



This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

PERSUADING WOMEN TO TAKE PROTECTIVE
ACTION AGAINST RAPE: A COMMUNICATION MODEL
SPECIFYING THE ROLE OF SIGNIFICANT OTHERS

presented by

KELLY MORRISON

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Communication

Sandra W. Smith
Major professor

Date December 18, 1996

LIBRARY

Michigan State University

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
 TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
DEC 09 1997		
AUG 06 1999		

**PERSUADING WOMEN TO TAKE PROTECTIVE
ACTION AGAINST RAPE: A COMMUNICATION MODEL
SPECIFYING THE ROLE OF SIGNIFICANT OTHERS**

By

Kelly Morrison

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to

Michigan State University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Communication

1996

ABSTRACT

PERSUADING WOMEN TO TAKE PROTECTIVE ACTION AGAINST RAPE: A COMMUNICATION MODEL SPECIFYING THE ROLE OF SIGNIFICANT OTHERS

By

Kelly Morrison

This paper presents a general model of indirect persuasion which targets significant others in close heterosexual relationships. It is suggested that when one partner in a relationship may be susceptible to a potential health threat, she or he may experience feelings of perceived invulnerability and may not take protective action against this potential health threat. Consequently, it may be more effective for health campaigns to target messages toward the significant others of these people and recommend that the significant others persuade their partners to take protective action. The general health model is delineated by several propositions, and the model is specifically exemplified by hypotheses regarding the issue of heterosexual rape against women. A pretest-posttest-follow-up design was employed to assess attitudes, intentions and behaviors. While the data were not consistent with many of the hypotheses, several interesting results emerged. The implications are discussed, as well as directions for future research.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to strong women everywhere, and three in particular who have influenced my life: Laura H. Grant, who taught me the strength that comes from discipline and the beauty of dance; Marion Simpson Lyman, who taught me the strength that comes from a close, loving family; and Carol Lyman Morrison, who taught me the strength that comes from determination, optimism, and never quitting.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation could not have been completed without the guidance, encouragement and assistance of several people. Thanks to Galen Bodenhausen, whose teaching has guided much of my thinking; Frank Boster, for his continuing instruction in the craft of scholarship; Kim Witte, for sparking my interest in fear appeal research; and Sandi Smith, whose guidance, teaching and friendship have gotten me to this point. Thanks to Carol and Ross Morrison and Connie and Bruce McCornack, for their interest, support, and encouragement. Thanks to Neera Singhvi for her help in coding and entering an ungodly amount of data. Thanks to Jen Kopfman, Steve Robbins and Marge Barkman, for keeping me sane and making me laugh. A special thanks to my three redheads, Colin and Kyle for teaching me the meaning of the word JOY, and especially to Steve, for giving me the encouragement to try, the confidence to continue, and the support to finish.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	.viii
INTRODUCTION	1
Overview of the Problem	1
The Prevalence of Rape	1
Women's Perceived Invulnerability to Rape	3
Dissertation Overview	5
LITERATURE REVIEW	7
The Just World Hypothesis	7
Perceived Invulnerability	8
Fear Control Processes	9
H1	10
H2	10
H3	11
Significant Others and Preventive Health	11
The Theory of Reasoned Action	12
Social Exchange Theories	14
H4	15
Assessing Relational Closeness	15
Proposition 1	16
H5	16
Fear Appeals and Perceived Fear	17

Positive relationships	18
Negative relationships	18
Curvilinear relationships	19
The Extended Parallel Process Model	20
Proposition 2	21
H6	22
Proposition 3	22
H7	22
Beliefs about Rape, Anger, and Empathy	23
Proposition 4	25
Proposition 5	26
H8	26
H9	26
Proposition 6	27
H10	27
METHOD	28
Procedure	28
Stimulus messages	29
Instrumentation	30
Dependent measures	35
Independent measures	35
RESULTS	36
Pretest	36
Main Project	36
Induction Checks	37
Results for Female Respondents	38

Results for Male Respondents	45
DISCUSSION	55
Overview	55
Female Respondents	55
Male Respondents	57
Parameters and Limitations of the Model	62
Summary	63
NOTES	65
APPENDIX A	66
APPENDIX B	77
APPENDIX C	78
LIST OF REFERENCES	81

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:	Correlations for the Female Respondents	39
Table 2:	Means and Standard Deviations for Repeated Measures ANOVAs	42
Table 3:	Differences Between Men and Women for Attitude and Intention Change	44
Table 4:	Means and Standard Deviations for the Effect of Communication and Beliefs about Rape on Worry	47
Table 5:	Means and Standard Deviations for the Effect of Communication and Message Threat Level on Perceived Fear	48
Table 6:	Means and Standard Deviations for the Effect of Communication and Message Threat Level on Sadness	49
Table 7:	Means and Standard Deviations for the Effect of Communication and Beliefs about Rape on Attitude Change at Time 1	51
Table 8:	Means and Standard Deviations for the Effect of Communication and Beliefs about Rape on Intention Change	52
Table 9:	Means and Standard Deviations for the Effect of Message Type and Beliefs about Rape on Frequency of Talk with Other People	53

INTRODUCTION

it will do us large to recall
when the animal in us rises
that all women are someone's
mother, sister, wife, or daughter
and are not fruit to be stolen when hungry
(Madhubuti, 1993, p. 169).

Overview of the Problem

The Prevalence of Rape

The crime of heterosexual rape against women has been described as a "pervasive fact of American life, and its incidence is growing dramatically" (Buchwald, Fletcher, & Roth, 1993, p. 9). Suggesting that rape is a "fact of life" is alarming, and unfortunately, also accurate. Rape generally can be defined as forced sexual intercourse against a victim's will and without the victim's consent¹.

The National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) reported 171,420 rapes in 1991. This indicates that one rape occurred every 3.5 minutes. The FBI's Uniform Crime Report (UCR, 1991) suggests that there was a 128 percent increase in the number of reported rapes between 1972 to 1991. Rape against women has become a problem of such magnitude that it has begun to

receive international as well as national attention. Internationally, the Worldwatch Institute declared the most common crime worldwide was violence against women (Wolf, 1991). Furthermore, "women's rights to be free from male violence are now recognized by the United Nations as fundamental human rights" (Koss, Heise, & Russo, 1994, p. 509). Nationally, it has been included as a health status objective in the recent Healthy People 2000 Report². Violence against women, "an area that historically has been the responsibility of the fields of law enforcement, social services, and mental health, has become a national public health priority" (p. 226).

Colleges and universities are not immune to this epidemic. Forty-five percent of all college women surveyed reported that they had had some form of forced sexual contact, with 25% of them reporting an experience of rape (Gidycz & Koss, 1991; Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987). In a survey of 2,400 colleges, Michigan State University reported the 2nd highest number of sexual assaults to police on any campus in 1991. While it should be noted that Michigan State University has one of the largest student populations in the country and is one of the few colleges with a program that encourages the reporting of rape (i.e. the Department of Public Safety's Sexual Assault Guarantee Program), research suggests that rape is drastically underreported to police. Typically, ten times the number of rapes are reported to counseling offices than

are reported to police (Shaw, 1993). For example, the phone records of Michigan State University's Sexual Assault Crisis Lines indicate that in 1991, 2 independent rape calls occurred every day. Thus, the problem of rape against women is prevalent in general and particularly on college campuses. This problem warrants attention from communication researchers so that effective communication campaigns can be created to help address and diminish this problem.

Women's Perceived Invulnerability to Rape

Many women are familiar with the statistic that one of four women may be raped at some time in their lives (Warshaw, 1988). Despite this knowledge, it seems that some women may refuse to acknowledge the prevalence of rape and also may perceive that they are invulnerable to this threat. For example, a recent study by Morrison (1994) found that while many women rated sexual assault as a serious and severe problem, they were not sufficiently motivated by the persuasive fear appeal utilized to take protective action against rape. Furthermore, in a recent focus group conducted with female undergraduate students (Morrison, 1995), one woman stated, "I deny, cuz' . . . you say one in four, but, like, I could name twenty of my friends and none of us have got . . . you know what I mean." This sentiment was echoed by many of the women participating in the focus group, and also pervades much of today's culture. As Harvard graduate and author Katie Roiphe stated, "if I was really standing in the middle of an

epidemic, a crisis, if 25 percent of my female friends were really being raped, wouldn't I know it?" (Roiphe, 1993, p. 52).

Although many explanations exist for why women may not be motivated to take protective action against the threat of rape, perceiving invulnerability to the threat of rape in order to cope with it seems to be a plausible alternative. The process of coping with fear has been termed "fear control processes" (Leventhal, 1970, 1971; Witte, 1992), and can include defensive avoidance, minimization and denial. These types of coping processes typically lead to less positive attitude, intention and behavioral change. Morrison (1994) did not measure fear control processes, thus the possibility that these processes affected the outcomes cannot be ruled out. Because many women may perceive themselves to be invulnerable to the threat of rape, persuasive fear appeals targeted toward women and recommending that they take protective action against rape may be ineffective. A more effective alternative may be to target messages toward men who have female significant others and recommend that men talk to the women they care about regarding the issues of rape and self-defense. Women may be less likely to feel invulnerable to a threat if they sense that their partners are concerned about their safety. Furthermore, women may be more likely to take protective action against rape if a man they care about discusses the issue with them and suggests that they enroll in

a self defense course together.

Dissertation Overview

This dissertation will present a general model of persuasion which targets the significant others of individuals who perceive invulnerability to health threats. In certain contexts where perceived invulnerability and fear control responses (i.e., defensive avoidance, minimization) are likely to be elicited in the target, more effective behavioral outcomes may result from persuading a significant other who is not directly vulnerable to a health threat. (The significant other is indirectly vulnerable to the health threat because it may impact the relationship, thus indirectly impacting the significant other). This general model will be specified by delineating several hypotheses about the issues of heterosexual rape against women and self defense. Additionally, this paper will examine the role of emotion in the proposed indirect persuasive process. Specifically, this dissertation will propose that relational closeness, beliefs about rape and message threat level will interact to influence emotional arousal and persuasive outcomes (attitude, intention and behavioral change).

To begin, the possibility that women perceive invulnerability to the threat of rape in order to cope with it will be established by reviewing literature on the Just World Hypothesis, perceived invulnerability and fear control processes. Next, current research on significant others and

preventive health will be addressed. The Theory of Reasoned Action, Social Exchange Theories, and assessing relational closeness then will be discussed in terms of recommending that persuasive fear appeals be targeted toward significant others of potential victims (men), rather than potential victims themselves (women). Several fear appeal theories will be reviewed and the idea that fear can be elicited in significant others by an indirect threat will be proposed. Finally, the influence of stereotyped beliefs and their relationship with an emotional continuum, ranging from sadness to anger will be discussed. Hypotheses are offered about each of these topics.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this section, the idea that women may cope with a potential health threat by perceiving invulnerability to it will be suggested. Research on Lerner's Just World Hypothesis (1965), perceived invulnerability, and fear control processes will be reviewed to support this claim.

The Just World Hypothesis

Lerner's Just World Hypothesis (1965) suggested that individuals have a "need to believe that they live in a world where people generally get what they deserve. The belief that the world is just enables the individual to confront his physical and social environment as though they were stable and orderly" (p. 1030). Belief in the Just World Hypothesis plays the important adaptive role of allowing individuals to function in an uncertain world. Because of this belief, victims of crime typically are derogated and/or blamed for their state, i.e. "if you got raped you must have done something to deserve it". This phenomenon of blaming and/or derogating the victim has been demonstrated by researchers who applied the Just World Hypothesis to situations involving victims of rape and victims of AIDS (Anderson, 1992; Connors & Heaven, 1989; Furnham & Proctor, 1988; Kleinke & Meyer,

1990; Wagstaff, 1982; Wyer, Bodenhausen, & Gorman, 1985).

For example, Kleinke and Meyer (1990) found that after viewing a six minute videotaped interview with a female "rape victim", individuals with high belief in a just world recommended a shorter prison sentence for the rapist than did individuals with low belief in a just world. Furthermore, Wyer et al. (1985) found that priming individuals about the negative consequences of aggression produced increased beliefs that a rape victim was responsible for the crime.

Thus, just world beliefs essentially are a belief system that allows individuals to cope with potential threats. By adhering to these beliefs, individuals can separate themselves from potential victims. Walster (1966) suggested that individuals blame victims so that they can dismiss the possibility of their own victimization by subsequently separating themselves from the victim through characterological and/or behavioral inferences. A similar method of separating oneself from negative outcomes has been labelled "unrealistic optimism" or "perceived invulnerability" (Perloff & Fetzner, 1986; Weinstein, 1984, 1987).

Perceived Invulnerability

Perceived invulnerability is the tendency to believe that one is more likely to experience positive health outcomes, and that negative health outcomes are more likely to be experienced by others. Recent research by Salovey, O'Leary, Stretton, Fishkin, and Drake (1991) demonstrated that

respondents always believed that negative health outcomes were more likely to occur to their peers than to themselves, and that positive outcomes were more likely to befall them. Additionally, research by Hansen, Raynor and Wolkenstein (1991) indicated that long-term health consequences of drinking were perceived as least likely to occur among respondents who were heavy drinkers.

These two different lines of research both suggest that one way in which people cope with health threats is to adhere to belief systems which allow people to separate themselves from potential victims. Similar conclusions have been suggested by fear appeal researchers in their discussion of fear control processes.

Fear Control Processes

The idea that individuals use defensive reactions to cope with threatening information has been suggested by several fear appeal researchers (Janis & Feshbach, 1953, 1954; Leventhal, 1970, 1971; Witte, 1992). Janis and Feshbach described these reactions as ones which "tend to be of an interfering nature - inattentiveness, perceptual distortions, defensive efforts to deny or minimize the threat, etc." (1954, p. 162). Specifically, when a message is perceived to be highly threatening, yet the recommendations are not perceived to be effective in deterring the threat (Witte, 1992) people will respond to persuasive fear appeals by trying not to think about the message information (defensive avoidance),

downplaying the nature of the threat (minimization), and/or reacting against the communicator (perceived manipulation). Additionally, Witte has described fear control as "primarily emotional processes where people respond to and cope with their fear, not the danger" (1992, p.116). While she hypothesized positive relationships between fear and defensive avoidance and between fear and minimization (see Witte, 1994), the results indicated negative relationships. Intuitively, if fear control processes function as coping mechanisms to deal with fear, then negative relationships should occur. When the coping mechanisms emerge they should function to reduce the fear.

It follows that if perceived invulnerability (the tendency to believe that one is more likely to experience positive health outcomes while negative health outcomes are more likely to be experienced by others) functions as a coping mechanism to deal with negative emotions, we should see a negative relationship between fear and perceived invulnerability as well as between worry and perceived invulnerability and a positive relationship between perceived invulnerability and other coping mechanisms (i.e., defensive avoidance, minimization and perceived manipulation).

H1: There will be a significant negative relationship between fear and perceived invulnerability.

H2: There will be a significant negative relationship between worry and perceived invulnerability.

H3: There will be a significant positive relationship between perceived invulnerability and fear control processes.

Perceived invulnerability should ultimately lead to less desirable persuasive outcomes (i.e. negative or no attitude change, lack of intention and behavioral changes). Thus, persuasive fear appeals which are targeted toward women who are vulnerable to a potential threat, yet feel invulnerable to the threat may be ineffective. A potentially more effective persuasive strategy would be to persuade an individual who is not directly vulnerable to a particular health threat to intercede and persuade someone they care about (i.e., someone who is directly vulnerable to this health threat) to take protective action. Literature on significant others and preventive health will be discussed next to support this claim.

Significant Others and Preventive Health

While the area of social support and health is a growing literature, "only a handful of studies have looked at the relationship between social support and/or social networks and preventive health behavior" (Zimmerman & Connor, 1989, p. 58). Most of the research has focused on getting social networks involved in supporting a target's behavior change process (Gottlieb & Green, 1979; Lauer & Newlin, 1983; Wingard & Berkman, 1985), rather than recommending a significant other (or key member of the social network) instigate the behavior change. Given that social network support has proven to be

effective in sustaining behavior change, it seems likely that social network support also may provide the impetus needed for action in many individuals who deny that potential health threats exist. Literature on the theory of reasoned action and social exchange theory will be discussed next to support this claim.

The Theory of Reasoned Action

Fishbein and Ajzen's Theory of Reasoned Action (1975) suggested that an individual's intention to behave is influenced by the individual's attitude toward the behavior and her/his subjective norm (beliefs about whether significant others think s/he should engage in the behavior and motivation to comply with others' beliefs). This theory applies to instances where the behavior is voluntary (i.e. the behavior is performed because a person chooses to perform it). While both the attitude and subjective norm components ultimately influence an individual's behavioral intention, an important construct in this research is the subjective norm component and its relationship to attitude change.

The subjective norm component is comprised of normative beliefs (perceptions of whether or not significant others think the individual should engage in the behavior), and the individual's motivation to comply with the preferences of the significant others. For example, a woman who perceives her boyfriend's strong desire for her to enroll in a self-defense course, and who is motivated to comply with his desire, should

yield stronger behavioral intention to enroll in a self-defense course than a woman who does not perceive these desires in her boyfriend or is not motivated to comply with them. Therefore, one method of persuading women to enroll in self-defense courses in order to protect themselves against rape (changing behavioral intention about a volitional behavior) entails making this subjective norm component salient to women. Increasing motivation to comply with the values and expectations of others has, in fact, been suggested as a possible intervention approach for alcohol abuse (Hansen, Raynor, & Wolkenstein; 1991). Hence, by making the subjective norm component salient to women and by persuading men to talk with women whom they care about regarding the issues of rape and self-defense, women who initially denied the threat of rape may ultimately be persuaded to take protective actions.

Thus far, it has been proposed that targeting persuasive fear appeals toward the significant others of potential victims may be an effective way to circumvent perceived invulnerability and fear control processes (defensive avoidance, minimization) in potential victims (women). Next, social exchange theory and relational closeness will be discussed to establish why significant others should be motivated to persuade the women they care about to take protective action.

Social Exchange Theories

Social exchange theories suggest that men in satisfied relationships should be motivated to influence their significant others to protect themselves. Kelley and Thibaut (1978) posited that interpersonal relationships are evaluated in terms of their rewards and their costs. Rewards include pleasures and gratifications that result from the relationship (such as value placed on friendship or companionship) and costs include negative consequences that result from the relationship (such as physical effort, mental effort, or anxiety). The extent to which a relationship is valued, and will continue, depends upon the relative outcomes (costs and rewards) associated with that relationship.

A key component of their theory is the idea of mutual interdependence, or the notion that one person's behavior ultimately affects the other person. Individuals within a relationship are outcome interdependent, and should therefore be concerned about the well-being of their partners. For example, if men value their relationships with women, and see their relationships as sources of positive outcomes (the rewards outweigh the costs), they should be motivated to maintain their relationships. Since women are sources of positive outcomes for men, anything that potentially threatens the well being of the women also could indirectly threaten the rewards the men experience. However, because these men are only indirectly susceptible to the threat (through their

relationships with women), they should not experience as much fear, perceived invulnerability or fear control processes as do the women who are directly susceptible to the threat. Therefore, men should be motivated to protect their significant others as this ultimately helps sustain their relationships and their continued positive outcomes.

If this reasoning is correct, what we should see is men reporting more positive attitude and intention changes than women. Thus,

H4: Men will report significantly more positive attitude and intention changes than will women regarding enrolling in self defense.

Not all men, however, may be motivated to persuade their female partners. Their degree of motivation will be influenced by the degree of closeness they feel toward their female partners. Defining and measuring "close" relationships has been approached from several different perspectives (see Berscheid, 1983). One promising approach is to examine the activities that partners share, and this approach will be reviewed next.

Assessing Relational Closeness

One method of describing and measuring the concept of relational closeness is to assess the amount of interdependence experienced by the partners (Berscheid, Snyder, & Omoto, 1989). This "relational closeness inventory" consists of three subscales which measure how frequently the

partners interact (frequency), the strength of the partner's influence (i.e., estimates of the impact partner has on decisions, plans, activities) (strength), and the diversity of their interactions (i.e., how many different activities they do together) (diversity). Berscheid (1983) has suggested that partners who are more "meshed" (those with many interconnections or shared activities) have the potential to experience the most emotion. However, unless an interconnection (shared activity) is broken, emotion probably won't be experienced. Emotion is elicited when an interconnection is broken (i.e., when a shared activity is no longer shared). For example, many rape victims subsequently have intimacy problems in their relationships. Thus, the thought of not being able to share in the same relational and intimate activities that they currently participate in may arouse emotion in some men.

Therefore, in general

Proposition 1: Men in close relationships will experience significantly greater emotional arousal in response to a persuasive fear appeal than will men in relationships that are less close.

Specific to the issue of heterosexual rape against women,

H5: Men in close relationships will experience significantly greater emotional arousal (perceived fear, anger, worry, and sadness) in response to a persuasive fear appeal regarding rape against women than will men in

relationships that are less close.

To summarize, thus far it has been suggested that persuasive fear appeals regarding rape against women may be ineffective when messages are targeted toward women because they may perceive themselves to be invulnerable to this threat. Utilizing the theory of reasoned action and social exchange theories, it has been suggested that persuasive campaigns be targeted toward men in close heterosexual relationships. Persuasive messages should recommend that men talk to their significant others about the issue of rape and persuade their significant others to enroll in self-defense courses. Next, the role of emotion in persuasion will be addressed. Specifically, the role of perceived fear and fear appeal theories will be reviewed, then the relationship between anger, sadness and beliefs about rape will be discussed.

Fear Appeals and Perceived Fear

Central to persuasive fear appeals is the idea that by evoking fear of a potential threat, and then providing an effective recommended action to avert this threat, individuals will be motivated to comply with the recommended action. Thus, fear is elicited by the persuasive message and ultimately functions to motivate attitude, intention, and behavioral change. As defined by Witte (1994), a fear appeal is "a persuasive message that attempts to arouse the emotion fear by depicting a personally relevant and significant threat

and then follows this description of the threat by outlining recommendations presented as feasible and effective in deterring the threat" (p. 114). However, the way in which fear functions is of considerable debate among fear appeal researchers.

Positive relationships. Several researchers have found a positive relationship between fear-arousing content and persuasion such that as fear-arousing content increases, degree of persuasion increases as well (Beck & Davis, 1978; Burnett, 1981; Hewgill & Miller, 1965; Janis & Mann, 1965; Leventhal, Singer & Jones, 1965; Miller & Hewgill, 1966; Sutton & Eiser, 1984). These results have been demonstrated regarding topics which range from smoking to nuclear fallout shelters. Despite the empirical support for this model of fear appeals, Boster and Mongeau (1984) described it as "an inadequate explanation of the effect of fear-arousing messages" (p. 365) due to the amount of support for opposing models, including negative relationships and the existence of moderating variables.

Negative relationships. Researchers also have found support for a negative relationship model, which suggests that as fear-arousing content increases, degree of persuasion will decrease (Goldstein, 1959; Janis & Feshbach, 1953; Janis & Terwilliger, 1962; Leventhal & Watts, 1966). High levels of fear arousing content may lead to resistance to persuasion for several reasons, including feelings of invulnerability

(Leventhal, 1970) or defensive avoidance (Janis, 1967; Miller, 1963). Again, Boster and Mongeau (1984) suggested that this model of fear appeals provided an inadequate explanation due to the empirical support for positive relationships.

Curvilinear relationships. Proponents of curvilinear relationships (Janis, 1967; Janis & Leventhal, 1968; McGuire, 1968; 1969) suggest that moderate levels of fear-arousing content are the optimal level to employ in order to produce desired persuasive effects. With low levels of fear-arousing content, people are not motivated to attend to the persuasive message. With high levels of fear-arousing content, defensive processes (such as message minimization and defensive avoidance) predominate and people are not motivated to adhere to the message recommendations. However, with moderate levels of fear-arousing content people are aroused enough to pay close attention to the message recommendations, but not overwhelmed such that defensive processes are initiated. Therefore, desired persuasive outcomes are achieved. Although support for optimal message processing occurring at moderate levels of arousal has been articulated in the cognitive processing literature (Darke, 1988; Gur, Gur, Skolnick, Resnick, Silver, Chawluk, Muenz, Obrist, & Reivich, 1988), results from Boster and Mongeau's meta-analysis (1984) suggest that the curvilinear hypothesis is inconsistent with the fear appeal data (p. 365).

The Extended Parallel Process Model. A recent fear appeal model (Witte, 1992) combines Roger's (1975) conception of protection motivation with Leventhal's (1970, 1971) parallel processing model. The Extended Parallel Process Model (EPPM) suggests that desired persuasive outcomes can be achieved by eliciting the combination of high levels of both perceived threat (fear-arousing content) and perceived efficacy. This combination is proposed to be effective because it initiates danger control responses. Leventhal originally described danger control responses as a problem solving control process where an individual responds to danger by attempting to act upon and control the outer world while ignoring or paying less attention to her/his fear. Thus, danger control is guided by external cues, or information primarily culled from the external environment.

Alternatively, less desirable persuasive outcomes (i.e., less attitude, intention, or behavior change, message minimization, or defensive avoidance) will occur when high levels of perceived threat combine with low levels of perceived efficacy. This combination of perceptions is proposed to initiate fear control responses. Leventhal originally described fear control as the interpretation of emotional behavior or internal cues, and as a process that "may be" independent from the danger control processes, "although the two processes should interact" (p. 126). Thus, in fear control people respond to, and attempt to control,

internal emotions rather than external (outer world) cues.

While considerable debate exists regarding which model sufficiently explains how and why fear appeals succeed or fail, general agreement exists regarding the arousal of perceived fear. Typically, "high fear messages produce more perceived fear on the average than do moderate fear messages, and moderate fear messages produce more fear on the average than do low fear messages" (Boster & Mongeau, 1984, p. 331). One question explored by this dissertation is whether or not perceived fear can be elicited when message recipients are not direct targets of a threat. Literature from relational closeness and Social Exchange Theories seem to support this reasoning. In particular, the concept of mutual interdependence from social exchange theories suggests that a threat that impacts one partner could ultimately impact the other partner as well. Furthermore, Berscheid suggested that partners in close relationships have the potential to experience more emotion than those who are less close. Thus, it seems reasonable that significant others could experience perceived fear in response to threats to which they are indirectly vulnerable. This suggests that, in general:

Proposition 2: a high threat persuasive message will elicit significantly more perceived fear in individuals in close relationships than will a low threat message.

Specific to the issue of rape against women,

H6: a high threat persuasive message regarding rape against women will elicit significantly more perceived fear in men in close relationships than will a low threat message.

Additionally, in general,

Proposition 3: A high threat persuasive message will yield significantly more positive attitude, intention and behavioral change in individuals in close relationships than will a low threat message.

Specific to the issue of rape against women:

H7: A high threat persuasive message will yield significantly more positive attitude, intention, and behavioral change in men in close relationships than will a low threat message.

It also has been suggested that individual difference variables (such as prior experiences, culture, and personality characteristics) will influence perceptions. "Thus, the same fear appeal may produce different perceptions in different people" (Witte, 1992, pp. 338-339). One personality characteristic that may influence emotional arousal as well as persuasive outcomes is the degree to which an individual demonstrates stereotyped beliefs about a health issue. Specific to the issue of rape, this is an individual's beliefs about rape.

Beliefs about Rape, Anger, and Empathy

A growing literature on rape against women has examined the significance of beliefs about rape and the impact which accepting false beliefs about rape, rapists, and rape victims has upon individuals and their social perceptions and judgments (Brownmiller, 1975; Burt, 1980; Burt & Albin, 1981; Feild, 1978; Ward, 1988). Burt (1991) described "rape myths" as an element of the general culture. "People learn them in the same way they acquire other attitudes and beliefs--from their families, their friends, newspapers, movies, books, dirty jokes, and, lately, rock videos" (p. 28). Burt's argument that these beliefs stem from culture has been strengthened by other feminist researchers who suggested that the culture we live in supports and condones rape against women by perpetuating attitudes and beliefs which encourage victimization and control over them (Brownmiller, 1975; Clark & Lewis, 1977; Griffin, 1971; Weis & Borges, 1973). An example of how cultural messages perpetuate these beliefs about rape appeared in Newsweek magazine in response to Antioch College's new rules regarding consensual sex,

"And the rules, by postulating a culture of female victimization and by creating many permutations of sexual offenses, delight those feminists who consider America a predatory 'rape culture'" (Will, 1993, p. 92).

Because accepting false beliefs about rape, rapists and rape victims narrows the definition of rape (Burt & Albin, 1981), the outcome of supporting these stereotyped beliefs is to deny that many instances involving coercive sex actually

constitute "rape". Thus, the population can be divided according to beliefs about rape; those individuals who support stereotyped beliefs and those who don't.

Burt's (1980) rape myth acceptance scale was designed to assess these "prejudicial, stereotyped, or false beliefs about rape, rape victims, and rapists" (p. 217). This scale has been demonstrated to correlate positively with sex role stereotyping, adversarial sexual beliefs, and acceptance of interpersonal violence. The scale taps five general classifications of beliefs (Burt, 1991). Four of these groups of beliefs focus on the victim/woman and redefine sexual assault as: nothing happened, no harm was done, she wanted it or liked it, and she asked for it or deserved it. The fifth group of beliefs focuses upon the man/assailant and essentially condones his action.

Beliefs about rape may affect the emotions that are aroused by the persuasive fear appeal. Specifically, as beliefs about rape vary according to how strongly individuals endorse stereotypes, the emotions elicited may vary from empathy to anger. Specifically, men who are in close relationships, yet endorse stereotyped beliefs about rape should experience both anger and perceived fear in response to a persuasive fear appeal regarding rape against women.

Three explanations exist for why anger may be elicited. First, men may experience anger as a defensive response. Because men are the perpetrators of heterosexual rape against

women, they may feel defensive over the issue that "not all men are rapists". Additionally, this anger may be directed toward the hypothetical rape victim in the message, (i.e. "anyone who does that deserves what she gets"). Finally, anger may be elicited by the desire to separate his significant other from the victim (i.e. "my girlfriend is not like that").

If men experience the mixed emotions of anger and perceived fear in response to the persuasive fear appeal, they should be more likely to stereotype the victim in the message according to the rape myths of "deserving" or "provoking" the rape. Bodenhausen (1993) recently demonstrated that individuals are more likely to use stereotypes when they are angry. Since stereotyping the victim functions to separate the man's significant other from the victim in the message, he should be less likely to attempt to persuade his significant other regarding the issues of rape and self-defense. Thoughts that may occur include, "since my girlfriend is not like that I don't need to worry her about this".

Therefore, in general:

Proposition 4: Stereotyped beliefs regarding the persuasive issue will significantly influence emotional arousal such that the more individuals endorse stereotyped beliefs, the more anger will be elicited in individuals in close relationships.

Proposition 5: Stereotyped beliefs regarding the persuasive issue will significantly influence persuasive outcomes such that the more individuals endorse stereotyped beliefs, the less attitude, intention and behavioral change will be elicited in individuals in close relationships.

Specific to the issue of rape against women,

H8: Beliefs about rape will significantly influence emotional arousal such that the more individuals endorse stereotyped beliefs about rape the more anger will be elicited in men in close relationships.

H9: Beliefs about rape will significantly influence persuasive outcomes such that the more individuals endorse stereotyped beliefs about rape the less attitude, intention and behavioral change will be elicited in men in close heterosexual relationships.

Alternatively, men who are in close heterosexual relationships yet do not endorse stereotyped beliefs about rape should experience empathy or sadness in response to a persuasive fear appeal regarding rape against women. Although many forms of conceptualizing empathy exist, a basic definition suggests that it is the reaction of one person to the observed experience of another (Davis, 1983). Recently, attention has been devoted to the possible multidimensionality of this construct (Stiff, Dillard, Somera, Kim & Sleight, 1988; Tamborini, Salomonson, & Bahk, 1993), and its separate

affective and cognitive dimensions. Of particular interest is the affective dimension of empathic concern, in which an individual experiences emotional reactions due to another's distress, and which is linked with altruistic helping behaviors (Houston, 1990). Since the persuasive message depicts another person's distress (an actual rape), men who do not endorse stereotyped beliefs about rape should experience empathic concern regarding the rape victim in the message, and specifically their significant others, such that:

Proposition 6: Stereotyped beliefs regarding the persuasive issue will significantly influence emotional arousal such that the more individuals endorse stereotyped beliefs, the less sadness will be elicited in individuals in close relationships.

H10: Beliefs about rape will significantly influence emotional arousal such that the more individuals endorse stereotyped beliefs about rape the less sadness will be elicited in men in close heterosexual relationships.

In summary, a general model of indirect persuasion regarding health threats has been offered. Additionally, the general model has been exemplified by several hypotheses regarding heterosexual rape against women. Interactions between relational closeness, message threat level, and beliefs about rape on emotional arousal and persuasive outcomes have been predicted. The methodology of this study will be discussed next.

METHOD

Procedure

A pretest-posttest-follow-up design was employed with separate samples of college male (N = 115) and female (N = 144) undergraduates from a large midwestern university. Respondents were recruited from large introductory interpersonal communication courses and given extra credit for their participation in this research. The respondents completed pretest measures assessing beliefs and attitudes about rape, rape victims, and self defense as a protective action, along with measures assessing their intent to participate in self defense. Berscheid, Snyder and Omoto's relational closeness inventory (1989) was completed by the male participants to determine the nature of their relationships.

The respondents then read either a high threat or a low threat stimulus message, and completed mood measures assessing levels of fear, worry, anger and sadness. Measures assessing the quality of the message arguments and plausibility of the message were then completed, as well as ratings of severity, susceptibility, response efficacy and self efficacy, defensive avoidance, perceived manipulation, message derogation and

perceived invulnerability. Finally, the respondents completed post-test measures assessing attitudes and intentions about enrolling in a self defense course.

One week later, a follow-up survey was completed, again assessing attitudes, intentions, and whether or not respondents had talked with a significant other/friend and/or enrolled in self defense. At this time, respondents were given postcards to return via campus mail to indicate whether or not any subsequent action was taken (talking with a significant other/friend and/or enrolling in self defense).

Stimulus Messages

Separate high threat and low threat messages were created for both the female and male samples, thus, there were four different messages. All of the messages included information about the efficacy of self defense and information regarding specific self defense classes. Each message recommended that respondents enroll in self-defense courses and/or persuade their friends (for female respondents) or significant others (for male respondents) to enroll in self defense courses. The female low threat message reported about an advertising campaign a man had created to help stop rape, while the female high threat message reported about an attempted attack at Michigan State University and statistics about the prevalence of rape. The male low threat message reported about a professor who suggested that rape statistics are exaggerated, while the high threat message reported an acquaintance rape

and statistics about the prevalence of rape. Thus, threat was manipulated by either including a vivid description of a rape or reporting general information about rape. (See Appendix A for all messages, pretest results are reported in the results section).

Instrumentation

Male participants completed a slightly different survey from the female participants. Male participants were instructed to think of a female whom they considered to be close, and keep her in mind during the completion of the survey. Additionally, several measures were completed by the men that were not completed by the women. All measures were completed by both men and women unless noted otherwise.

Attitudes toward self defense. Attitudes toward self-defense was assessed with one seven-item semantic differential scale. Female participants considered the statement "taking a self defense or martial arts class to learn how to protect myself from rape would be:" while male participants considered the statement "taking a self defense or martial arts class with a woman I care about so that she could learn how to protect herself from rape would be:". Response items included bad/good, undesirable/desirable, pleasant/unpleasant, (ranging from 1 - 7).

Intentions. The intentions scale was composed of eight items with Likert-type response options. Example items include, "I'm going to sign up for a self defense or martial

arts course with a friend (female)/with a woman I care about (male)", "I am thinking about enrolling in a self defense or martial arts course" (both female and male), and "I intend to talk with a friend (female)/with the woman I care about (male) regarding the two of us signing up for a self defense or martial arts course. Response options ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

Beliefs about rape. Both men and women completed Ward's Attitudes Toward Rape Victims Scale, which consists of twenty-eight Likert-type items. Response options ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Example items included, "a raped woman is usually an innocent victim", "the extent of a woman's resistance should be the major factor in determining if a rape has occurred", and "intoxicated women are usually willing to have sexual relations".

Additionally, men completed the rape empathy scale, which consists of nineteen forced choice items. Participants were instructed to choose which statement they preferred, ranging from 1 (most prefer "A") to 7 (most prefer "B"). Example statements include; A) "In general, I feel that rape is an act that is provoked by the rape victim", B) "In general, I feel that rape is an act that is not provoked by the rape victim", and A) "In a court of law, I feel that the rapist must be held accountable for his behavior during the rape", B) "In a court of law, I feel that the rape victim must be held accountable for her behavior during the rape".

Relational closeness. Only the male participants completed Berscheid, Snyder and Omoto's relational closeness inventory. This inventory includes measures of shared activities (i.e., in the past week I talked about personal things/ate a meal/engaged in sexual relations...with "X") and the strength of the partner's influence (i.e, "X" influences important things in my life, influences the way I feel about myself).

Mood measure. Immediately after reading the persuasive message, both male and female participants completed a mood measure, consisting of twenty Likert-type items (1 to 7 range) and assessing four moods. Sadness was assessed by five items, including "not at all"/"very" sad, sorrowful and depressed. Anger was assessed by five items, such as "not at all"/"very" angry, furious, and enraged. Fear was assessed by five items, including "not at all"/"very" afraid, frightened and scared. Worry was measured by five items, such as "not at all"/"very" worried, apprehensive and concerned.

Severity. The severity scale was comprised of four items with Likert-type responses. Participants responded to items such as, "I believe that rape is a severe problem" and "Rape is a critical problem". Options ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

Susceptibility. Four Likert-type response items comprised the susceptibility scale. Respondents completed items ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly

agree), such as "it is likely that I (the woman I care about) could get raped" and "I am at risk (the woman I care about is at risk) for the threat of rape".

Response efficacy. The response efficacy scale consisted of four items with Likert-type responses. Participants responded to items such as, "taking self defense/martial arts classes are an effective way to protect women against rape" and "self defense/martial arts classes work in protecting women against rape". Options ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

Self efficacy. Four Likert-type response items made up the self efficacy scale. Respondents completed items ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree), such as "I (the woman I care about) could learn how to protect myself (herself) from rape if I (she) took a self defense/martial arts class" and "Self defense/martial arts classes would not teach me (the woman I care about) effective ways to protect myself (herself) from rape".

Perceived manipulation. The perceived manipulation scale was composed of four items with Likert-type response options. Example items include, "reports of rape are exaggerated" and "reports of rape are overblown". Response options ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

Minimization. Four Likert-type response items comprised the minimization scale. Respondents completed items ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree), such as "I

feel that prevention messages concerning rape are distorted" and "I feel that prevention messages concerning rape are deceptive".

Defensive avoidance. Defensive avoidance was assessed with one six-item semantic differential scale. Participants considered the statement "when I first read the message about rape, my first instinct was to:", and responded to items such as "want to/not want to think about rape", "want to/not want to try to remember the message". Response alternatives ranged from 1 (want to) to 7 (not want to).

Message quality. One five-item semantic differential scale assessed message quality. Participants considered the statement "I believe that the quality of the arguments presented in this message is:", and responded to items such as "high/low", "poor/outstanding", and "superior/inferior". Response alternatives ranged from 1 (poor) to 7 (outstanding).

Message plausibility. One five-item semantic differential scale measured message plausibility. Participants considered the statement "I believe that this message was:", and responded to items such as "plausible/not plausible", "believable/not believable", and "possible/not possible". Response alternatives ranged from 1 (believable) to 7 (not believable).

Perceived invulnerability. Five Likert-type response items composed the perceived invulnerability scale. Respondents completed items ranging from 1 (strongly disagree)

to 7 (strongly agree), such as "other women have more of a chance of getting raped than I (the woman I care about) really do (does)" and "rape is more likely to happen to other women than it is to me (the woman I really care about)".

Behavior measures. Several one-item behavioral measures were utilized to assess a range of behavioral action. Respondents reported whether or not they talked with a friend/woman they care about regarding the issues of rape and self defense, if they spoke with others regarding these issues (men only), and if they signed up for a self-defense course.

Dependent Measures

The dependent measures included mood measures in response to the stimulus messages, attitude change regarding self defense as a protective measure against rape, intentions to enroll and/or persuade friends/significant others to enroll in self defense courses, and the behavioral measures of whether or not a conversation occurred, and whether or not anyone enrolled in self defense.

Independent Measures

The independent measures included the threat level of the stimulus messages, relational closeness, and beliefs about rape.

RESULTS

Pretest

The messages were extensively pre-tested with a different sample from a large midwestern university (N = 27 men, N = 30 women). T-test results indicated the messages to be significantly different in terms of perceived fear for both the male respondents ($t(1,25) = 2.41, p < .05, M = 5.69$ high threat, $M = 4.64$ low threat) and the female respondents ($t(1,28) = 3.50, p < .05, M = 5.08$ high threat, $M = 3.51$ low threat).

Main Project

Scale Reliabilities. Confirmatory factor analyses (Hunter & Gerbing, 1982) were employed to test the dimensionality of the measures. The analyses resulted in the deletion of several items from several measures. Cronbach's coefficient alpha and the number of items for each measure are reported for all scales in Appendix B.

The relational closeness inventory was particularly problematic in terms of the lack of unidimensionality of the behavioral activities used to assess closeness. Because this research presents a communication model, the decision was made to focus solely on items measuring talk between partners.

This was measured by three items responding to the question, "please check all those activities that you have engaged in alone with ("X"/the woman you care about) in the past week": "talked about nonpersonal things", "talked on the phone", and "talked about personal things". Thus, this research uses communication as an indicator of relational closeness.

To measure beliefs about rape, items from Ward's Attitudes Toward Rape Victims Scale were combined with items from the rape empathy scale to create a unidimensional measure. These scales were combined because of the degree of item overlap and similarity between the two measures. The final scale consisted of seventeen items (see Appendix C for Beliefs About Rape Scale).

Induction Checks

Considering the male respondents first, T-test results indicated the messages to be significantly different in terms of perceived fear ($t(1,109) = -2.17, p < .05, M = 4.68$ high threat, $M = 4.09$ low threat) and severity ($t(1,109) = -2.40, p < .05, M = 6.39$, high threat, $M = 5.96$, low threat). Additionally, the messages were not perceived to differ according to response efficacy ($t(1,109) = .41, p > .05, ns, M = 5.40$, high threat, $M = 5.49$, low threat), self-efficacy ($t(1,109) = -.13, p > .05, ns, M = 5.63$, high threat, $M = 5.61$, low threat), message plausibility ($t(1,108) = .12, p > .05, ns, M = 5.67$, high threat, $M = 5.69$, low threat), or message quality ($t(1,109) = -.52, p > .05, ns, M = 5.22$, high threat,

$\underline{M} = 5.13$, low threat).

Similarly, the female respondents reported the messages to be significantly different in terms of perceived fear ($t(1,146) = 2.80$, $p < .05$, $\underline{M} = 4.95$ high threat, $\underline{M} = 4.28$ low threat). However, the messages also differed according to message plausibility ($t(1,143) = 3.46$, $p < .05$, $\underline{M} = 6.35$, high threat, $\underline{M} = 5.90$, low threat) and message quality ($t(1,146) = 1.97$, $p = .05$, $\underline{M} = 5.43$, high threat, $\underline{M} = 5.10$, low threat). Ironically, the women seemed to perceive it to be more plausible for a man to rape a woman than to create an advertising campaign to reduce rape against women. Finally, the women did not perceive the messages to differ according to severity ($t(1,144) = .33$, $p > .05$, ns, $\underline{M} = 6.42$, high threat, $\underline{M} = 6.38$, low threat), response efficacy ($t(1,146) = -.13$, $p > .05$, ns, $\underline{M} = 5.75$, high threat, $\underline{M} = 5.77$, low threat), or self-efficacy ($t(1,146) = .71$, $p > .05$, ns, $\underline{M} = 5.99$, high threat, $\underline{M} = 5.89$, low threat).

Results for Female Respondents

Hypothesis 1. This hypothesis suggested that perceived fear would be negatively related to perceived invulnerability for women. An examination of the correlation matrix (see Table 1) revealed a small and insignificant relationship between perceived invulnerability and perceived fear ($r = -.06$, $p > .05$, ns), thus the data were not consistent with this hypothesis.

Table 1

Correlations for Female Respondents

	FEAR	WORRY	PI	MIN	PM	DA
FEAR						
WORRY	.86**					
PI	-.06	-.06				
MIN	-.06	-.12	-.00			
PM	-.06	-.14	-.01	.52**		
DA	-.07	-.02	.13	.09	.22*	

**indicates significance at the .001 level, *indicates significance at the .01 level, PI = perceived invulnerability, MIN = minimization, PM = perceived manipulation, DA = defensive avoidance.

Hypothesis 2. This hypothesis suggested that worry would be negatively related to perceived invulnerability for women. An examination of the correlation matrix revealed a small negative relationship between perceived invulnerability and worry ($r = -.06$, $p > .05$, ns). Again, the relationship was not significant so the data were not consistent with this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 3. This hypothesis suggested that perceived invulnerability would be positively related to fear control processes for women. The correlation matrix revealed a positive correlation between perceived invulnerability and defensive avoidance, however it was not significant ($r = .13$, $p > .05$, ns). Additionally, there were no relationships between perceived invulnerability and minimization ($r = -.00$) or between perceived invulnerability and perceived manipulation ($r = -.01$). Hence, the data were not consistent

with this hypothesis.

To summarize thus far, the data were not consistent with the first link in the model. This link suggested that women would experience perceived invulnerability in response to a potential health threat (in this case, rape against women). In general, women felt vulnerable to the threat of rape ($M = 2.03$, $sd = 1.3$, range = 1-7, low scores indicate low perceived invulnerability). Additionally, the data were not consistent with the posited relationships between perceived invulnerability, emotions and fear control processes for women.

Hypothesis 4. This hypothesis suggested that men would report more positive attitude and intention change toward self defense than would women. To test this hypothesis, both repeated measures ANOVAs and T-tests were employed. First, a series of six repeated measures ANOVAs were performed with time as the within groups factor (pretest, posttest and follow-up) for both men and women. The first ANOVA assessed the attitudes of the male respondents. This analysis indicated a significant effect for the within groups factor of time on attitudes ($F(2,168) = 4.52$, $p = .01$, $\eta^2 = .05$). The means and standard deviations for all ANOVAs are listed in Table 2. The second ANOVA assessed the male respondents' intentions to take action with their female partners (i.e., "intentions for both"). This analysis indicated a significant effect for the within groups factor of time on intentions

($F(2,166) = 7.32, p = .001, \eta^2 = .08$). The last ANOVA for the male respondents assessed their intentions to talk with their female partners so that the women would take action by themselves. This analysis also indicated a significant effect for the within groups factor of time on intentions ($F(2,168) = 10.40, p < .0001, \eta^2 = .11$).

Similarly, the ANOVAs for the female respondents also indicated significant effects for the within groups factor on intentions. The analysis assessing intentions for women to enroll by themselves in self defense revealed a significant and substantial effect for the within groups factor of time on intentions ($F(2,252) = 33.48, p = .000, \eta^2 = .21$), as did the analysis assessing intentions to enroll in self defense with a friend ($F(2,252) = 33.85, p = .000, \eta^2 = .21$). The effect of the within groups factor of time on attitudes toward self defense was not significant ($F(2,252) = 1.90, p > .05, ns$). However, it should be noted that women had very high positive attitudes about self defense at all three points in time. Furthermore, an examination of the means revealed that women initially reported higher scores than men for each of the measures at the pretest, and continued to display this trend for both the posttest and the follow-up surveys.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Repeated Measures ANOVAs

<u>Attitude</u>	<u>Pretest</u>	<u>Posttest</u>	<u>Follow up</u>
Men	<u>M</u> = 5.91 <u>sd</u> = .98	<u>M</u> = 5.64 <u>sd</u> = 1.02	<u>M</u> = 5.62 <u>sd</u> = 1.10
Women	<u>M</u> = 6.21 <u>sd</u> = .86	<u>M</u> = 6.16 <u>sd</u> = .90	<u>M</u> = 6.04 <u>sd</u> = 1.02
<u>Intent/T</u>	<u>Pretest</u>	<u>Posttest</u>	<u>Follow up</u>
Men	<u>M</u> = 3.06 <u>sd</u> = 1.47	<u>M</u> = 3.58 <u>sd</u> = 1.46	<u>M</u> = 3.41 <u>sd</u> = 1.60
Women	<u>M</u> = 3.35 <u>sd</u> = 1.62	<u>M</u> = 4.24 <u>sd</u> = 1.62	<u>M</u> = 4.18 <u>sd</u> = 1.68
<u>Intent/A</u>	<u>Pretest</u>	<u>Posttest</u>	<u>Follow up</u>
Men	<u>M</u> = 3.58 <u>sd</u> = 1.68	<u>M</u> = 4.42 <u>sd</u> = 1.63	<u>M</u> = 4.07 <u>sd</u> = 1.73
Women	<u>M</u> = 3.72 <u>sd</u> = 1.57	<u>M</u> = 4.49 <u>sd</u> = 1.55	<u>M</u> = 4.39 <u>sd</u> = 1.65

N = 84 (men), N = 127 (women), Intent/T = intentions to enroll in self-defense together (men with their partners and women with another female friend), Intent/A = intentions to enroll in self-defense alone (men to persuade their partners to enroll alone and women to enroll alone).

The differences between men and women also were analyzed by T-tests. Three sets of change scores were created for the attitude and intention measures; the difference between the posttest and the pretest, between the follow-up and the posttest, and between the follow-up and the pretest. The data indicated a significant difference between men and women for intention change regarding enrolling in self defense alone (women by themselves, men's partners by themselves) between

the posttest and the pretest ($t(1,252) = 2.22, p < .05, M = .81$, men, $M = .51$, women), and for intention change regarding enrolling in self defense alone (women by themselves, men's partners by themselves) between the follow-up and the posttest ($t(1,83) = -2.00, p < .05, M = -.36$, men, $M = -.08$, women). No other significant differences emerged between men and women for any of the other change scores (see Table 3).

Table 3

Differences Between Men and Women for Attitude and Intention Change

	t-value	df	p	M	sd
ATT1	-1.67	211	>.05	-.26 -.05	.97 .82
ATT2	-1.25	211	>.05	-.34 -.17	1.03 .89
ATT3	.25	212	>.05	-.09 -.13	1.13 .92
INTENT1/T	-1.29	128	>.05	.79 .89	1.03 1.09
INTENT1/A*	2.22	85	<.05	.81 .51	1.64 1.30
INTENT2/T	-1.26	126	>.05	.71 .83	1.30 1.49
INTENT2/A	.41	83	>.05	.50 .44	1.60 1.44
INTENT3/T	-.29	125	>.05	-.09 -.06	.99 1.14
INTENT3/A*	-2.00	83	<.05	-.36 -.08	1.27 1.17

1=difference between posttest and pretest, 2=difference between follow-up and pretest, 3=difference between follow-up and posttest, T=enrolling in self defense together, A=enrolling in self defense alone. First mean and standard deviation scores listed are for men, second are for women.

Therefore, the data were consistent with hypothesis four regarding intentions to enroll in self defense alone (men's partners by themselves/women by themselves). Men revealed more positive intention change than did women between the posttest and pretest in terms of enrolling in self defense.

However, the data were not consistent with this hypothesis for any of the other change scores (attitudes or intentions to enroll in self defense together). In terms of the general model, the data are consistent with the notion that men will demonstrate more positive intention change than women, but not the notion that they will demonstrate more positive attitude change than women.

Results for Male Respondents

It should again be noted that communication was employed as an indicator of relational closeness. Thus, while the hypotheses will be reviewed in terms of their original wording (i.e., closeness), the results will be reported in terms of communication.

Median splits were used to dichotomize each predictor variable (communication $M = .67$, beliefs about rape $M = 5.71$) and ANOVA procedures were employed to test the hypotheses. Since main effects should not be interpreted when interactions exist, three-way ANOVAs (between message threat level, communication and beliefs about rape on emotional arousal and persuasive outcomes) were conducted to test for interactions. While the data did not reveal any three-way interactions, several two-way interactions and main effects were discovered.

Hypothesis Five. This hypothesis suggested that men in close relationships would experience significantly greater emotional arousal than would men in less close relationships. The data were consistent with this hypothesis for arousal of

anger. Men who communicated more with their partners experienced significantly more anger ($\bar{M} = 4.90$) than did those who communicated less ($\bar{M} = 4.17$), ($F(1,84) = 4.33$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .05$).

Several unpredicted results also emerged regarding emotional arousal as a dependent measure. The data revealed a main effect for message type on the amount of anger experienced ($F(1,84) = 4.42$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .05$). Men who read the high threat message experienced significantly more anger ($\bar{M} = 4.96$) than did those who read the low threat message ($\bar{M} = 4.23$). Finally, a significant two-way interaction was found for communication and beliefs about rape on the amount of worry experienced ($F(1,84) = 4.60$, $p = .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$). Men who communicated more with their partners and did not endorse stereotyped beliefs about rape experienced the greatest amount of worry, followed by those who communicated more with their partners and endorsed stereotyped beliefs about rape more strongly. The least amount of worry was experienced by those who communicated less and did not endorse stereotyped beliefs about rape (see Table 4).

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations for The Effect of Communication and Beliefs about Rape on Worry

	Low Comm	High Comm
Low Stereotyped Beliefs	<u>M</u> = 4.81 <u>sd</u> = 1.58 n = 16	<u>M</u> = 5.98 <u>sd</u> = .85 n = 22
High Stereotyped Beliefs	<u>M</u> = 5.04 <u>sd</u> = 1.19 n = 19	<u>M</u> = 5.27 <u>sd</u> = .89 n = 28

Therefore, the data were only partially consistent with hypothesis five. The predicted main effect for closeness on emotional arousal only emerged for anger, but not for fear, worry or sadness. Additionally, emotional arousal was affected by message type (those who read the high threat message experienced more anger) and by the combination of closeness and beliefs about rape (for the amount of worry experienced). In general, the data appear to be consistent with the contention that closeness (as measured by communication with partner) influences emotional arousal (both by itself and in combination with stereotyped beliefs).

Hypothesis Six. This hypothesis suggested that men in close relationships would experience significantly more perceived fear in response to the high threat message compared to the low threat message. A significant two-way interaction between communication and message threat level emerged for

perceived fear, ($F(1,84) = 8.47$, $p = .005$, $\eta^2 = .08$), however, it was not in the predicted direction (see Table 5 below). The most perceived fear was experienced by men who communicated more with their partners and read the low threat message, followed by those who communicated more with their partners and read the high threat message. The least perceived fear was experienced by men who communicated less with their partners and read the low threat message.

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for The Effect of Communication and Message Threat Level on Perceived Fear

	Low Comm	High Comm
Low Threat	$\underline{M} = 3.34$ $\underline{sd} = 1.46$ $n = 18$	$\underline{M} = 5.10$ $\underline{sd} = 1.24$ $n = 24$
High Threat	$\underline{M} = 4.61$ $\underline{sd} = 1.45$ $n = 17$	$\underline{M} = 4.70$ $\underline{sd} = 1.19$ $n = 26$

While the hypothesized two-way interaction occurred, it was not in the predicted direction. Therefore, the data were not consistent with hypothesis six.

Additionally, an unpredicted significant two-way interaction between communication and message threat level emerged for sadness ($F(1,84) = 5.07$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .06$). Men who communicated less and read the high threat message

experienced the most sadness, followed by men who communicated more and read the high threat message. The least sadness was experienced by men who communicated less and read the low threat message (see Table 6 below).

Table 6

Means and Standard Deviations for The Effect of Communication and Message Threat Level on Sadness

	Low Comm	High Comm
Low Threat	$\bar{M}$ = 3.15 $\underline{sd}$ = 1.37 n = 18	$\bar{M}$ = 4.04 $\underline{sd}$ = 1.51 n = 24
High Threat	$\bar{M}$ = 4.63 $\underline{sd}$ = 1.49 n = 17	$\bar{M}$ = 4.09 $\underline{sd}$ = 1.53 n = 26

Hypothesis Seven. This hypothesis suggested that the high threat message would evoke more attitude, intention and behavioral change than would the low threat message for men in close relationships. A significant main effect was revealed for message type on attitude change between the pretest and follow-up surveys ($F(1,83) = 3.10$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .05$). Men who read the low threat message reported a lower mean for attitude change ($\bar{M} = -.48$) than did those who read the high threat message ($\bar{M} = -.09$), consistent with the hypothesized direction. However, since a main effect emerged when a two-way interaction was predicted, the data were not consistent

with this hypothesis. No other significant main effects or interactions were detected for message type on intentions. (A significant interaction between message type and beliefs about rape on behaviors is described later in Table 9).

Hypothesis Eight. This hypothesis suggested that beliefs about rape would influence anger arousal for men in close relationships. The effect for beliefs about rape on anger was not significant ($F(1,84) = .132, p > .05$), thus, the data were not consistent with this hypothesis.

Hypothesis Nine. This hypothesis suggested that beliefs about rape would influence persuasive outcomes for men in close relationships. While several interesting effects emerged that are discussed below, in general, the data were not consistent with this hypothesis.

Attitudes. A significant two-way interaction between communication and beliefs about rape was found on attitude change between the pretest and posttest ($F(1,83) = 4.10, p < .05, \eta^2 = .05$). Men who communicated less and did not endorse stereotyped beliefs about rape reported the lowest mean ($M = -.66$) for attitude change. However, results from a one-sample T-test revealed that the mean was not significantly different from zero ($t(1,15) = -1.71, p > .05, ns$), essentially indicating no change. The only positive mean for attitude change was small and insignificant ($M = .02$), and was reported by men who communicated more and did not endorse stereotyped beliefs about rape. Overall, though the data revealed

significant differences between the groups (as displayed in Table 7), none of the changes in attitudes toward self defense were significantly different from zero.

Table 7

Means and Standard Deviations for The Effect of Communication and Beliefs about Rape on Attitude Change at Time 1

	Low Comm	High Comm
Low Stereotyped Beliefs	$\bar{M} = -.66$ $sd = 1.54$ $n = 16$	$\bar{M} = .02$ $sd = .56$ $n = 22$
High Stereotyped Beliefs	$\bar{M} = -.14$ $sd = .88$ $n = 18$	$\bar{M} = -.36$ $sd = .83$ $n = 28$

Intentions. A significant two-way interaction between communication and beliefs about rape emerged for intention change to enroll in self defense together between the pretest and follow-up surveys ($F(1,82) = 9.88, p < .05, \eta^2 = .06$). Men who communicated less and more strongly endorsed stereotyped beliefs about rape reported the highest mean for intention change. Results from a one-sample T-test revealed the mean to be significantly different from zero ($t(1,17) = 2.23, p < .05, \bar{M} = .89$). None of the other reported means for intention change were significantly different from zero (see Table 8).

Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations for The Effect of Communication and Beliefs about Rape on Intention** Change at Time 2

	Low Comm	High Comm
Low Stereotyped Beliefs	<u>M</u> = -.10 <u>sd</u> = 1.06 n = 16	<u>M</u> = .55 <u>sd</u> = 1.63 n = 22
High Stereotyped Beliefs	<u>M</u> = .89 [*] <u>sd</u> = 1.69 n = 18	<u>M</u> = .11 <u>sd</u> = 1.25 n = 27

*denotes significantly different from zero at .05 level

**denotes intentions to enroll in self-defense together

Behaviors. A significant two-way interaction between message type and beliefs about rape emerged for the frequency with which men spoke with people besides their significant other regarding the issue of rape ($F(1,84) = 8.93, p < .05, \eta^2 = .05$). Men who read the low threat message and endorsed stereotyped beliefs about rape more strongly reported the highest frequency, followed by men who read the high threat message who did not endorse stereotyped beliefs about rape. The lowest frequency was reported by men who read the high threat message and endorsed stereotyped beliefs about rape more strongly (see Table 9).

Table 9

Means and Standard Deviations for The Effect of Message Type and Beliefs about Rape on Frequency of Talk with Other People

	Low Threat	High Threat
Low Stereotyped Beliefs	$\bar{M}$ = 2.06 sd = 1.55 n = 18	$\bar{M}$ = 2.50 sd = 1.54 n = 20
High Stereotyped Beliefs	$\bar{M}$ = 2.63 sd = 1.76 n = 24	$\bar{M}$ = 1.78 sd = .94 n = 23

Lastly, a significant main effect emerged for beliefs about rape on whether or not men spoke with their significant others regarding rape and self defense ($F(1,84) = .90$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .06$). Men who did not endorse stereotyped beliefs about rape were more likely to speak with their significant others ($\bar{M} = .89$) than were men who endorsed stereotyped beliefs about rape more strongly ($\bar{M} = .68$).

Hypothesis Ten. This hypothesis suggested that beliefs about rape would influence sadness for men in close relationships. The data revealed no effect for beliefs about rape on sadness ($F(1,84) = .656$, $p > .05$) thus the data were not consistent with this hypothesis.

To summarize the importance of stereotyped beliefs about rape, while the data were not consistent with many of the hypotheses, the results are consistent with the notion that

stereotyped beliefs should be measured. Beliefs about rape did not influence anger or sadness (contrary to predictions), but did influence whether or not men talked with their significant others. Additionally, beliefs about rape combined with closeness to influence intention change and attitude change, and combined with message type to influence the frequency with which men spoke with other individuals about the topics of rape and self-defense.

DISCUSSION

Overview

The purpose of this research was to suggest a general model of indirect persuasion and to test it utilizing the specific issues of rape and self-defense. It was suggested that women may perceive invulnerability to the threat of rape which would result in less desirable persuasive outcomes (i.e., less positive attitude, intention and behavioral change). To circumvent this process it was proposed that 1) persuasive messages be targeted toward men in close relationships, and 2) these messages recommend that men talk with the women they care about regarding the issues of rape and self defense.

Female Respondents

The data were only partially consistent with the proposed model. The relationships between perceived invulnerability and emotions (fear and worry) as well as the relationships between perceived invulnerability and fear control processes (perceived manipulation, defensive avoidance and minimization) for female respondents were small and insignificant. An examination of the means for these constructs revealed a basement effect for perceived invulnerability. Put another

way, the female respondents in this study did feel vulnerable to the threat of rape. However, additional analyses revealed a significant positive relationship between perceived invulnerability and defensive avoidance ($r = .24$, $p < .01$) in the follow-up survey one week after the message induction. This finding suggests that perceived invulnerability and fear control processes may both function as coping mechanisms that are best measured well after the message induction. As Witte suggested, "to truly assess avoidance patterns, one must delay measurement of the construct" (1994, p. 122). Intuitively, it seems reasonable to suggest that a coping mechanism will emerge well after, as opposed to immediately after, the message processing. During the initial message processing, respondents are in a data collection environment and may be cognitively taxed and inwardly focused. Alternatively, when an individual is outside of a data collection environment and not as cognitively taxed, unwanted thoughts and feelings from the initial message processing may emerge. This is when a coping mechanism should become more active.

To adequately conceptualize and measure perceived invulnerability and fear control variables, researchers need to decide how and when to measure these constructs. These findings support Witte's suggestion that delayed measurement is necessary. Possible approaches to assessing these constructs include diary methods or delayed thought-listing tasks. One option is to utilize delayed thought-listing

measures and code the thoughts according to whether or not they reveal threatening, efficacious or neutral information. This approach may allow researchers to better distinguish fear control from danger control processes.

Male Respondents

Closeness and Emotional Arousal. Perhaps the most interesting results from these data were the relationships between relational closeness (as measured by communication with partner) and emotional arousal. Even though the male respondents were not directly vulnerable to the threat conveyed in the message, they still reported fear arousal. Specifically, the most fear was reported by those who communicated more with their partners and read the low threat message. The notion that it is possible to evoke fear in indirect targets has several practical implications for fear appeal researchers. First, these findings broaden the concept of susceptibility. Several fear appeal theorists have suggested that eliciting a feeling of vulnerability is a central component when crafting a fear appeal. These data suggest the need for expanding our notions of susceptibility to include indirect targets of a threat. Also, these findings provide another persuasive route for fear appeals. As Boster and Mongeau noted (1984), fear manipulations typically are small, likely due to ethical and human subjects restrictions. This research suggests that by emphasizing the threat to the relationship, perceived fear can be elicited in indirect

targets. Finally, this research has emphasized the importance of examining the range of emotions experienced by message recipients. Varying degrees of fear, sadness, anger and worry were elicited by the persuasive messages used in this research. To adequately parse out effects, fear appeal researchers should measure the range of negative emotions elicited by fear appeals and test causal models.

Beliefs about Rape. This research suggests that stereotyped beliefs regarding the persuasive issue of interest (in this case, beliefs about rape) are an important construct to examine. Beliefs about rape influenced emotional arousal (worry), attitude change, intention change, and behaviors. Specifically, beliefs about rape combined with closeness (as measured by communication with partner) to influence worry, attitude change and intention change. Also, beliefs about rape combined with message threat level to influence how often men spoke with someone besides their significant others regarding rape and self-defense. Although no consistent pattern emerged in the data in terms of the two-way interactions, the behavioral outcome measure of whether or not men spoke to their significant others about the issues of rape and self defense was determined solely by beliefs about rape. Men with more empathy toward rape victims (i.e., those who did not endorse stereotyped beliefs) were more likely to speak with their significant others. While inconsistent with the predicted interaction, this finding highlights the importance

of assessing stereotyped beliefs regarding the persuasive issue of interest and assessing their influence on the critical behavioral outcomes. For example, if people believe the ideas that only gay men can acquire HIV, they may be less likely to take protective action against the threat of HIV (i.e., always using a condom during sexual intercourse). Consequently, rather than solely focusing on evoking fear, these data indicate the need for communication campaigns which address stereotyped beliefs as well.

Persuasive Outcomes. The most intention change was reported by men who more strongly endorsed stereotyped beliefs about rape and communicated less with their partners. However, the results from the behavioral measures indicate that this same group of men ultimately did not follow through with their intentions, since the men who were less likely to endorse stereotyped beliefs about rape were more likely to talk with their significant others. These findings emphasize a common problem in persuasion research, namely, motivating people to act on their intentions. Future research should attempt to uncover the barriers that are inhibiting action, such as the question of whether or not perceptions of invulnerability influence men's intentions and behaviors as well as reasons men may give for not talking with their significant others.

The results comparing men's attitude and intention change to women's were only partially consistent with predictions.

Men reported more positive intention change than did women (in terms of enrolling in self defense alone, i.e., men persuading their partners to enroll in self defense alone). However, they did not report more positive attitude change than women. Furthermore, the means from the repeated measures data revealed that women had more positive attitudes and intentions than did men at all three time points.

These results can be interpreted several ways. First, the basement effect for women's perceived invulnerability must be considered. The model presented in this research targets women who perceive themselves invulnerable to a health threat and this sample was not captured. This limitation reiterates the notion that some barriers to action (i.e., perceived invulnerability) need to be measured well after the initial survey date and may require multiple methods in order to better understand them (such as the combination of diary and thought-listing techniques).

Additionally, the issue of efficacy must be addressed. As Hale and Dillard suggested (1995), a recommended response must be easy to enact. Unfortunately, presenting efficacious recommendations is not always possible for many health issues (such as rape prevention or organ donation). For example, the recommended response in this research was to enroll in a self defense class which meets more than once. Perhaps more intention change or behavioral outcomes would have been obtained by recommending a brief seminar as opposed to an

extended course. Because attitudes about the efficacy of self defense as a protective measure against rape were high in general (as mentioned above), some other barriers must have influenced people's decisions not to take action. Future research should seek to uncover these barriers, as well as deal with the question of how to create the perception that a recommendation may be more efficacious than it actually is.

Subsidiary analyses. Post hoc analyses revealed two important findings. First, 58% of the men in this research talked about the issues of rape and self defense to people other than the women they cared about. Second, 22% of the men in this research talked with their significant others about the issues of rape and self defense. It is important that in our search for statistical significance and predicting differences between groups that we not lose sight of important behavioral outcomes. Although this data was not consistent with the hypothesized differences between men and women, over half of the men surveyed discussed the issues of rape and self defense and almost one quarter of the men surveyed spoke with their significant others about the issues of rape and self defense.

These findings have important theoretical implications for the literature on social support and preventive health. Specifically, these data suggest that persuading relational partners to instigate behavior change in their significant others may be a promising persuasive route to explore. The

findings indicate that emotional arousal, intention change and behavioral action all can be achieved in people who are not directly vulnerable to a health threat. An implication of these findings is that significant others can play a pivotal role in promoting healthy lifestyles, not just supporting them. The next question to be answered is, how effective were significant others in promoting behavioral changes in their partners? To adequately assess this question, a couples study must be conducted.

Parameters and Limitations of the Model

The goal of the general model presented in this research is to circumvent the coping mechanisms (perceived invulnerability, fear control processes) that individuals may use to deal with health threats. A limitation of this model is that it excludes those individuals not in close relationships (as indicated by communication with partner). While this model has been specified in terms of close heterosexual relationships, it seems reasonable to assume that it could be extended to include close same-sex friends, and other types of intimate relationships. As long as an individual is involved in a close relationship that displays mutual interdependence, and only one partner is susceptible to a health threat, this model could apply.

Additionally, this model has been explicated by applying fear appeals to significant others. However, this model conceivably could have utilized a general persuasion theory

rather than a fear appeal theory. The central issue is the interaction between individuals who deny a health threat and their significant others. Future research could test the usefulness of this model by utilizing a variety of health issues and a variety of general theories.

While this model does not reconcile previous research, it provides a useful framework to employ in order to persuade those who have not been persuaded by previous research efforts. Typically, researchers are happy to change the attitudes and actions of a small group of people. However, when current research efforts are ineffective with an entire group of individuals, new and creative solutions must be attempted. The model presented in this dissertation utilizes social exchange theories and the theory of reasoned action to suggest an alternative approach to persuade individuals who perceive invulnerability to health threats.

Summary

Powell (1965) stated that "anxiety appeals will change attitudes significantly only if explicitly directed at the listener or at those with whom he is personally and closely involved" (p. 106, emphasis added). Indeed, the findings from this research suggest that relational closeness (as indicated by communication with partner) is an important component in emotional arousal, as well as intention change. Welch Cline and McKenzie (1994) also have suggested that indirect persuasion may be a viable and effective persuasive route for

HIV prevention because women tend to perceive more vulnerability to HIV than do men.

Thus, although the idea of indirect persuasion is not new, the need for it has begun to be recognized by researchers so that perceived invulnerability can be circumvented and protective health actions can be pursued. This research represents a first attempt at examining this indirect persuasive process, and the results appear promising. These data indicated that indirect emotional arousal can occur, and that people can be motivated to take behavioral action when they are not directly vulnerable to a health threat. The question to be explored by future research is how best to take advantage of this indirect process.

NOTES

¹The legal definition of rape varies by state, and many terms are used interchangeably. See Bohmer and Parrot, p. 4, 1993, for discussion.

²Health status objective number 7.7: "Reduce rape and attempted rape of women aged 12 and older to no more than 108 per 100,000 women. (Baseline: 120 per 100,000 in 1986). These numbers are likely underreported as "victims of acquaintance and date rape and other rapes that do not meet common stereotypes often fail to define their experience as rape" (pp. 234-235, Healthy People 2000).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

STIMULUS MESSAGES

Female Low Threat Message

FIGHTING RAPE IS ONE MAN'S CRUSADE

Rape

she met him at a party she asked him on a date
she took him to dinner
she flirted she drove him home she kissed him
she went inside she kissed
him again she said no he said yes you will
is he guilty?

(Example ad from Charles Hall)

"Charles Hall has spent \$5,000 on a series of 15 stickers and 13 posters that challenge men to reconsider any cavalier attitudes toward rape, a subject that 'usually is just talked about in the locker room in terms of - do you think Mike Tyson is guilty?-'

Why this costly leap from thinking to doing the right thing? 'I want to make people understand there's a line. And no woman, no matter how turned on she may be, is asking for someone to do that to her.'

The provocative messages so far have not been picked up by anyone in the mood to donate free ad space. But they have garnered write-ups in Elle, Vibe, The Paper, and Playboy. 'We get a lot of flak for objectifying women, and we thought (Hall's) images were sexually charged but showed that we don't condone (rape),' says Terry Glover, Playboy assistant editor. She says many women have written letters in support of the January spread, which included posters of women in provocative poses. The line, 'This is not an invitation to rape me,' appears in places where the eye is naturally drawn. All the phrases came from Hall, 'just things that I either read or am feeling.'

But feminist activist Holland Utley told Elle that Hall's campaign is questionable, since it 'still serves women up as the delicious object.' Hall counters that the images he uses

are 'lifted from ads and fashion layouts in women's magazines . . . It's what's out there.'

Others think Hall is on the right track.

'I think his campaign can reach men and boys who never would think of themselves as rapists,' said Karel Amaranth of the Women's Action Alliance. 'I'm surprised he hasn't gotten anyone to run the ads. If I could raise the money, I'd pay to run them.'

'This is a very innovative way to get the message out. Remember, most men don't listen to what women say, they listen to other men', says Cassandra Thomas, director of the Rape Crisis Program at the Houston Area Women's Center and last year's president of the National Coalition Against Sexual Assault.

'The myth out there is that if you behave like X or dress like Y, then you deserve it,' she says. 'What we do here is Band-Aid work, but it's really changing the message about rape that is important, and that's what a campaign like this can do.'

Hall hasn't given up on free ad space, and in May starts production with donated funds and time on a series of TV spots. He also is hoping to get colleges interested in printing and distributing the stickers and posters on campus.

Thomas thinks junior high school would be just as appropriate. 'We need to alert kids young, get them to think in terms of checking their level of entitlement' to a girl when on a date, she says. As for whether one man can make a difference: 'This is the way we handled racism in the '60s. It wasn't corporations that got together, it was one person getting fed up, stepping on a bus and going to demonstrate.'

Although Hall considers himself someone 'who stands up for something (I) feel', he admits that his personal crusade has landed him in some situations unfamiliar to the average ad executive, like getting stopped by police while stickering a New York subway car. (USA Today, 3/28/95)

It is important that you do not become paranoid about the idea of being sexually assaulted - you are not under siege - though at the same time it is necessary for you to exercise a reasonable degree of awareness and forethought with respect to your environment and with respect to your actions. While sexual assault may not be a problem on your campus (and indeed, the sexual assault numbers have declined compared to previous years), one thing that you may want to consider is enrolling yourself in a self defense or martial arts course. Not just a one time 2 hour workshop, but a continuing course.

Consider the facts:

1. Statistics show that people who are trained in self defense are less likely to be chosen as victims because they act differently and don't put themselves in potentially dangerous situations.
2. The National Center for Prevention and Control of Rape reports that women who fight, yell and attempt to flee are more successful in avoiding rape than those who talked, cried, tried to appeal to the assailant, or tried to make themselves appear less desirable.
3. Completing a course (rather than a short workshop) trains you to react automatically and instinctively to defend yourself in attack situations.
4. Many self defense and martial arts classes are available on or around campus, including:
 - PES 106L - Self Defense through the physical education department
 - MSU Karate Club - 355-0822
 - Okinawan Karate Club at the Michigan Athletic Club - 337- 0002
 - Self Defense Workshop sponsored by intramural and recreative services 355-9991 ext. 373 or 355-5250

Please enroll in a self defense course today, either by yourself, with a female friend, or your boyfriend. It will protect you and give you confidence. Do it today and do it for yourself!

Female High Threat Message**FIGHTING RAPE IS ONE WOMAN'S CRUSADE**

"Two recent sexual assaults at MSU have illustrated a traditional college fear turned into reality. The victim of an attempted rape early Sunday morning never saw her attacker's face, but police continue to search for him. While the 19-year old West Wilson Hall resident was walking home from an East Lansing party, she was tackled and groped by a tall, heavy set man near Landon field, said Detective Alicia Spalding of the MSU Department of Police and Public Safety.

'The victim said she was fighting with him the whole time,' Spalding said. The woman managed to kick the man in the back several times, but it was voices nearby that scared him away, Spalding said.

When the assailant fled toward the IM Sports-Circle, the woman ran to the Sparty statue, where two men passing by escorted her to Case Hall, Spalding said. A resident assistant from Wilson Hall reported the attack to police.

Spalding said this particular incident strays from other cases of sexual assault this year in that the perpetrator was a stranger. In a majority of sexually related attacks, the victim knows or has a relationship with the assailant.

Just this month, a woman was allegedly assaulted by an MSU student . . . who knew her attacker and was locked in his dorm room. He made sexual advances toward her and covered her mouth when she tried to scream.

Regardless of the relationship between the victim and the attacker, sexual assault is damaging to a victim's sexual and emotional growth, said Bonnie, a volunteer staffer for the MSU Crisis Line. The call-in line provides counseling and legal and medical advocacy for victims of sexual assault and harassment.

'Psychologically, their emotional development gets fixed at the age when (the attack) occurs,' said Bonnie. 'Their sexual development is sort of impeded.'

Although sexual assault is widespread, it is difficult if not impossible to approximate the total number of incidents at MSU.

Last year, there were seven reported incidents of criminal sexual conduct on campus. In 1993, the records show 14 reported cases. However, not all cases are reported to the police.

'I've had a lot of people calling in but not wanting to report it - a lot of guilt comes out, and they don't feel they have the right to report it,' Bonnie said.' (The State News, 3/22/95)

Realize that somebody else won't always be available to protect you. There may come a day when the only person you have to rely on is yourself. Would you be ready?

Nobody likes to think that situations like the ones described above can happen, but these are true stories and they do happen. IT CAN HAPPEN TO YOU. College campuses are not immune from violence, and as much as you might like to believe otherwise, MSU is not immune from violence and neither are you. College women represent the age group of women most likely to be victimized by rape. consider the facts:

1. One out of four women will be raped at some time during her life. That means that if you know four women, one of them may be sexually assaulted at some time in her life. This includes girlfriends, sisters, and yourself.

2. Women are more likely to be sexually assaulted by acquaintances than by strangers. This is especially problematic, because women tend to "let down their guard" when they are around people they know, and this is exactly what they should not do.

3. In a 1991 nationwide survey of 2400 colleges, Michigan State University reported the 2nd highest number of sexual assaults on campus.

4. Statistics from the sexual assault crisis line at MSU indicate that there were two independent calls per day regarding sexual assault in 1992.

5. In a recent study, 65% of college educated males said they would rape a woman if they thought they could get away with it.

It is important that you do not become paranoid about the idea of being sexually assaulted - you are not under siege - though at the same time it is necessary to exercise a reasonable degree of awareness and forethought with respect to your environment and actions. While there are many answers to the problem of rape, one answer is for you to take action for yourself. Don't wait until it's too late. One of the best things you can do for yourself is to get enrolled in a self defense or martial arts course now! Statistics show that people who are trained in self defense are less likely to be chosen as victims because they act differently and don't put themselves in potentially dangerous situations. The National

Center for Prevention and Control of Rape reports that women who fight, yell and attempt to flee are more successful in avoiding rape than those who talked, cried, tried to appeal to the assailant, or tried to make themselves appear less desirable. Additionally, completing a course (rather than a short workshop) trains you to react automatically and instinctively to defend yourself in attack situations. Many self defense and martial arts classes are available on or around campus, including:

PES 106L - Self Defense through the physical education department

MSU Karate Club - 355-0822

Okinawan Karate Club at the Michigan Athletic Club - 337-0002

Self Defense Workshop sponsored by intramural and recreative services 355-9991 ext. 373 or 355-5250

Please enroll in a self defense course today, either by yourself, with a female friend, or with your boyfriend. It will protect you and give you confidence. Don't count on other people to be there for you, do it for yourself!

Male Low Threat Message

FIGHTING RAPE IS ONE MAN'S CRUSADE

"Radical feminists aren't the only ones talking about the rape crisis anymore. Since the mid eighties the media have been kindling public interest in rape with a series of revelations.

"According to the widely quoted Mg. survey, one in four college women is the victim of rape or attempted rape. One in four. I remember standing outside the dining hall at Harvard looking at a purple poster with this statistic written in bold letters. It didn't seem right. If sexual assault was really so pervasive, it seemed strange that the intricate gossip networks hadn't picked up more than one or two shadowy instances of it. If I was really standing in the middle of an epidemic, a crisis, if 25 percent of my female friends were really being raped, wouldn't I know it?

Neil Gilbert, professor of social welfare at the University of California at Berkeley, has written several articles attacking the two sociological studies that are cornerstones of the rape-crisis movement, the Mg. magazine study and one done in the early eighties by Diana Russell. Having taken a closer look at the numbers he questions the validity of the one-in-four statistic. He points out that in the Mg. study, which is the one most frequently quoted, 73 percent of the women categorized as rape victims did not define their experience as "rape". It was Dr. Mary Koss, the psychologist conducting the study, who did. These are not self-proclaimed victims, then - these are victims according to someone else. From Koss's point of view, these women were suffering from what they used to call false consciousness. The way it is usually and tactfully phrased these days is that they don't recognize what has really happened to them.

Gilbert also points out that 42 percent of the women identified in this study as rape victims later had sex with the man who supposedly raped them after the supposed rape . . . According to Gilbert, in the Mg. study one of the questions used to define rape was 'Have you ever had sexual intercourse when you didn't want to because a man gave you alcohol or drugs?' The strange phrasing of this question itself raises the issue of agency. Why aren't college women responsible for their own intake of alcohol or drugs? A man may give a woman drugs, but she herself decides to take them . . . Many of these instances, as Gilbert points out, are simply too vague for statistical certainty. Classifying a positive answer to Koss's ambiguous question as rape further explains how she could have reached the conclusion that one in four women on college campuses has been raped.

As Gilbert points out, at Berkeley, a campus with 14,000 female students, only 2 rapes were reported to the police in 1990, and between 40 and 80 students sought assistance from the campus rape-counseling service. Even if we assume that many students don't report rapes, even to the sympathetic rape-crisis center, the one-in-four statistic would still leave thousands of rapes unaccounted for.

At George Washington University a few years ago, a student was caught inventing a rape story. 'Mariam', a sophomore who worked in a rape crisis center, told a story about 'two muscular-looking males in torn dirty clothing' raping a female student. She later admitted to fabricating the story and wrote in a letter of apology that 'my goal from the beginning was to call attention to what I perceived to be a serious safety concern for women'. The fabricated rape was not just a lie, but a lie promoting stereotypes." (Katie Roiphe, 1993).

It is important that women do not become paranoid about the idea of being sexually assaulted - they are not under siege - though at the same time it is necessary for them to exercise a reasonable degree of awareness and forethought with respect to their environment and actions. While sexual assault may not be a problem on your campus (and indeed, the numbers have declined compared to previous years), one thing that women may want to consider is enrolling in a self defense or martial arts course. Consider the facts:

1. Statistics show that people who are trained in self defense are less likely to be chosen as victims because they act differently and don't put themselves in potentially dangerous situations.
2. The National Center for Prevention and Control of Rape reports that women who fight, yell and attempt to flee are more successful in avoiding rape than those who talked, cried, tried to appeal to the assailant, or tried to make themselves appear less desirable.
3. Completing a course (rather than a short workshop) trains you to react automatically and instinctively to defend yourself in attack situations.
4. Many self defense and martial arts classes are available on or around campus, including:

PES 106L - Self Defense through the physical education department
 MSU Karate Club - 355-0822
 Okinawan Karate Club at Michigan Athletic Club - 337-0002
 Self Defense Workshop sponsored by intramural and

recreative Services - 355-9991 ext. 373 or 355-5250

Get a woman you care about enrolled in a self defense or martial arts course now! At least talk with a woman you care about regarding getting her enrolled in a self defense course, or better yet, enroll in the course together. You may have to bring up the topic more than once in order to convince her, but it will be worth it. It will protect her, and protect your relationship with her.

Male High Threat Message

"Sometimes an event gets under your skin. And other times it creeps deep into your brain. 'Charles' (a student) threw a party a year ago at his apartment at MSU. Three women friends of his left with men in tow, men they had met at his party. 'Charles' wished them well, wondering if he had the match-making touch. Instead, one woman was raped by her new date. A complaint was filed, but 'Charles' was overcome by a crushing sense of responsibility. 'Beating the (rapist's) brains out was tempting, but I knew it wouldn't solve the problem', says Hall . . . I just kept thinking of my mother, my girlfriend, my cousins, thinking-I don't want them to suffer from this, so what can I do? . . . I want to make people understand there's a line. And no woman, no matter how turned on she may be, is asking for someone to rape her.'"

Realize that you won't always be available or able to protect someone you care about, as this woman's experience illustrates:

"On my 21st birthday at MSU, my roommate had a party for me. One guest was a friend of my boyfriend, a man who I made 'small talk' with. At 2:30 a.m., he and a few other guests-including my boyfriend - were out front talking, but I was tired so I said goodnight and went to bed. I woke up with someone on top of me, shoving something up inside me. The panic I felt was incredible: I knew everybody had still been up when I went to sleep, and all I could think was, 'this man has killed everybody, and now he's going to kill me!' After a struggle that seemed like an eternity, the man lost his balance on my waterbed. Only when I opened the door to escape and saw him in the light did I recognize who it was - he had broken back into the house while my boyfriend slept downstairs, it was his friend. Since then, my relationship with my boyfriend has been different and we go to counseling. I am different now, and our relationship will never be the same. It's hard for me to even let my boyfriend hold me now. The only thing worse than the attack was that my boyfriend was sleeping downstairs while it happened. He feels guilty about not being there to defend and protect me. You always think that you'll be able to protect yourself, but until you are faced with a situation like the one I was in, you really don't know. That's why my boyfriend and I have enrolled in a self defense course together. We both are learning how to defend ourselves, and I think its helping us recover from that awful night."

Nobody likes to think that situations like the ones described above can happen, but these are true stories and they do happen. IT CAN HAPPEN TO SOMEONE YOU KNOW. College campuses are not immune from violence, and as much as you might like to

believe otherwise, MSU is not immune from violence and neither are you. Consider the facts:

1. College women represent the age group of women most likely to be victimized by rape.
2. One out of four women will be raped at some time during her life. That means that if you know four women, one of them may be sexually assaulted at some time in her life. This includes girlfriends, sisters, relatives and close female friends.
3. Women are more likely to be sexually assaulted by acquaintances than by strangers. This is especially problematic, because women tend to "let down their guard" when they are around people they know.
4. In a 1991 nationwide survey of 2400 colleges, Michigan State University reported the 2nd highest number of sexual assaults on campus.
5. Statistics from the sexual assault crisis line at MSU indicate that there were two independent calls per day regarding sexual assault in 1992.
6. In a recent study, 65% of college educated males said they would rape a woman if they thought they could get away with it.
7. This month, a woman was sexually assaulted by an MSU student.

While there are many answers to the problem of rape, one answer is for you to persuade a woman you care about to enroll in a self defense or martial arts course now! Statistics show that people trained in self defense are less likely to be chosen as victims because they act differently and don't put themselves in potentially dangerous situations. The National Center for Prevention and Control of Rape reports that women who fight, yell and attempt to flee are more successful in avoiding rape than those who talked, cried, tried to appeal to the assailant, or tried to make themselves appear less desirable. Additionally, completing a course (rather than a short workshop) trains you to react automatically and instinctively to defend yourself in attack situations. Many self defense and martial arts classes are available on or around campus, including:

PES 106L - Self Defense through the physical education department
 MSU Karate Club - 355-0822
 Okinawan Karate Club at Michigan Athletic Club - 337-0002

APPENDIX B

SCALE RELIABILITIES

<u>Scale</u>	<u># of items</u>	<u>Cronbach's alpha</u>
attitudes	4	.81
post-attitude	4	.88
follow up attitude	4	.87
attitude change	4	.74
intentions (male/both)	3	.88
intentions (male/her)	3	.95
post-intentions (male/both)	3	.92
post-intentions (male/her)	3	.98
f/up intentions (male/both)	3	.95
f/up intentions (male/her)	3	.98
intentions (female/both)	3	.96
intentions (female/self)	3	.94
post-intentions (female/both)	3	.96
post-intentions (female/self)	3	.96
f/up intentions (female/both)	3	.95
f/up intentions (female/self)	3	.94
beliefs about rape	17	.83
misogyny	4	.68
closeness (talk)	3	.74
sadness	3	.90
anger	3	.95
fear	3	.97
worry	3	.86
severity	3	.70
susceptibility	4	.83
response efficacy	3	.85
self efficacy	4	.79
minimization	4	.92
perceived manipulation	4	.93
defensive avoidance	4	.71
quality	5	.92
plausibility	4	.89
perceived invulnerability	4	.89
f/u perc. invulnerability	4	.91

APPENDIX C

BELIEFS ABOUT RAPE SCALE

The following items are from the Attitudes Toward Rape Victims Scale. Responses ranged from 1 - strongly disagree to 7 - strongly agree.

1. Women often claim rape to protect their reputations.
2. Most women secretly desire to be raped.
3. Claims of rape by strippers and prostitutes should be viewed with suspicion.
4. Women put themselves in situations in which they are likely to be sexually assaulted because they have an unconscious wish to be raped.
5. If a woman leads a man on, he should not be blamed if a rape occurs.
6. Women often really mean "yes" or "maybe" when they say "no".
7. In most rape against women, the women are promiscuous or have bad reputations.

The following items were from the Rape Empathy Scale. Responses ranged from 1 - strongly prefer A) to 7 - strongly prefer B).

8. A) I feel that the situation in which a man compels a woman to submit to sexual intercourse against her will is an unjustifiable act under any circumstances.
B) I feel that the situation in which a man compels a woman to submit to sexual intercourse against her will is a justifiable act under certain circumstances.
9. A) I would find it easier to imagine how a rapist might feel during an actual rape than how a rape victim might feel.
B) I would find it easier to imagine how a rape victim might feel during an actual rape than how a rapist might feel.

10. A) Under certain circumstances, I can understand why a man would use force to obtain sexual relations with a woman.
- B) I cannot understand why a man would use force to obtain sexual relations with a woman under any circumstances.
11. A) In a court of law, I feel that the rapist must be held accountable for his behavior during the rape.
- B) In a court of law, I feel that the rape victim must be held accountable for her behavior during the rape.
12. A) When a woman dresses in a sexually attractive way, she must be willing to accept the consequences of her behavior, whatever they are, since she is signalling her interest in having sexual relations.
- B) A woman has the right to dress in a sexually attractive way whether she is really interested in having sexual relations or not.
13. A) I believe that it is impossible for a rape victim to enjoy being raped.
- B) I believe that it is possible for a rape victim to enjoy the experience of being raped, whether she admits it or not.
14. A) I feel it is impossible for a man to rape a woman unless she is willing.
- B) I feel it is possible for a man to rape a woman against her will.
15. A) Once a couple has had sexual intercourse, then that issue is resolved and it is no longer possible for that man to rape that woman.
- B) Even if a couple has had sexual intercourse before, if the man forces the woman to have sexual intercourse with him against her will, this should be considered rape.
16. A) I can understand a wife's humiliation and anger if her husband forced her to have sexual relations with him.
- B) A husband has every right to determine when sexual relations with his wife occur, even if it means forcing her to have sex with him.

17. A) If I were a member of a jury in a rape trial, I would probably be more likely to believe the woman's testimony than the man's, since it takes a lot of courage on the woman's part to accuse the man of rape.
- B) If I were a member of a jury in a rape trial, I would probably be more likely to believe the man's testimony than the woman's, since rape is a charge that is difficult to defend against, even if the man is innocent.

Item #s 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,11,13,16,17 were recoded, thus high scores indicate high empathy for rape victims and less endorsement of stereotyped beliefs about rape.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

Anderson, V.N. (1992). For whom is this world just?: Sexual orientation and AIDS. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22, 248-259.

Beck, K.H., & Frankel, A. (1981). A conceptualization of threat communications and protective health behavior. Social Psychology Quarterly, 44, 204-217.

Berscheid, E. (1983). Emotion. In H.H. Kelley, E. Berscheid, A. Christensen, J.H. Harvey, T.L. Huston, G. Levinger, E. McClintock, L.A. Peplau, & D.R. Peterson, Close Relationships (pp. 110-168). New York: Freeman.

Berscheid, E., Snyder, M., & Omoto, A.M. (1989). The relationship closeness inventory: Assessing the closeness of interpersonal relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57, 792-807.

Bodenhausen, G.V. (1993). Emotions, arousal, and stereotypic judgments: A heuristic model of affect and stereotyping. In D.M. Mackie & D.L. Hamilton (Eds.), Affect, cognition, and stereotyping. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Boster, F.J., & Mongeau, P. (1984). Fear-arousing persuasive messages. In R.N. Bostrom, & B.H. Westley (Eds.), Communication Yearbook (Vol. 8, pp. 330-375). Beverly Hills: Sage.

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

Buchwald, E., Fletcher, P.R., & Roth, M. (1993). Are we really living in a rape culture? In E. Buchwald, P.R. Fletcher, & Roth, M (Eds.), Transforming a rape culture (pp. 7-10). Minneapolis, MN: Milkweed Editions.

Burnett, J.J. (1981). Internal-external locus of control as a moderator of fear appeals. Journal of Applied Psychology, 66, 303-393.

Burt, M.R. (1978). Attitudes supportive of rape in american culture. House Subcommittee on Science and Technology, Subcommittee on Domestic and International Scientific Planning Analysis, and Cooperation, Research into Violent Behavior: Sexual Assaults (Hearing, 95th Congress, 2nd Session, January 10-12, 1978). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 277-322.

Burt, M.R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 217-230.

Burt, M.R. (1991). Rape myths and acquaintance rape. In A. Parrot & L. Bechhofer (Eds.), Acquaintance rape: The hidden crime (pp. 26-40). New York: Wiley and Sons.

Burt, M.R., & Albin, R.S. (1981). Rape myths, rape definitions, and probability of conviction. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 11, 212-230.

Clark, L., & Lewis, D. (1977). Rape: The price of coercive sexuality. Toronto: The Women's Press.

Connors, J., & Heaven, P.C.L. (1989). Belief in a just world and attitudes toward AIDS sufferers. Journal of Social Psychology, 130, 559-560.

Darke, S. (1988). Anxiety and working memory capacity. Cognition and Emotion, 2, 145-154.

Davis, M.H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. Journal of Personality Psychology and Social Psychology, 44, 113-126.

Dillard, J.P. (1993). Rethinking the study of fear appeals: An emotional perspective. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Washington, D.C.

Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, Crime in the United States, 1991, August 30, 1992, pp. 14, 17, 24, 58, Table 1. -Index of Crimes, United States, 1972-1991.

Feild, H.S. (1978). Attitudes toward rape: A comparative analysis of police, rapists, crisis counselors, and citizens. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 156-179.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Furnham, D., & Proctor, E. (1988). Just world beliefs and AIDS: A validation study of a new multidimensional just world belief scale. Unpublished paper.

Gidycz, C.A., & Koss, M.P. (1991). The effects of acquaintance rape on the female victim. In A. Parrot & L. Bechhofer (Eds.), Acquaintance rape: The hidden crime (pp. 270-283). New York: Wiley and Sons.

Goldstein, M.J. (1959). The relationship between coping and avoiding behavior and response to fear-arousing propaganda. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 58, 247-252.

Gottlieb, N.H., & Green, L.W. (1979). Life events, social networks, life-style, and health: An analysis of the 1979 National Survey of Personal Health Practices and Consequences. Health Education Quarterly, 14, 91-105.

Griffin, S. (1971). Rape: The all-american crime. Ramparts, September, 26-35.

Gur, R.C., Gur, R.E., Skolnick, B.E., Resnick, S.M., Silber, F. I., Chawluk, J., Muenz, L., Obrist, W.D., & Reivich, M. (1988). Effects of task difficulty on regional cerebral blood flow: Relationships with anxiety and performance. Psychophysiology, 24, 392-399.

Hale, J.L., & Dillard, J.P. (1995). Fear appeals in health promotion campaigns: Too much, too little, or just right? In E. Maibach & R.L. Parrott (Eds.), Designing health messages (pp. 65-80). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hansen, W.B., Raynor, A.E., & Wolkenstein, B.H. (1991). Perceived personal immunity to the consequences of drinking alcohol: The relationship between behavior and perception. Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 14, 205-224.

Hewgill, M.A., & Miller, G.R. (1965). Source credibility and response to fear-arousing communications. Speech Monographs, 32, 95-101.

Houston, D.A. (1990). Empathy and the self: Cognitive and emotional influences on the evaluation of negative affect in others. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 859-868.

Hunter, J.E., & Gerbing, D.W. (1982). Unidimensional measurement, second order factor analysis and causal models. In B.M. Straw and L.L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior (Vol. 4), Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Janis, I.L. (1967). Effects of fear arousal on attitude change: Recent developments in theory and experimental research. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol.3, pp. 166-225). New York: Academic Press.

Janis, I.L., & Feshbach, S. (1953). Effects of fear-arousing communications. The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 48, 78-92.

Janis, I.L., & Feshbach, S. (1954). Personality differences associated with responsiveness to fear-arousing communications. Journal of Personality, 23, 154-166.

Janis, I.L., & Leventhal, H. (1968). Human reactions to stress. In E. Borgatta & W. Lambert (Eds.), Handbook of personality theory and research. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Janis, I.L., & Mann, L. (1965). Effectiveness of emotional role playing in modifying smoking habits and attitudes. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1, 84-90.

Janis, I.L., & Terwilliger, R.F. (1962). An experimental study of psychological resistances to fear-arousing communications. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 65, 403-410.

Kelley, H.H., & Thibaut, J.W. (1978). Interpersonal Relations: A theory of interdependence. New York: John Wiley.

Kleinke, C.L., & Meyer, C. (1990). Evaluation of rape victims by men and women with high and low belief in a just world. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 14, 343-353.

Koss, M.P. (1985). The hidden rape victim: Personality, attitudinal, and situational characteristics. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 9, 193-212.

Koss, M.P., Gidycz, C.A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55, 162-170.

Koss, M.P., Heise, L. & Russo, N.R. (1994). The global health burden of rape. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 18, 509-537.

Lauer, F., & Newlin, G. (1983). Peer support in maintenance of weight loss. Paper presented at the American Public Health Association Conference, Dallas, Texas.

Lerner, M.J. (1965). Observer's evaluation of performance as a function of performer's reward and attractiveness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1, 355-360.

Leventhal, H. (1970). Findings and theory in the study of fear communications. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology, vol. 5 (pp. 119-186). New York: Academic Press.

Leventhal, H. (1971). Fear appeals and persuasion: The differentiation of a motivational construct. American Journal of Public Health, 61, 1205-1224.

Leventhal, H., Singer, R., & Jones, S. (1965). Effects of fear and specificity of recommendation upon attitudes and behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2, 20-29.

Leventhal, H., & Watts, J. (1966). Sources of resistance to fear-arousing communications on smoking and lung cancer. Journal of Personality, 34, 155-175.

Madhubuti, H.R. (1993). On becoming anti-rapist. In E. Buchwald, P.R. Fletcher, & Roth, M. (Eds.) Transforming a rape culture, (pp. 165-178). Minneapolis, MN: Milkweed Editions.

McGuire, W.J. (1968). Personality and susceptibility to social influence. In E. Borgatta & W. Lambert (Eds.), Handbook of personality theory and research (pp. 1130-1187). Chicago: Rand McNally.

McGuire, W.J. (1969). The nature of attitude and attitude change. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), The handbook of social psychology (Vol. 3, pp. 136-314). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Miller, G.R. (1963). Studies on the use of fear appeals: A summary and analysis. Central States Speech Journal, 14, 117-124.

Miller, G.R. & Hewgill, M.A. (1966). Some recent research on fear-arousing message appeals. Speech Monographs, 33, 377-391.

Morrison, K. (1994). The influence of experience and prior knowledge on the reception of persuasive fear appeals: A test of the extended parallel process model. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.

Morrison, K. (1995). Talking with male and female college students about preventing rape: Insights from a focus group discussion. Unpublished manuscript. Department of Communication, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

Perloff, L.S., & Fetzer, B.K. (1986). Self-other judgments and perceived vulnerability to victimization. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 502-510.

Powell, F. A. (1965). The effect of anxiety-arousing messages when related to personal, familial, and impersonal referents. Speech Monographs, 32, 102-106.

Roiphe, K. (1993). The morning after: Sex, fear, and feminism on campus. New York: Little Brown.

Rogers, R.W. (1975). A protection motivation theory of fear appeals and attitude change. Journal of Psychology, 91, 93-114.

Salovey, P., O'Leary, A., Stretton, M.S., Fishkin, S.A., & Drake, C.A. (1991). Influence of mood on judgments about health and illness. In J. Forgas (Ed.), Emotion and Social Judgments (pp. 241-262). New York: Pergamon Press.

Shaw, K. (1993, January 25). 'U' sexual assaults up, crime down. The State New, pp. 1, 11.

Stiff, J.B., Dillard, J.P., Somera, L., Kim, H., Sleight, C. (1988). Empathy, communication, and prosocial behavior. Communication Monographs, 55, 198-213.

Sutton, S.R., & Eiser, J.R. (1984). The effects of fear-arousing communications on cigarette smoking: An expectancy-value approach. Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 7, 13-33.

Tamborini, R., Salomonson, K., & Bahk, C. (1993). The relationship of empathy to comforting behavior following film exposure. Communication Research, 20, 723-738.

United States Department of Health and Human Services & Public Health Service. (1990). Healthy people 2000: National health promotion and disease prevention objectives (DHHS Publication No. PHS 91-50212). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Wagstaff, G.F. (1982). Attitudes to rape: The "just world" strikes again? Bulletin of the British Psychological Society, 35, 277-279.

Walster, E. (1966). Assignment of responsibility for an accident. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3, 73-79.

Ward, C. (1988). The attitudes toward rape victims scale. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 12, 127-146.

Warshaw, R. (1988). I never called it rape: The Ms. report on recognizing, fighting, and surviving date and acquaintance rape. New York: Harper & Row.

Weinstein, N.D. (1984). Why it won't happen to me: Perceptions of risk factors and susceptibility. Health Psychology, 3, 431-437.

Weinstein, N.D. (1987). Unrealistic optimism about susceptibility to health problems: Conclusions from a community-wide sample. Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 10, 481-500.

Weis, K., & Borges, S. (1973). Victimology and rape: The case of the legitimate victim. Issues in Criminology, 8, 71-114.

Welch Cline, R.J., & McKenzie, N.J. (1994). Sex differences in communication and the construction of HIV/AIDS. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 22, 322-337.

Will, G. (1993, October). Sex amidst semicolons. Newsweek, p. 92.

Wingard, D., & Berkman, L.F. (1985). A multivariate analysis of health practices and social networks. In S. Cohen and L. Syme (Eds.), Social Support and Health (pp. 161-175). New York: Academic Press.

Witte, K. (1992). Putting the fear back into fear appeals: The extended parallel process model. Communication Monographs, 59, 329-349.

Witte, K. (1994). Fear control and danger control: A test of the extended parallel process model (EPPM). Communication Monographs, 61, 113-134.

Wolf, N. (1991). The Beauty Myth. New York: William Morrow.

Wyer, R.S., Bodenhausen, G.V., & Gorman, T.F. (1985). Cognitive mediators of reactions to rape. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 324-338.

Zimmerman, R.S., & Connor, C., (1989). Health promotion in context: The effects of significant others on health behavior change. Health Education Quarterly, 16, 57-75.

