination of how rape myths are maintained or challenged within the criminal justice system, and the implications this has for the design and implementation of juror-focused interventions.

## 2. Methods

### 2.1. Sample

Twenty-eight individuals took part including nine victim-survivors of rape and serious sexual offences, nine criminal barristers (five female and four male), and ten female ISVAs. The number of individuals to be invited to take part was not decided a priori, rather the research team together made an interpretive judgement that the data collected across interviews with 28 participants was adequately strong such that data collection could cease (Malterud et al., 2016). Of the seven victim-survivors who elected to provide demographic information, six identified as female, and one as male; five identified as White British, one identified as White European, and one identified as West Indian/White;

six identified as heterosexual, and one stated that they were unsure as to their sexuality. At the time of their engagement with the CJS (i.e., at the point of trial), the victim-survivors were aged between 28 and 55. Seven trials concerned the offence of rape and two concerned child sex abuse offences. The trials were conducted in Crown Courts across five regions of England and Wales. The barristers and ISVAs were based across eleven regions of England. Two ISVAs had specialisms; one was a Child ISVA and another was a Complex Needs ISVA.

## 2.2. Procedure

The study was approved by the ethics committee at the University of Huddersfield. The sample were self-selecting. Initially, ISVAs were recruited. An email containing study information and invitations were sent to 44 organisations across England and Wales within which ISVAs are employed. Those who were eligible and interested to take part were advised to contact LH. Similarly, legal clerks at 54 barrister's chambers across England and Wales were contacted with a request to share study information and invitations to barristers who had experience prosecuting and/or defending RASSO cases. The ten ISVAs who agreed to take part worked within eight different organisations. To recruit victim-survivors, posters advertising the study were placed on social media platforms, namely X (formerly Twitter) and Facebook, and in buildings across the University of Huddersfield campus. Victim-survivors who were interested in taking part were invited to email LH for further information. Steps were taken to ensure that they were able to provide fully informed consent and that they would be supported throughout participation. Indeed, recruitment materials were designed with the sensitivity of the topic in mind and prospective participants were provided with clear information regarding the interview topics and the types of questions that they would be asked (e.g., they would not be asked to discuss the sexual assault(s) that they had experienced). All participants were also informed during recruitment that participation was entirely voluntary, they could skip any of the interview questions, take break during the interview if needed, and indeed could terminate the interview at any time, without giving a reason. Additionally, participants were provided with information regarding support services available to them during recruitment, at the beginning of the interview, and at the close of the interview. Finally, participants were afforded the opportunity to decide as to how they would like to take part (either in person in a private interview room, over the telephone, or via a teleconferencing platform).

Twenty-three semi-structured interviews were conducted over the phone, four in person, and one online. Each were conducted in a confidential environment. Interviews lasted between 19 and 80 min. Please see [Table 1](#) for a breakdown of the length of the interviews across participant groups. All interviews were audio recorded with a Dictaphone. The audio files were uploaded to a secure, encrypted storage driver. LH transcribed the audio files using intelligent verbatim. During transcription, each participant was provided with a pseudonym. Identifying information was removed from the transcripts. One participant (within the barrister group) requested to receive the transcript of their interview to review for any identifying information. Upon review, the participant requested that information regarding their employment was redacted. The request was accepted and the information was

**Table 1**  
Interview lengths across interview groups.

Interview group	Interview length range (minutes, rounded to the nearest minute)	Mean interview length (minutes, rounded to the nearest minute)
Victim-survivors	30–80	58
ISVAs	28–52	39
Barristers	19–63	45

subsequently removed. It should be noted that this information would not have been used within the analysis and would not appear within any study outputs, as per the ethical agreement of the study and steps taken to ensure participants anonymity.

## 2.3. Data analysis

**Thematic Analysis.** The data set was analysed via Thematic Analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2019). While this study was part of a wider research project, and participants were asked about various topics relevant to their experiences of RASSO trials, the focus of the analysis for this paper was participants' views regarding juror belief in rape myths and the implementation of an RMA intervention for jurors. Given this, a deductive approach towards the analysis was taken, and analysis was guided by two a priori analytic categories: 1) arguments in favour of implementing an educational intervention and 2) arguments against implementing an educational intervention. The categories provided an initial analytical orientation, and were not fixed theme names.

Initial steps towards data analysis were made during the data collection process; notes were made after each interview was conducted and on the interview transcripts once they were produced and read. The notes made at these stages captured initial ideas regarding recurring patterns within and across transcripts. Following this, a more formal approach to analysis was undertaken. Firstly, LH re-read the interview transcripts several times for familiarisation and then created initial codes. During the coding process, both semantic and latent coding was conducted via both paper-based coding and digital coding using NVivo 1.0. A table of initial codes was created for each participant, which was then compared and contrasted with the tables for other participants to determine similarities and differences. Codes were refined such that some were removed, some were adapted, and some were merged with others. Once codes were established, themes were developed by considering how the codes could be meaningfully grouped. At each stage of the aforementioned process, LH engaged with the wider research team members as 'Critical Friends'; the team members engaged in critical discussion with LH, to challenge their interpretations, encourage reflexivity and reflection, and ensure that LH considered the potential for any subjectivities to have influenced the interpretation of the data (Smith & Sparkes, 2006). Once collaboratively developed, the themes were reviewed and refined. The theme and sub-theme names were formalised once it was decided that each theme had a unified central concept and sufficient data.

**Reflexivity Statement.** Each of the research team members had a background in gender-based violence research, which informed our interest in the research topic. None of the team members had any prior association with research participants or the organisations with which they were associated. We recognise that research perspectives and experiences shape data collection and analysis. To support LH, the wider research team engaged as critical friends, as outlined above, and provided supervision sessions to encourage reflexivity throughout the research process.

## 2.4. Findings

Two overarching themes were developed, each with a number of sub-themes, informed by the a priori analytic categories outlined above that guided the analysis. The themes and sub-themes capture the mixed views participants had regarding the proposal for an educational intervention to be provided to jurors: 1) Support for a Rape Myth Intervention for Jurors in RASSO Cases and 2) Concerns Raised Regarding a Rape Myth Intervention for Jurors in RASSO Cases.

### **Theme 1: Support for a Rape Myth Intervention for Jurors in RASSO Cases**

Theme one highlights the support participants had for the proposal to provide jurors in RASSO cases with educational information regarding rape myths. Two inter-related subthemes were developed that

showcase participants support. To summarise, participants supported the proposal given that jurors' beliefs and decision-making were seen to be affected by biased belief in rape myths and, furthermore, they believed current judicial directions given in England and Wales regarding rape myths could and should be improved upon.

**Jurors are Affected by Rape Myth Beliefs.** ISVAs and barristers in particular spoke to the impact of rape myths on jury decision-making and, in turn, case outcomes. Many felt that the average juror lacks an in-depth understanding of sexual offences and holds misconceptions regarding them. While some spoke about this in a general sense, many gave specific examples of misunderstandings and misconceptions they believed jurors to have. Several participants also recalled cases that, to their surprise, had resulted in a not guilty verdict, despite strong evidence being presented as to the defendant's guilt. Crucially, they attributed this to a reliance on rape myths when assessing the evidence, and overall, it was clear from the discussions that many participants felt that jurors are affected by rape myths.

Speaking in a general sense, participants stated:

You've got all the prejudices in the world in the jury retiring room.  
(Nicholas, Barrister)

They're [jurors] full of misconceptions.  
(Janine, ISVA)

With sexual offences, it is an area where there are preconceived ideas.  
(Anne, Barrister)

Participants went on to give several examples of issues relevant to sexual offences that they believed jurors do not fully understand. These issues included consent, the dynamics of abuse and grooming, and the impact of trauma on victim-survivors. Claire (ISVA) shared:

I have read studies ... about what ... their [laypeople's] understanding about what consent is ... people can't even verbalise what they think consent is, almost. ... I think there is definitely this idea that someone has a hidden agenda to reporting sexual violence ... there a lot of people who can't understand why someone would report after years and years as well.

With regards to grooming, Peter (Barrister) stated: 'It's often very difficult to get across the idea to a layperson that a child will like his abuser and want to spend time [with them] ... that idea is difficult for laypeople and for jurors ... the idea that ... they want attention, they want mobile phones, cigarettes ... they don't want the rest of it, but they sometimes put up with it to get what they want.'. Similarly, Nicholas (Barrister) felt that jurors often did not understand that it is normal for an individual to 'freeze' when raped, stating: 'juries don't know that, they don't know that'.

Jurors were compared to CJS professionals who, in contrast, were perceived to have some understanding of sexual offences. For example, Janine (ISVA) stated: 'I just think they would be better off with maybe three judges who know about rape trauma, who know why women and men don't come forward'.

Furthermore, participants gave examples of expectations they believed jurors to have that were based on rape myths rather than the reality of cases. These concerned characteristics of cases, when a victim-survivor would report, and how a victim-survivor would present when testifying in court:

Most people outside of the CJS have a conception of rape which is affected by the way the media tends to exaggerate, embellish, and print the most horrific kinds of rape.  
(Richard, Barrister)

People expect rape to come with more physical after-effects ... beatings or injuries and obviously that is really quite rare... There is still a misconception of stranger rape ... people being pulled into

alley ways which yes it can happen, but that's not the majority of cases that I am working with.

(Grace, ISVA)

People make presumptions that the survivors should report rape ... straight away ... that is a myth ... most survivors do not report straight ... there are many reasons why they don't.

(Ana, ISVA)

The jury see detachment and think well that didn't happen because she just spoke about it as if it was another person. But this is what people do.

(Janine, ISVA)

Participants felt that jurors' biased belief in rape myths was an issue and perceived these beliefs to directly impact case outcomes. David (Barrister) and Jade (ISVA) made similar statements:

I have done cases where there have been not guilty verdicts and that could be explained by a jury applying stereotyped views.  
(David)

Regardless of how strong your case is when it goes to court, it really, it's down to what the jury think and who's on that jury and their conceptions and beliefs around sexual violence.  
(Jade)

Nicholas (Barrister) described a trial in which he 'presented an absolutely overwhelming case' and the defendant was 'completely unable to explain a piece of evidence'. He stated that the jury gave a not guilty verdict and that he remains 'even to this day, shocked by ... the outcome of the case, truly shocked'. He further stated that he felt that this verdict was to do with jurors' biases as the defendant 'was the epitome of the sort of person the jury might find difficult to conceive as a rapist', and, when asked what he felt the key issue to be that led to the acquittal, he said 'it'll come down to myths and stereotypes'.

Others had similar experiences where they were surprised by not guilty outcomes and attributed this to jurors' rape myth beliefs:

I have had so many cases that I was so sure that were definitely gonna get a guilty verdict ... you hear 'not guilty', and you think wow with all of that evidence ... how did you get to a not guilty verdict, it is just shocking, so I actually boil it down to the juries.  
(Abigail, ISVA)

His case was essentially that "she agreed two weeks ago to have sex with me so even though I was violent and even though I was shouting and she was crying and even though she was upset and didn't want it, I had sex with her because she had agreed", and to my absolute astonishment ... the jury were unable to reach a verdict ... some of them were of the view that that could amount to consent ... I think attitudes are changing but not everyone's attitudes are changing ... on a jury you have got all ages and all different sectors of society ... some people are certainly miles behind.

(Peter, Barrister)

Overall, several participants felt that many jurors hold belief in rape myths and lack an adequate understanding of sexual offences to be able to appropriately evaluate RASSO cases. Based on this, many participants went on to state that they believed educational information should be provided:

I think it [an intervention] would be something that would be really helpful because I guess it would give the jurors brief knowledge ... some knowledge and understanding about sexual offences  
(Nicole, ISVA)

Would it [an intervention] be an improvement? Yes ... for some people to have that knowledge and understanding will inform their decision  
(Danielle, ISVA)

**Building on Current Approaches to Providing Information to Jurors.** In highlighting that there is precedent for providing informative video or written materials to jurors, barristers indicated that they were open to the suggestion of a *standardised* rape myth intervention being implemented. It was clear that they saw it feasible for information regarding rape myths to be provided as standard:

They [jurors] are getting handouts at the start of cases now, to reiterate what they judge has said. So there is precedent if you like for the juries having ... a handout.

(Anne)

I think that [a standard intervention] sounds like a good initiative something really good to explore because jurors get a bit of information anyway on a little film about being a juror when they are called for jury service, so yes why not.

(Genevieve)

[W]e are giving out documents about not conducting research ... not going on the internet and that sort of thing ... I don't see why something similar couldn't work for the rape myths.

(Peter)

Furthermore, participants felt the current approach could be improved upon. Many ISVAs, for example, felt that a standardised intervention would be an improvement, as they had concerns regarding the non-standard nature of judicial directions.

We don't really know what the judge is going to be saying, or how detailed, or what he is gonna cover.

(Abigail)

Relying on individual judges to kind of formalise something it's not an even approach, so that [a standardised intervention] would be a good idea

(Ana)

Beyond this, several barristers spoke to various ways in which they thought judicial directions could be improved. Peter remarked that the directions could be 'clearer' and 'strengthened'. In particular, he felt that judges should discuss the research that underpins the directions, rather than it being stated that the information provided was based simply upon 'the experience of the court'. Nicholas similarly stated that any information provided could be 'a little more detailed than [what] we have now ... a bit more helpful to them [jurors]'. Some barristers also suggested that it would be beneficial to build upon the content of the current directions. For example, Genevieve stated that jurors should be advised against making judgements regarding complainants' body language.

Victim-survivors also spoke to the issue of jurors' belief in rape myths and the impact this can have on trials. However, this did not appear to be of focal concern to them when discussing issues across trials more broadly. Indeed, victim-survivors' discussion of the impact of rape myth beliefs centred around barristers' use of such myths during cross-examination and the impact it had on them. While other participants focussed on the need for juror education, victim-survivors also spoke to the need of restrictions on the content of barristers' questioning of complainants and defendants. For example, victim-survivors stated:

I think barristers shouldn't be allowed to use them [rape myths] as a defence to be honest and then that would solve the problem of the jury.

(Becky)

Barristers need to be not presenting these myths and things as facts as well because then that undoes any good work [of an intervention].

(Carol)

This view was echoed by some of the ISVAs. For example, Jade stated:

It's all well and good challenging it at the start and at the end [of the trial] but if that is the basis of the defences' case there needs to be, you know, perhaps limitations on what is going to be allowed

### **Theme 2: Concerns Raised Regarding a Rape Myth Intervention for Jurors in RASSO Cases**

Theme two highlights that, while many participants were in favour of jurors' receiving educational materials regarding rape myths, several had concerns regarding this proposal. These concerns centered around the perceived fairness of implementing an intervention with regards to the defendant's right to a fair trial, whether a standardised approach is appropriate, and the extent to which such an intervention would be effective in reducing jurors' reliance upon rape myths during decision-making.

**Perceptions of Bias Towards the Prosecution.** While many participants were in favour of implementing an intervention, several noted that the content of any educational information package provided would have to be carefully considered given that such an intervention might be, or be deemed to be, unfair towards defendants. For example, Harriet (Barrister) stated: 'If there is a standard direction that has to be played ... where does that leave the defence?'

Other interviewees did not have this concern themselves, but predicted that the proposal would be met with opposition based on the perceived impact that an intervention could have on jurors' views of defendants. Participants suggested that it might be 'met with contention' (Jade, ISVA) and that there would 'potentially be a backlash' (Claire, ISVA) or a 'kick-back against it' (Nicholas, Barrister). They stated that an intervention would be seen as something that would 'sway the jury too much' (Janine, ISVA) and be 'bordering on jury bias ... or aiding the prosecution' (Jade, ISVA), and 'biasing against the defence ... and towards the victim' (Claire, ISVA). Both Grace (ISVA) and Harriet (Barrister) argued that to combat this, the intervention content would have to be very general. Other ISVAs emphasised that, given that an intervention would consist only of factual information, the proposal should not in fact be regarded as unfair.

**Issues with a Standardised Intervention.** Participants raised several reasons as to why they believed a standardised intervention could not be provided before all RASSO cases. Their arguments centered around the complex nature of sexual offences cases and the practicalities with regards to *when* an intervention could be provided to jurors.

Some barristers felt that, given the complex nature of sexual offences cases, a standardised intervention would be problematic as it would not allow for nuance. It was felt that while a standard direction regarding a particular issue would apply to many cases, it would not apply to others, and therefore it would not be appropriate to provide such information before all RASSO cases. For example, Harriet believed that a complainant's underwear might be relevant in a particular case, and Anne similarly felt that medical records might be relevant in certain circumstances, thus they believed the provision of standard directions stating that information regarding complainant underwear or medical records was not relevant would be inappropriate:

I think [laughs] juries certainly need to be told that whatever knickers somebody is wearing has no relevance whatsoever to ... consent ... that can safely be dealt with in video form, there isn't an item or clothing a man or a woman can possibly wear you know [laughs], even if it is rubber and comes from Ann Summers, it's not implied consent and that should be absolutely drummed home ... but that is where it becomes difficult because I think, in those circumstances juries are also entitled to take into account, that that might too, in the context of that person and that, uh, be a sign of consent.

(Harriet, Barrister)

I didn't want to trawl through all of her medical notes, I just wanted to see and understand her treatment ... her level of stability at any one time was a very relevant factor.

(Anne, Barrister)

This demonstrates the perception that some issues cannot be addressed in a uniform way.

Others raised concerns with regards to when a standardised intervention could practicably be provided to jurors. Nicholas (Barrister) asked 'Would we be showing a video like this to a jury before starting a sex trial or at the beginning of their service? ... a lot of careful decision-making would have to go into that.'. It was noted that if jurors were required to engage in an intervention once they had been allocated to a sexual offences trial, this would delay proceedings, but that providing an intervention before this point, to every juror regardless of the case type that they ultimately sit on, may not be the most appropriate action. Both David and Peter also raised this issue:

I don't see the benefit of showing it to jurors trying a wounding case ...  
(David, Barrister)

You can't just tell every juror-give them a lesson on rape myths.  
(Peter, Barrister)

This too makes it difficult to implement a standardised intervention.

**Limits on the Impact of an Intervention.** Participants also shared concerns regarding the extent to which an intervention would make an impact on jurors' views and decisions. They were concerned that it would be difficult to challenge rape myth beliefs given that they might be deeply held, and that the impact could be limited owing to the fact that individuals receive a wealth of information regarding their role and also the matters of the case(s) they are allocated to when serving as a juror.

With regards to the concern that rape myth beliefs are often deeply held beliefs, Jayne (victim-survivor), stated 'I don't know how you can realistically shift people's opinions if they are stereotypes and cultural opinions that they have had for years'. Others shared similar thoughts and felt that a short pre-trial intervention therefore might not be adequate to address these views:

I would be sceptical that ... training delivered at 9 o'clock on a Monday morning will be sufficient, in-depth though it is, to overturn what is probably years' worth of ingrained, stereotyped thinking  
(David, Barrister)

If I think, like, even about my journey in this sector and the development of my understanding, it has been over a period of time and quite slowly ... it has been through not reading something, but experiential knowledge developed through working with women ... seeing things in practice ... I just don't know if [reading an information sheet] will really get underneath those myths ... and have a meaningful impact  
(Danielle, ISVA)

Many felt not only that a short-term intervention would not be sufficient, but that the issue of rape myth belief was one that stretched beyond the court and jurors, and was a widespread societal issue. They advocated for initiatives to occur outside of the courtroom and stated that this was required for long lasting change in laypeople's beliefs:

Society needs to be educated ... you can't just educate them [jurors] for five minutes... it's a cultural process on a much wider scale  
(James, Victim-Survivor)

Myths are so pervasive, on the whole, defence barristers aren't making up new ones [laughs], they are playing on ones that exist, so they are so well established already ... so I don't think it's [judicial directions] enough basically ... I do have some sympathy with the idea of having juries do a very short amount of training before a trial ... however ... anything that's gonna happen within the court context is not enough without societal change.

(Bethany, ISVA)

It's too little too late because the myths are so pervasive... anything that's gonna happen within the court context is not enough without societal change

(David, Barrister)

Society has got to change as a whole ... [jurors] are not going to change their mind at the door of the court. That work has got to be done in advance.

(Harriet, Barrister)

I think it's [addressing jurors' views] is a bigger picture than within the courtroom you've got to think of what your future juries are and what society is.

(Janine, ISVA)

Barristers also shared concerns regarding the amount of information provided to jurors. Indeed, they expressed concern that jurors might find it difficult to absorb the intervention content, particularly if it were presented at the outset of their service when they are provided with information about the process and their role. This too was seen to be a factor that could limit the effectiveness of an intervention:

I think they get information overload at the very beginning of their service  
(Nicholas, Barrister)

To what extent does it [educational information regarding rape myths] actually make a difference? ... telling them something among ... a whole load of other information ... just telling them once might not be enough  
(Genevieve, Barrister)

### 3. Discussion

Overall, this study makes an original contribution to knowledge by demonstrating stakeholder's views regarding not only juror belief in rape myths, but also the proposal to provide jurors with educational guidance regarding such myths, as well as their insight into key considerations that must be made when designing such an intervention. Interviews with the various stakeholder groups demonstrated mixed views with regards to juror belief in rape myths and RMA interventions for jurors. While most participants believed that juror RMA was an issue in trials, and there was support for the proposal to provide jurors with educational guidance regarding rape myths, this was juxtaposed against concerns about the fairness and potential for bias caused by such an intervention and also to the perceived efficacy of a courtroom educational intervention to meaningfully tackle rape myths. The findings highlight the need for careful consideration in the development of RMA intervention materials and further research.

The fact that all participants felt jurors held misconceptions based on rape myths, and that such beliefs were in turn likely to impact upon decision-making, is in line with the wealth of previous experimental research with mock-jurors that has demonstrated the impact of such beliefs (Leverick et al., 2025). For example, participants in our study felt that jurors consider perceived complainant 'detachment' when making judgements about their credibility, which has also been demonstrated in quantitative studies exploring the impact of rape myth beliefs on decision-making in mock-RASSO trials (Nitschke et al., 2019). Furthermore, our findings align with those of previous studies exploring CJS stakeholder's views elsewhere, in that previous studies have also found that stakeholders believe jurors to be affected by rape myth beliefs (Carline & Gunby, 2017; Gunby et al., 2010; Larcombe et al., 2015; Temkin & Krahe, 2008). For example, that participants in our study observed 'evidentially strong' cases that resulted in guilty verdicts, and attributed this to juror belief in rape myths, is in line with findings reported by a study conducted by HM Government (2021).

Beyond this, it is important to note that victim-survivors, and some

ISVAs, highlighted that it is the defence barristers who reinforce the saliency of rape myths for jurors, a finding reported by [Smith and Skinner \(2017\)](#) in their court-observation study of rape trials. Notably, this use of rape myths by barristers was not explicitly expressed by the participating barristers. Some participants therefore argued that limitations should be placed on barristers use of rape myths. This too should be considered and is also in line with the recommendation made by the [Law Commission \(2023\)](#) that all legal practitioners should engage in training on myths and misconceptions in RASSO cases to reduce the risk of them being introduced at trial.

We also demonstrated stakeholder concern regarding the current approach of providing judicial directions in England and Wales; echoing previous calls for additional information to be added to current directions, many participants felt that the directions could, and should, be built upon, and some felt a more standardised approach could be beneficial. The call for standardisation was made based on concerns that current directions are not consistently given. The [Law Commission \(2023\)](#) recommended in their review into the use of evidence in sexual offences trials that judges should retain discretion regarding the timing and content of directions on rape myths, however contributors to their consultation shared our participant's concerns regarding inconsistency.

Our study builds upon previous research into stakeholder beliefs regarding the impact of rape myths on jury decision-making and RMA interventions for jurors as it highlights not only support for such interventions, but also provides insight into key concerns that participants held regarding RMA interventions. Specifically, there was some concern that a juror RMA intervention might be unfair, or perceived to be unfair, with regards to the defendant's right to a fair trial.

The evident divergence in stakeholder perspectives, with victim-survivors being more concerned with the barristers' use of rape myths in the courtroom and barristers' concern about fairness of any intervention to prevent rape myth bias in jurors, can be understood through the feminist legal lens (e.g., [MacKinnon, 1982](#)). Such a lens highlights how legal principles of neutrality and fairness may obscure the gendered dynamics of sexual violence trials. Victim-survivors' emphasis on restricting the use of rape myths reflects their experiential knowledge of the harms produced by such narratives in practice. In contrast, barristers' focus on fairness and procedural constraints aligns with the adversarial system's prioritisation of defendant rights and evidential scrutiny, which feminist scholars argue can inadvertently sustain gendered assumptions about credibility and consent (e.g., [Conaghan & Russell, 2023](#); [Temkin & Krahe, 2008](#)). ISVAs, positioned between these groups, appeared to navigate both the structural limitations of the legal system and the lived realities of victim-survivors, reflecting a more mediating or translational role within the justice process.

Crucially, these divergent views highlight the need for careful consideration regarding the content of any information provided to jurors. We suggest that consultation with a range of stakeholders take place when determining the scope of such an intervention and that further research should be conducted with stakeholders regarding their views. It is worth noting, however, that, as highlighted by the [Law Commission \(2023\)](#), information that dispels rape myths and reduces jurors' reliance upon them should not be seen as unfair, rather, providing such information ensures that fact finding is based on only relevant evidence to a defendant's case and is not distorted by myths.

Others in our sample, particularly the victim-survivors and ISVAs, were concerned about the extent to which an RMA intervention for jurors would be effective given the limited time available for such an intervention and the fact that rape myth beliefs are likely deeply held. However, recent reviews have demonstrated that RMA interventions can be effective, at least in the short term ([Hudspith et al., 2023, 2024](#)). Nevertheless, additional research is needed to further refine our understanding as to how interventions can best address rape myth beliefs (See [Hudspith et al., 2023, 2024](#) for a review).

The findings presented should be considered in light of a number of

limitations of the study. First, the sample were self-selecting, thus those who opted to participate may have different views to those who did not. Second, the study was conducted with participants based in England and Wales and the findings may not generalise to other countries or other, non-adversarial legal systems. Third, while the researchers contacted HMCTS to invite judges to participate in the study, they declined this invitation, thus this key stakeholder voice is missing. Future research could be conducted that captures judicial opinion on this matter.

#### 4. Conclusion

This qualitative study provides an insight into CJS stakeholder's views regarding juror belief in rape myths in England and Wales and the proposal to provide rape myth debunking information to them. The novel findings can be used to inform subsequent approaches to addressing this issue in the CJS. While all the CJS stakeholders in this study felt that juror belief in rape myths was an issue across RASSO trials, and many participants across the different stakeholder groups were therefore in favour of the implementation of an RMA intervention, participants raised several key issues to be considered in the development of such an intervention. We conclude that consideration should be given to building upon the current approach implemented in England and Wales, the provision of judicial directions. First, additional directions could be developed. Second, further research should be conducted – both experimental research studies examining the effectiveness of various forms of RMA interventions (e.g., written versus video format), and further, in-depth research exploring stakeholder views – to further inform a shift from judicial directions to the development and implementation of an alternative, standardised approach. In keeping with stakeholder theory, utilising a co-design approach to developing any juror intervention, employing multiple representatives from each of stakeholder groups, could reduce some of the concerns raised and the tensions between the different perspectives, thus, ultimately improving the widespread acceptability of the resultant intervention.

#### CRedit authorship contribution statement

**Lara Flynn Hudspith:** Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Project administration, Methodology, Investigation, Funding acquisition, Formal analysis, Data curation, Conceptualization. **Nadia Wager:** Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Supervision, Project administration, Methodology, Formal analysis, Conceptualization. **Dominic Willmott:** Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Supervision, Methodology, Formal analysis, Conceptualization. **Bernard Gallagher:** Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Supervision, Formal analysis, Conceptualization.

#### Funding sources

We thank the University of Huddersfield for providing Doctoral Training Alliance Funding which enabled this research to be conducted.

#### Declaration of competing interest

None.

#### References

- [Bohner, G. \(1998\). \*Vergewaltigungsmythen \[rape myths\]\*. Verlag Empirische Pädagogik.](#)
- [Braun, V., & Clarke, V. \(2019\). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. \*Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health\*, 11\(4\), 589–597. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806>](#)
- [Brownmiller, S. \(1975\). \*Against our will: Men, women and rape\*. Secker and Warburg.](#)
- [Burt, M. R. \(1980\). Cultural myths and supports for rape. \*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology\*, 38\(2\), 217–230.](#)
- [Carline, A., & Gunby, C. \(2017\). Rape politics, policies and practice: Exploring the tensions and unanticipated consequences of well-intended victim-focused measures.](#)

- The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice, 56(1), 34–52. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hojo.12190>
- Conaghan, J., & Russell, Y. (2023). *Sexual history evidence and the rape trial*. Bristol: Bristol University Press.
- Dinos, S., Burrowes, N., Hammond, K., & Cunliffe, C. (2015). A systematic review of juries' assessment of rape victims: Do rape myths impact on juror decision-making? *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 43(1), 36–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlcrj.2014.07.001>
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gillen, J. (2019). Gillen review: Report into the law and procedures in serious sexual offences in Northern Ireland. [https://www.justice-ni.gov.uk/sites/default/files/pu\\_blications/justice/gillen-report-may-2019.pdf](https://www.justice-ni.gov.uk/sites/default/files/pu_blications/justice/gillen-report-may-2019.pdf).
- Gravelin, C. R., Biernat, M., & Bucher, C. E. (2019). Blaming the victim of acquaintance rape: Individual, situational, and socio-cultural factors. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9 (2422), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02422>
- Gunby, C., Carline, A., & Beynon, C. (2010). Alcohol-related rape cases: Barristers' perspectives on the sexual offences act 2003 and its impact on practice. *The Journal of Criminal Law*, 74(6), 579–600. <https://doi.org/10.1350/jcla.2010.74.6.670>
- HM Government. (2021). Review into the criminal justice system response to adult rape and serious sexual offences across England and Wales. Research report [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/994817/rape-review-research-report.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/994817/rape-review-research-report.pdf).
- Hudspith, L. F., Wager, N., Willmott, D., & Gallagher, B. (2023). Forty years of rape myth acceptance interventions: A systematic review of what works in naturalistic institutional settings and how this can be applied to educational guidance for jurors. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, 24(2), 981–1000. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380211050575>
- Hudspith, L. F., Wager, N., Willmott, D., & Gallagher, B. (2024). The impact of rape myth education on jury decision-making: A systematic review. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, 25(5), 4062–4077.
- Larcombe, W., Fileborn, B., Powell, A., Henry, N., & Hanley, N. (2015). Reforming the legal definition of rape in Victoria - What Do Stakeholders Think? *Queensland University of Technology Law Review*, 15(2), 30. <https://doi.org/10.5204/qltr.v15i2.635>
- Law Commission. (2023). Evidence in sexual offences prosecutions. A consultation paper. <https://s3-eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/lawcom-prod-storage-11jsxou24uy7q/uploads/2023/05/23-05-23-Evidence-in-Sexual-Offences-Prosecutions-Consultation-Paper.pdf>.
- Leverick, F. (2020). What do we know about rape myths and juror decision making? *International Journal of Evidence and Proof*, 24(3), 255–279. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1365712720923157>
- Leverick, F., Chalmers, J., Keane, E. P., & Kinghan, J. (2025). Why we need juror education in rape and serious sexual offence cases. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 101, Article 102525.
- Lilley, C., Willmott, D., & Mojtahedi, D. (2023). Juror characteristics on trial: Investigating how psychopathic traits, rape attitudes, victimisation experiences and juror demographics influence decision-making in an intimate partner rape trial. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 13, Article 1086026. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2022.1086026>
- MacKinnon, C. A. (1982). Toward feminist jurisprudence. *Stanford Law Review*, 34(3), 703–737.
- Maeder, E., Yamamoto, S., & Saliba, P. (2015). The influence of defendant race and victim physical attractiveness on juror decision-making in a sexual assault trial. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 21(1), 62–79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2014.915325>
- Mahajan, R., Lim, W. M., Sareen, M., Kumar, S., & Panwar, R. (2023). Stakeholder theory. *Journal of Business Research*, 166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.114104>
- Malterud, K., Siersma, V. D., & Guassora, A. D. (2016). Sample size in qualitative interview studies: Guided by information power. *Qualitative Health Research*, 26(13), 1753–1760. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732315617444>
- Martin, E., & Monds, L. A. (2024). The effect of victim intoxication and crime type on mock jury decision-making. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 30(9), 1231–1252. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2023.2176498>
- McIntosh, S., & Davis, J. P. (2022). The “Casting Couch” scenario: Impact of perceived employment benefit, reporting delay, complainant gender, and participant gender on juror decision-making in rape cases. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(9–10), NP6676–NP6696.
- Nitschke, F., McKimmie, B., & Vanman, E. (2019). A meta-analysis of the emotional victim effect for female adult rape complainants: Does complainant distress influence credibility? *Psychological Bulletin*, 145(10), 953–979. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000206>
- Pals, A. M., Levi, M. M., Meier, J. R., Jenkins, B. D., Le Grand, A. M., & Golding, J. M. (2024). Mock juror perceptions of a male or female adult rape victim crying in the courtroom. *Violence Against Women*, 30(5), 1107–1132.
- Pica, E., Bride, H., Lamirande, A., & Pozzolo, J. (2025). The influence of assault type, delayed reporting, and testimony inconsistencies on mock jurors' judgments. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 40(4), 743–756.
- Pollard, P. (1992). Judgements about victims and attackers in depicted rapes: A review. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 31(4), 307–326. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1992.tb00975.x>
- Romero-Sánchez, M., Megías, J., & Krahé, B. (2012). The role of alcohol and victim sexual interest in Spanish students' perceptions of sexual assault. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27(11), 2230–2258. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260511432149>
- Schwendinger, J. R., & Schwendinger, H. (1974). Rape myths: In legal, theoretical, and everyday practice. *Crime and Social Justice*, 1(2), 18–26.
- Smith, B., & Sparkes, A. C. (2006). Narrative inquiry in psychology: Exploring the tensions within. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(3), 169–192. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qrp0680a>
- Smith, O., & Skinner, T. (2017). How rape myths are used and challenged in rape and sexual assault trials. *Social & Legal Studies*, 26(4), 441–466.
- Stevens, K. L., Mojtahedi, D., & Austin, A. (2024). Juror decision-making within domestic sex trafficking cases: Do pre-trial attitudes, gender, culture and right-wing authoritarianism predict believability assessments? *Journal of Criminal Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCP-09-2023-0059>. Advance online publication.
- Süssenbach, P., Eyssel, F., & Bohner, G. (2013). Metacognitive aspects of rape myths: Subjective strength of rape myth acceptance moderates its effects on information processing and behavioral intentions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28(11), 2250–2272. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260512475317>
- Temkin, J. (2010). And always keep a hold of nurse, for fear of finding something worse: Challenging rape myths in the courtroom. *New Criminal Law Review*, 13(4), 710–734. <https://doi.org/10.1525/nclr.2010.13.4.710>
- Temkin, J., Gray, J., & Barrett, J. (2018). Different functions of rape myth use in court: Findings from a trial observation study. *Feminist Criminology*, 13(2), 205–226. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1557085116661627>
- Temkin, J., & Krahe, B. (2008). *Sexual assault and the justice gap: A question of attitude*. Hart Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663916680130>
- Thompson, L. E., & Pozzolo, J. (2025). How length of and reason for delayed reporting influence mock-jurors judgments in a sexual assault trial. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 40(2), 386–397.
- Topping, A., & Bar, C. (2020). Rape convictions fall to record low in England and Wales. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2020/jul/30/convictions-fall-record-low-england-wales-prosecutions>.
- Victims Commissioner. (2022, June 22). *The distressing truth is that if you are rape in Britain today, your chances of seeing justice are slim*. Victims Commissioner. <https://victimscommissioner.org.uk/news/the-distressing-truth-is-that-if-you-are-raped-in-britain-today-your-chances-of-seeing-justice-are-slim/>.
- Vrij, A., & Firmin, H. R. (2001). Beautiful thus innocent? The impact of defendants' and victims' physical attractiveness and participants' rape beliefs on impression formation in alleged rape cases. *International Review of Victimology*, 8(3), 245–255. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026975800100800301>
- Whatley, M. A. (1996). Victim characteristics influencing attributions of responsibility to rape victims: A meta-analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 1(2), 81–95. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1359-1789\(95\)00011-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/1359-1789(95)00011-9)
- Willmott, D., Boduszek, D., Debowska, A., Hudspith, L. F., Crighton, D., & Towl, G. (2021). Jury decision making in rape trials: An attitude problem?. In *Forensic psychology* (3rd ed.). Chichester: Wiley.
- Willmott, D., & Hudspith, L. F. (2024). Jury trials and rape myth bias: Examining the research evidence, stakeholder perspectives and effective solutions. In N. Monaghan (Ed.), *Challenges in the jury system: UK juries in comparative perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Zidenberg, A. M., Sparks, B., Harkins, L., & Lidstone, S. K. (2019). Tipping the scales: Effects of gender, rape myth acceptance, and anti-fat attitudes on judgments of sexual coercion scenarios. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 00(0), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260519872978>