This is to certify that the

thesis entitled
EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF A SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION PROGRAM TARGETING MALE COLLEGIATE ATHLETES

presented by

Wendi L. Siebold

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

M.A. degree in Psychology

Major professor

Date 12-1-00

EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF A SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION PROGRAM TARGETING MALE COLLEGIATE ATHLETES

By

Wendi Lyn Siebold

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Psychology

2000

ABSTRACT

EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF A SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION PROGRAM TARGETING MALE COLLEGIATE ATHLETES

By

Wendi Lyn Siebold

Male collegiate athletes are one of the groups on college campuses most commonly assumed to be at a high risk for perpetration of sexual assault, because of their direct involvement in a culture that has been known to foster an aggressive and competitive environment (Curry, 1991; Messner, 1992; Nelson, 1994). Yet, there exist only a handful of prevention and education programs that are specifically designed for male student athletes, none of which have been evaluated and published in the literature. The present study evaluated a sexual assault prevention program targeting male collegiate athletes. Initial results from this evaluation indicated that the program did not significantly reduce men's rape myth acceptance or likelihood of sexually aggressing, or increase their likelihood of confronting. Additionally, none of the sport-specific characteristics of being an athlete significantly predicted participants' change in attitudes post-intervention. Open-ended program utilization questions gave insight into these findings, as well as the possibility of group-level change within a male peer supportive environment (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997). Implications for future programming targeting male collegiate athletes are discussed, along with a general discussion about the efficacy of such efforts that target individuals who operate within a larger system of accountability.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study would not have been possible without the enduring support of numerous people who worked with me through both the process and the product of this project. I would particularly like to thank Jayne Schuiteman, the Women's Resource Center, and all of the members of the program planning committee for allowing me to come on board and be a part of the this project from the start. I appreciate all of the support they gave to both me and the evaluation of this program – it was truly a joy to get to know and work with all of you. I am sincerely grateful to Cris Sullivan, the chair of my thesis committee, for advising me through the changing tides of evaluating such a politically tempestuous program. Her wealth of experience in program evaluation and working with campus groups helped guide me through the process. And if it weren't for Cris, this paper would have probably been twice as long with multiple punctuation mistakes! My other two committee members also deserve accolades, namely, Deborah Bybee for the amount of time she worked with me on my methodology and statistical analyses, and Pennie Foster-Fishman for guiding me through the "larger worth" conceptual portions of this project. Last, but certainly not least, I thank Carolyn for all of her emotional and practical support. She was my solid ground for not only the emotional aspects of this project, but also by being my own personal editor through reading numerous drafts of this paper. Thanks for putting up with all of my mood swings and supporting me throughout!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

It is now known that sexual assault on college campuses is a major social problem. Recent studies suggest that undergraduate women are sexually victimized at three times the rate of women in the general United States population, and at least one in three undergraduate women experience an attempted or completed rape before leaving college (Boeringer, 1999; Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987; Meuhlenhard & Linton, 1987). Based on these findings, a number of colleges and universities across the country have implemented sexual assault prevention and education programs targeting the general student population. Although college students have been the recipients of a variety of prevention programs, specific sub-groups of the college population (e.g. fraternities and sports teams) have traditionally either missed general programming or have not received programming that is specifically tailored to their group's reality. For example, sexual assault awareness programs are often targeted to first-year students on a voluntary basis, so students who elect to not attend these programs (who may often be men), or who are hard to access because of a busy schedule (e.g. athletes) do not receive any programming.

However, recent theories about the etiology of sexual assault have increased the focus of speculation about the perpetration of sexual assault to certain "high-risk" groups of students (Sanday, 1990). Male student athletes are one of the sub-groups most commonly assumed to be at a high risk for perpetration of sexual assault, because of their direct involvement in a culture that has been known to foster an aggressive and competitive environment (Curry, 1991; Messner, 1992; Nelson, 1994). Factors that are

both coached and expected within the world of sport, such as aggression and conquest over others, as well as the enforced belief that male power over women is natural and sexualized (Messner, 1992; Messner & Sabo, 1994), have led the general public, media, and some researchers to believe there is a connection between participation in all-male sports and the perpetration of sexual assault.

Although there is a growing body of literature that makes connections between the sports culture and sexual assault, there is only a handful of prevention and education programs that work directly and specifically with male student athletes. Although these programs have reported having good outcomes and reputations with university administrators and students, none of the programs published in the literature has been evaluated for its effectiveness.

The present study undertakes the evaluation of a college-based rape prevention program targeting male student athletes. The program is one of the few that targets males as a single-sex group in team-based workshops incorporating group facilitation and interactive presentation materials. It was developed in an effort to specifically address the unique culture that male collegiate athletes are a part of, and deliver the information in an effective way. The current evaluation adds not only to the general knowledge base of research on program content and presentation of information, but allows for a more critical look at what extraneous factors may predict the effectiveness of education programs that target male collegiate athletes. Considering the tailored nature of this program, the effectiveness of such an approach is important to understand to direct the efforts of future programs targeting male collegiate athletes. It is necessary to not only determine if specific factors related to being a male collegiate athlete are related to

program effectiveness, but also whether or not targeting male collegiate athletes for rape prevention education is even a worthwhile endeavor.

The first section of this paper examines the definitional process that sexual assault has undergone over the past 30 years. There have been a variety of opinions about how sexual assault should be defined for use in research, and the specific definition that is used for this study, in addition to the development of presentation materials, is explained.

In addition to there being a debate about how sexual assault should be defined, an even larger debate has surrounded the explanation for the perpetration of it. The second section gives an overview of the main theories of the etiology of sexual assault, and the underlying rationale for targeting male collegiate athletes with specifically designed rape prevention programs that differ from programs targeting the general male student body. The main theory reviewed is one put forth by Peggy Sanday (1990) in which America as a whole is deemed as a "rape culture," or a culture that condones and facilitates the existence of rape. She and other researchers have hypothesized that certain groups within this rape culture (e.g. fraternities and male student athletes) are more prone to condone or commit sexual assault. A review of the research supporting the male collegiate athlete sub-culture as a rape culture is provided.

Although there is evidence that the male collegiate athletic culture is conducive to increased sexual aggression against women, the factors connecting sports participation with sexual assault have been equivocal in the research. The third section of this paper reviews the recent research, theory, and debate on the specific connection between male collegiate athletes and sexual assault. The quantitative evidence of a variety of specific factors related to sexual aggression is presented, and suggestions of other possible factors

are presented for further research. It is these sport-specific factors that may serve as predictors of a prevention program's effectiveness. Therefore, these sport-specific factors were measured and tested as predictors of the current programs' effectiveness at attitude change.

Because the general link between student athletes and increased sexual aggression has provided evidence that athletes are indeed a higher risk population, there have been a few prevention and education programs developed that target male student athletes. However, in order to draw a distinction between these programs and programs that target the general student population, it was necessary to first gain an understanding of the rape prevention programs targeting the general college student population. There have been numerous programs developed targeting both male and female college students, and certain program formats and content have been found to be more effective with specific groups than with the general student body. For example, researchers have shown that, under certain conditions, men have less attitude change after a workshop than do women. As a result, there are programs targeting only men that incorporate specific presentation styles and formats to which men are more responsive. These findings within the general rape prevention literature help in the development of programs specifically targeting male collegiate athletes. Although specifically designed for male athletes, programs are based largely on techniques and materials used by programs targeting the general student body. It is therefore essential that the effectiveness of using general programmatic planning techniques for the implementation of a program specifically targeting male collegiate athletes is determined.

The last section of the literature review describes the two main programs that have been developed and implemented specifically for male collegiate athletes. Although both of these programs report having great rapport with the school administration and athletes, neither one has been formally evaluated for effectiveness at attitude change or knowledge increase. Additionally, although one of the programs emphasizes the peer culture in which male student athletes exist, no evaluation of the effectiveness of this type of program focus has yet been evaluated. A discussion of the possibilities that exist for group change when individuals participate in programs like those that target collegiate athletes is then presented, as well as a description of the current program evaluation.

Chapter 1

OVERVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Defining Sexual Assault

Over the past 30 years, there have been a variety of opinions about how sexual assault should be defined for use in research. Much of the debate about the definition of sexual assault started and has centered on the largest and most widely cited survey of the prevalence of sexual assault on college campuses was administered by Koss and colleagues in 1987. In this landmark study, a self-report questionnaire was filled out by 6,159 students (3,187 women and 2,972 men) in 32 institutions of higher learning located across the United States. About 25% of the men in Koss's original sample (Koss et al., 1987) reported engaging in some form of coercive sexual activity since the age of 14. Part of what has been most controversial about Koss et al.'s (1987) study is how sexual assault was measured. A range of coercive sexual behaviors were included in the scale, in order to reflect the dimensional view that sexual assault is a behavior that lies at one extreme of human sexual behavior. The two original goals for the creation of the scale were to 1) develop an instrument to collect data supporting the dimensional viewpoint and 2) develop an instrument capable of reflecting the large number of rapes that go unreported in the United States (Koss & Oros, 1982). Therefore, the scale captures a wide range of sexual behaviors that some people have considered unrelated to rape (Gilbert, 1991_b; Sommers, 1994), while others consider them to be rape, whether or not the woman perceives it as so (e.g. women talked into having sex against their wishes).

For example, Sommers (1994) claims that if a woman does not label an incident as rape, the researcher has no right to call her a rape victim, based on certain behaviors that took place in the situation. Despite this conceptual turf war, multiple people in the field of sexual assault research have maintained a dimensional view, which is still the most widely cited and used measure of rape prevalence in the U.S. (Bohmer & Parrot, 1993; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997).

More recent studies on the prevalence of college sexual assault have measured women's and men's experiences of a broad range of behaviors, rather than the classic legally-bound definitions of rape or criminal sexual conduct. Studies investigating the prevalence of not just rape, but all forms of sexual assault, including sexual coercion, have helped enlighten our understanding of the prevalence of sexual assault in America's universities. With the use of a range of sexual behaviors to determine prevalence rates, many other researchers have found rates to range between 15% and 25% (Kanin, 1957; Koss & Gidycz, 1985; Koss et al., 1987; Makepeace, 1986; Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987; Rivera & Regoli, 1987).

Expanding the concept of sexual assault has taken years. For years American society has perceived rape through stereotypic images (Lonsway, 1996). Rapists have been believed to be the outcasts of society – those who are often linked to crimes because of their income level, ethnicity, or mental health. We have been overwhelmed with news reports of serial rapists and deranged attackers – images that reinforce the belief that if women just avoid dark alleys and stay safe in their own homes and private spaces, rape will not affect them.

This "stranger rape" ideology shaped American society's understanding of sexual assault for many years, and only recently is beginning to change with more evidence that rape and sexual assault are much more commonly acted out among acquaintances. We now know that the majority of rapes (80-90%) are perpetrated by known acquaintances (Koss,1987; Lonsway, 1996; National Victim Center,1992; Warshaw,1988), and gradually, the general public as well as the media, medical, and legal professions are becoming more aware of the pervasiveness of acquaintance rape.

However, broadening people's understanding and definition of sexual assault to include behaviors such as sexual coercion and sex that is not penile-vaginal has been problematic. Many researchers and theorists still vary on their definition of sexual assault, with the main commonality being an emphasis on nonconsensual sexual conduct (Bohmer & Parrot, 1993; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997). Feminist scholars and activists have argued for years that a broader definition of sexual assault that includes a range of unwanted sexual experiences is less judgmental and more encompassing of the violations that women endure throughout their lives, *both emotionally and physically*. For example, the use of alcohol and other drugs to facilitate a rape is increasingly common on college campuses (Koss & Gaines, 1993). Many women who have been drugged are not aware that what they experienced would be considered rape, largely because our society is slow to name unwanted sexual contact as "rape." Often women expect sex to be somewhat "unpleasant" or "aggressive" with men, since American mainstream culture stresses heterosexual sex as being a man's ultimate goal and source of pleasure, rather than something a woman should actively want or pursue (Brownmiller, 1975). This presents barriers to naming unwanted sex as rape, since these beliefs are so

embedded in American culture. By capturing the totality of unwanted experiences that women endure, we gain a more representative picture of what college sexual life can be like, rather than excluding those equally devastating experiences that may not fit strictly legal definitions of rape or criminal sexual conduct (e.g. men's use of alcohol or threats to gain sex).

For the purposes of the current project, the definition of sexual assault that was developed by Koss et al. in 1987 and used by many other researchers since then (e.g. Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997), was used. This understanding breaks sexual assault into four categories:

1) *Unwanted sexual contact* – includes unwanted sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting) arising from menacing verbal pressure, misuse of authority, threats of harm, or actual physical force.
2) *Sexual coercion* – includes unwanted sexual intercourse arising from the use of menacing verbal pressure or the misuse of authority.
3) *Attempted rape* – includes attempted unwanted sexual intercourse arising from the use of or threats of force, or the use of drugs or alcohol.
4) *Rape* – includes unwanted sexual intercourse arising from the use of or threats of force and other unwanted sex acts (anal or oral intercourse or penetration by objects other than the penis) arising from the use of or threat of force, or the use of drugs or alcohol.

The Etiology of Sexual Assault

In addition to the debates surrounding the definition of sexual assault, there have been a variety of theories about its etiology. Most theories of perpetration have focused on one or more of the following factors: 1) the individual, psychological make-up of perpetrators, 2) group dynamics, and 3) sociocultural phenomena. At this time, most researchers and theorists have come to an agreement that sexual assault is multidimensional in nature (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997; Thorne-Finch, 1992; Malamuth, Stockloskie, Koss, & Tanaka, 1991; Craig, 1990; Baron & Strauss, 1989; Stanko, 1990). Individual, group, and sociocultural factors play a role in sexual and physical aggression by men against women.

One example of the interrelatedness of these three factors is how group and sociocultural factors support the individual factors associated with sexual assault, by giving a person who is more prone to perpetration the environment and cultural support to actually carry out the assault. The individual component of a rape culture that is studied the most in relation to sexual assault is a person's adherence to rape myths. Rape myths are "prejudicial, stereotyped, or false beliefs about rape, rape victims, and rapists" that are present in the general American culture, yet widely held by certain individuals (Burt, 1980, p. 217). Burt (1980) developed the first scale to measure an individual's acceptance of rape myths, which included statements such as "A woman who goes to the home or apartment of a man on their first date implies that she is willing to have sex," and "Many women have an unconscious wish to be raped, and may then unconsciously set up the situation in which they are likely to be attacked." Lonsway & Fitzgerald (1994) have refined the definition of rape myths as "attitudes and beliefs that are

generally false but are widely and persistently held, and that serve to deny and justify male sexual aggression against women" (p.134). Rape myths are the most commonly measured variable in the evaluation of rape prevention programs, as an individual's level of adherence to rape myths has been found to be associated with self-reported likelihood to sexually aggress (Koss & Gaines, 1993).

Another aspect of an individual's belief system associated with increased sexual aggression is an individual's acceptance of the use of violence in both general society and interpersonal relationships. Burt (1980) also was the first to develop a scale that measured a person's acceptance of interpersonal violence, and found that this construct was the strongest attitude predictor of rape myth acceptance. These findings have been replicated numerous times within the literature on rape prevention (Lonsway, 1996). Individual factors involved with rape perpetration, such as those described above, have been the main focus of empirical sexual assault research, as well as rape prevention interventions. However, there is a wide range of literature that focuses on how the group and cultural components of a society play a role in an individual's choice of behaviors. It is these group/cultural components that have added to the speculation that male athletes are especially prone to sexually assault women, since they exist in a culture that is so dependent on peer-group support and teamwork. The understanding of the contribution of group or cultural factors to the occurrence of sexual assault was developed in the past fifteen years, mainly through qualitative research.

One of the most prominent and widely cited cultural theories of rape perpetration was developed by anthropologist Peggy Sanday in 1990 in her landmark qualitative study of fraternities, *Fraternity Gang Rape* (Sanday, 1990). Sanday studied the existence of

rape in different cultural communities across the world, and based on those experiences abroad and her interviews and observations of fraternity members on American college campuses, she dubbed certain cultures "rape cultures." Sanday's claim that American society is a "rape culture" that supports the facilitation of rape is supported by previous writings about sexual assault. In her landmark book, *Against Our Will*, Susan Brownmiller (1975) asserted that rape is a "conscious process of intimidation by which all men keep all women in a state of fear" (p.15). Martin and Hummer (1989) published a qualitative look at fraternity culture, and suggested that fraternities "foster and strengthen beliefs and attitudes supportive of sexual violence" (Boeringer, 1999, p.83). The theory of "rape culture" supports the contention that sexual assault is not just a result of one person's biological make-up or psychological disposition; rather it is a behavior that is socially encouraged (Crosset, et al, 1995; Brownmiller, 1975; Russell, 1975; Sanday, 1981, 1990). Most definitions of a rape culture stem from Sanday's (1981) study of ninety-five band and tribal societies, in which she classified 47% as rape-free and 18% as rape-prone (Sanday, 1996, p.193). Cultures that displayed a high level of tolerance for violence, male dominance, and sex segregation had the highest frequency of reported rape (both individual and gang) (Crosset, 1995). Sanday (1996) describes societies that are rape prone as those in which "the incidence of rape is reported by observers to be high, or rape is excused as a ceremonial expression of masculinity, or rape is an act by which men are allowed to punish or threaten women" (Sanday, 1996, p.193).

Schwartz and DeKeseredy (1997) have expanded Sanday's (1996) concept by specifying the cultural components that make up a rape-prone culture. Among the multiple factors involved, there are a few that are more salient to the world of male sports

than others. First, the existence of a "courtship patriarchy" is an important component of the rape culture (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997). Courtship patriarchies exist in societies that hold customs, beliefs, and opinions about the man's role of dominance in a dating relationship. Expecting men to pay for dinner and a movie (the date), and expecting women to wait for men to open car doors are both examples of how the courtship process consists of traditional rules of behavior. Many people think these rules make life easy for women, because the man is "taking care" of her. However, these behaviors set up a dangerous power dynamic, as societies often are accustomed to engaging in behavioral "exchanges," rather than a simple favor without anything expected in return. Schwartz & DeKeseredy (1997) comment that "the problem here as it relates to [sexual assault] is that people often feel that under the rules of what we will call 'courtship patriarchy,' the male under many circumstances is entitled to sex provided by the female" (p.62). Both men and women may at times feel pressured into ending a date with sexual intercourse or contact, although one or both parties may not want to engage in such behavior.

Although the concept of a courtship patriarchy was originally developed in reference to general societal practices, there are some components of the male collegiate athlete experience that, when combined with a general culture supportive of courtship patriarchies, may exacerbate women's vulnerability. Particularly, the loss of accountability and personal responsibility that often accompanies being a male student athlete (particularly on scholarship), may be a prominent factor involved with an athlete's perception that he has the right to sex from a woman he dates or with whom he comes into intimate contact. Jeffrey Benedict, in his book *Athletes and Acquaintance Rape*

(1998) describes that in addition to multiple monetary and academic-related benefits, certain athletes also are given a type of privilege that may play the largest role in a player's misuse of his power in an intimate situation:

> In addition to the isolation from typical student responsibilities, athletes are also relieved from virtually all personal accountability as well...As citizens, student athletes see their behavior condoned or overlooked when it violates either campus codes of conduct or local laws. Coaches and athletic administrators are often content to tolerate otherwise socially unacceptable behavior in exchange for superb athletic performances. (p.13)

Other components defining a rape culture in our general American society may also be exacerbated through the world of male sports. Two of them stem from slightly different roots, yet result in a complementary oppression of women. The extent to which parents raise their children with traditional sex role beliefs and a mass media that sexualizes women as objects, combine to characterize the perceptions and expectations that men and women have for their own role and the role of the opposite sex in intimate relationships and situations. A rape culture is often easily defined by its media images of women and their bodies in sexually demeaning and/or objectified roles. Examples of women in objectified positions often arise in all-male social gatherings, where fraternal bonding is at its highest point. Ice cube trays in the shape of nude women, glasses in the shape of a breast or with pictures of sexy women whose clothes disappear when the glass gets wet are all examples of objects turned into a representation of women's bodies (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997). Women are often reduced to just a part of their body – a breast, a nipple, armless, or headless. The pornographic industry and some advertisements for commercial products often depict women as sexual objects. In fact, pornography has been a primary target of feminists and anti-rape advocates for years.

They have argued that in heterosexual male-produced pornography, women exist to serve and service men, and that to some men "that means that women are fair game to rape or sexually abuse" (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997, p.85). MacKinnon (1993) has made some of the most widely cited and publicized arguments against pornography, contending that pornography silences women and creates a hostile environment for women within general societal living (e.g. attaining jobs, housing, etc.). Baker (1992) clearly describes the danger imposed to women specifically relating to sexual abuse:

> Pornography expresses more than the view that women are mere sex objects. It tells men that women enjoy sex and are always available for it, even when they deny it. It tells men that women secretly enjoy rape... (p.140)

While this view of women's sexuality is often portrayed to the general American public as part fantasy, the availability of women for the sexual taking is often a reality for certain male student athletes. Highly recruited players are often "exposed to women who are used to entice players to their school [and] this initial experience with women as a benefit is expanded over the course of a college career" (Benedict, 1998, p.14). Benedict (1998) notes that this practice is not carried out by college athletic departments, but rather by other players on the team. An NFL player interviewed by Benedict (1998), recalled the number of women (usually referred to as "groupies") who were essentially at the sexual disposal of the team:

> There were groupies in college – college groupies. Athletic department college groupies are usually the ones that you meet on a recruiting trip. And they're there and they sleep with all the recruits, or they sleep with some freshmen. It's either someone that they [coaches and recruiters] are trying to entice to come to the school or someone that's at the school and they want to keep happy. (p.15)

Not all male student athletes have the "luxury" of available women and additional privileges, as "groupies" associate more with higher profile athletes and teams (e.g. basketball, football). However, other teams and athletes may assume that women who were known to be groupies are also sexual objects for the taking. When societal all-male group objectification of women is combined with the sexual privileges of certain male student athletes, it is possible that the extent to which men are trained to objectify women on the basis of sex creates a danger for those women who say "no." When women are seen as objects and not as individuals, the boundaries get blurred between a woman who wants sex and a woman who wants companionship. This belief is reflected in our society's practice of doubting the motives of women who claim higher profile athletes sexually abused them, particularly if the women are known to be "groupies" or have a promiscuous sexual history. Unfortunately, athletes' experiences with groupies have not yet been empirically studied in relation to their likelihood of sexually aggressing, nor to the severity of their sexual aggression.

A complementary cultural practice (that impacts individual beliefs) to the sexual objectification of women is the raising of children with extreme sex-role specific beliefs. For example, boys and girls who are raised to believe that maternal duties are for girls and being the family breadwinner is for boys often grow up with certain expectations for the other sex's behavior in an intimate relationship (Thorne, 1993). Socialization theorists have written for years about the harm of growing up with such polarized expectations of gender, and some have tied this genderization to violence in intimate heterosexual relationships. Berkowitz et al. (1994, p.7) argue that "men's sexuality and their relationships with women provide a sphere for enactment and confirmation of these

traditional gender-role expectations, which assign men the role of aggressor and women the role of gatekeeper in sexual intimacy." When the societal sexual objectification of women is concomitant with the engendered socialization of its girls and boys, individuals grow up into adults with belief systems supportive of a rape culture.

It has been suggested that male collegiate athletes hold more stereotypic sex role beliefs for both themselves and the women in their lives (Parrot et al., 1994). Research has found that men who subscribe to traditional sex roles and male sexual dominance are more likely than other men to engage in verbal sexual coercion, sexual assault, and rape (Muehlenhard et al., 1990 as cited in Parrot et al., 1994). It is hard to argue with the connection of traditional sex role stereotypes and male athletes, since part of America's definition of masculinity and "what it means to be a man" includes participation in sports. The implications for sexual assault are encountered in the fact that "masculinity in sport has been defined in contrast with, if not wholly separate from, women and womanhood" (Crosset et al., 1996, p.175). If a man hones his athletic talent enough to make a college team, he has "made it" into a world that defines its masculinity not only by stereotypical masculine behaviors (e.g. yelling, grabbing his crotch, being violent and unemotional unless the emotion is anger), but mainly to the extent it is *not* feminine. For example, it is common for coaches and teammates to call a player derogatory names when he fails to do something correctly in practice or a game. Some of the more common choices for names are "pussy," "bitch," and "girl" (Messner, 1992; Nelson, 1994). One of the accusations that boys in sports commonly grow up hearing is that they "play like a girl" or "throw like a girl" if their athleticism is not at par with the expectations of the activity. This polarization of gender is so extreme in male sports that even homosexuality between

men is engendered into being "feminine" and derogatory words about homosexual acts are often targeted at athletes. Nelson (1994), who has written extensively about the male sports culture, gives an example of how influential coaches can be in the process of defining athletes as non-feminine:

> Coaches who would be fired for calling athletes "nigger" employ with impunity such terms as "cunt." "Faggot" is another popular derogation. It refers not so much to sex between men as to weakness, timidity, cowardice – and femininity...In response to "wimpy" performances, male coaches have been known to deposit tampons, sanitary napkins, and bras in young men's lockers. "You have debased yourself to the level of a woman" is the message. (p.87)

Cultural practices such as those described above, have led researchers to label certain sub-groups within the American rape culture as more "rape prone" because of their group characteristics often associated with sexual assault (e.g. male bonding, distinct hierarchies of power and dominance) (Sanday, 1996). The two most studied sub-groups are fraternities and male sports teams (Boeringer, 1999). Although the current study focuses on male collegiate athletes as a sub-culture, it is important to review some of the research regarding the fraternity sub-culture. Fraternities were the first sub-group to be studied, and likewise, most of the research on the dynamics of rape-prone sub-cultures comes from the fraternity literature. There are also some important connections and distinctions to be drawn between fraternity sub-groups and athlete sub-groups.

Initial research with fraternities was more qualitative in nature, which helped describe and explain the type of culture that existed within fraternity houses. Sanday (1990) and Martin & Hummer (1989) have been the two main proponents (via ethnography) of there being a rape sub-culture within fraternities. Both provided convincing evidence that "fraternities may provide an environment in which rape-

supportive ideologies can thrive and be transmitted to others" (Boeringer, 1999, p.83). Social get-togethers in which fraternity men use alcohol, drugs, and physical and verbal coercion to "work a yes out," as well as male bonding around the objectification of women and "scoring" sexually, all lend to the suggestion that fraternities are conducive to sexual assault (Boeringer, 1999).

However, quantitative research that has tested the hypothesized connection between rape myth acceptance, sexual aggression, and affiliation with fraternities has not provided the convincing support that was expected. While many researchers have not been able to find a connection between fraternity affiliation and sexual aggression (Lenihan & Rawlins, 1994; Schwartz & Nogrady, 1996; Boeringer, Shehan, & Akers, 1991; Koss & Gaines, 1993), others have (Boeringer, 1999). Some have even found that fraternity members were less accepting of rape myths than a non-Greek comparison group (Schwartz & Nogrady, 1996). Both Schwartz & Nogrady (1996) and Koss & Gaines (1993) found that alcohol and substance use were stronger predictors of sexual aggression than fraternity affiliation. However, both had methodological problems, which may have had an impact on their findings. For example, Koss & Gaines (1993) warn against inferring too much from their study (1993), because of its low sample size of fraternity members. Schwartz & Nogrady (1996) caution that "it may well be that the large number of fraternity men who do not engage in sexually coercive behavior is masking the effect of those who do" (p.159).

Other studies have found that fraternity members were more likely to use alcohol, drugs, and other substances, even though they were less accepting of rape myths. Despite Koss & Gaines' (1993) and Schwartz & Nogrady's (1996) unsupportive findings,

Boeringer (1999) did find a relationship between fraternity and athletic affiliation and rape-supportive attitudes. Boeringer (1999) sampled general attitudes in a sample of 477 college men, and found that men who were members of fraternities scored significantly higher than the control group (of non-Greek and non-student-athlete men) on 18% of statements endorsing rape-supportive beliefs. The control group agreed with 8% of rape-supportive belief statements. Male collegiate athletes endorsed the most rape-supportive beliefs, agreeing with 56% of the statements (16 out of 28 statements). Boeringer's (1999) study joins other quantitative and qualitative studies that have found similar evidence that fraternity groups hold more rape-supportive ideologies (Bohmer & Parrot, 1993; Schaeffer & Nelson, 1993; Sanday, 1990, Martin & Hummer, 1989). Because the research findings on fraternities and sexual aggression have been so inconsistent, some researchers and theorists have turned to a more detailed analysis of what is involved in the experience of a being fraternity member. Currently, peer group influence is one of the most prominent theories put forth, which suggests that an individual's acceptance of rape myths or increased sexual aggression is largely influenced by a male peer group culture, in addition to other factors. Schwartz & Nogrady (1996) state quite simply that it may not be just fraternities, but rather the components that define a fraternity that make certain groups more rape-prone:

> It seems to be possible that other groups on campus may be just as likely as fraternities to provide extensive male peer support for the sexual objectification of women, and access to alcohol, that encourages some men to engage in victimizing behaviors. (p.159)

Schwartz & DeKeseredy (1997) are two of the main proponents of this idea and have written extensively about it in their book *Sexual Assault On The College Campus: The Role of Male Peer Support* (1997). They note that there are a variety of factors

associated with male peer group membership that have a relationship with being rape prone. For example, a group's narrow conception of masculinity (e.g. quite accepting of the idea that males are dominant and females are submissive), group secrecy (e.g. hiding their peers' deviant activities), and sexual objectification of women all are part of some male peer support groups. The concept of peer group influence particularly plays into the reasoning behind sports teams' reputation as being the second most common group implicated in gang rapes (behind fraternities) (Neimark, 1991).

Certain male collegiate athletes exist in a peer group culture that is quite similar to that of a fraternity group, including the male bonding that leads to the objectification of women and tight vows of secrecy that prevent exposure (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997). As discussed earlier, certain male athletes are in an environment that continuously debases women and polarizes the sexes. However, the most salient part of the collegiate team athlete peer group culture is the daily training to sacrifice everything to a group goal and to exist "for the team." Not only is each athlete a part of a team, he is part of a team that is trained to react without question to the orders and authoritarian directions of coaches and team captains. The hierarchy of team membership is set right from the start, as first year team members frequently go through "initiation rights" at the hands of older players (much like in fraternities), and the simple fact that most team captains are older, starting players. The male bonding that is essentially required on collegiate sports teams can be very powerful, since the athletes live, eat, and work with each other. Schwartz & DeKeseredy (1997) note that "this group bonding can be so strong that such men are willing to take part in rape, or to observe rape, or at least to take part in a cover-up,

because the alternative is to go against the group. It becomes more important to be part of the group than it is to do the right thing" (p. 126).

This group influence also may account for the lack of research findings linking group members' individual factors to sexual aggression. Boeringer (1999) alluded to the possibility that individual level factors (e.g. rape myth acceptance, acceptance of interpersonal violence) may not always have a direct relationship to sexual aggression, because such strong peer influence may essentially drown out individual decision-making and behavior in the guise of "being a team player." Despite this, the relation that group factors have to sexual assault by members of the group has not yet been empirically explored. Because athletes are part of such a group-dominated culture (i.e. teams), it is necessary to explore the group influences involved with their level of sexual aggression or intervention in a sexually aggressive situation. More discussion about the effects of group influence will be discussed later in this chapter.

Male Collegiate Athletics as a Rape-Prone Sub-Culture

There is little doubt among researchers and theorists that the male sports culture is indicative of a rape culture (Crosset et al., 1996). Male sports are highly sex segregated and often promote hostile attitudes toward rivals and physical domination over others (Kidd, 1990; Messner, 1992; Messner & Sabo, 1994). Organized male sports have been described as supporting male dominance and sexist practices (Crosset et al., 1996; Bryson, 1987; Kidd, 1990; MacKinnon, 1987; Messner, 1992; Whitson, 1990). Curry (1991) qualitatively assessed the language and culture within male locker rooms, and found statements consistent with what would exist within a rape culture. There are

perhaps two additional factors that are specific to the collegiate male athlete's experience that are not accounted for in the peer group model presented above: lack of accountability and a struggle for autonomy. Issues of power, dominance, and privilege intertwine in the daily life of a high profile collegiate athlete. On one hand, the athlete is often submissive to the orders of the coaching staff and older players on the team. Sport sociologists have noted that athletes exist in a life of "structured inequality" in which they are dependent on their coaches for playing time and exposure. This struggle for social placement has been suggested to be a contributing factor to male athletes' sexual aggression against women off the field (Crosset, 1996). On the other hand, much of the general student body, some school administrators and staff, and numerous people affiliated with the university often treat athletes with more favor than non-athlete students, which serves as a constant reminder that the athlete is in a position of power and acquisition. It is possible that a athletes' struggle for autonomy coupled with a heightened status on the college campus may play a role in some athletes' violence against women.

Research with college student athletes seems to be taking a similar path as research on fraternities. There is rich qualitative evidence that the male sports culture is a rape supportive environment (Messner, 1992; Curry, 1991; Nelson, 1994). However, there have been equivocal quantitative findings related to collegiate athletic involvement and sexual aggression. Despite some research supporting a connection between participation in collegiate sport and rape perpetration, the specific factors that contribute to sexual aggression remain undetermined (Koss & Cleveland, 1996). In fact, this lack of specific evidence has created quite a debate among researchers and the general public as to how or why student athletes may have a higher propensity to rape women. Some

claim that athletes are scrutinized more because of their notoriety, which creates a distorted perception that athletes are assaulting women at a higher rate than the general population (Dershowitz, 1994). However, members of the press have pointed out that athletic teams foster a sense of elitism, disrespect for women, and physical domination over others – which all can lead to a supportive environment for sexual aggression (Eskenazi, 1990). It turns out that both perspectives are probably accurate. As Crosset et al. (1996) stated, "The press has overstated the extent of the problem of athletes and violence against women, but evidence nonetheless suggests an association between athletic involvement and violence against women" (p.164).

Studies have found evidence to support both assertions (Crosset, Benedict, & McDonald, 1995; Koss & Gaines, 1993). In their study on the prediction of sexual aggression by alcohol use, athletic participation, and fraternity affiliation, Koss & Gaines (1993) found that the strongest predictor of self-reported sexual aggression in a sample of 530 male undergraduates, was drinking intensity, followed by nicotine use, hostility toward women, and athletic involvement. No effect was found for fraternity affiliation, which might be accounted for by the low sample size of fraternity members. For example, nicotine use contributed almost twice as much Beta weight power to the prediction of sexual aggression as athletic involvement. However, it must be noted that athletic involvement included a variety of levels of sports participation. Spectatorship, informal participation (e.g. pick-up games), club sports participation, and formal sports participation (i.e. varsity intercollegiate athletics) were all included in the variable athletic involvement. When this was broken down into specific components, formal

sports participation was more strongly associated with sexual aggression than other forms of athletic involvement.

Crosset et al. (1995) followed up the work of Koss & Gaines by reviewing campus judicial records of sexual assaults on 30 campuses. Varsity athletes were found to be over-represented as reported perpetrators of simple sexual assault (one perpetrator as opposed to a group perpetration). For the combined three years that the judicial files encompassed, male student athletes accounted for 3.3% of the total male student population, but were 19% of the reported perpetrators. The authors note that caution must be taken when interpreting these results, as sample sizes were low (perpetrators n = 69), and the action of women's reporting a sexual assault to campus police is not yet fully understood. The notoriety of a student athlete may either encourage *or* discourage a woman's decision to report the incident to campus police. The authors note that these findings "do *not* support the contention that athletes' violence against women only appears to be a problem because athletes are being targeted by the media" (Crosset et al., 1996, p.175). However, the media may still play a large role in the perceived notoriety of an athlete, which may or may not affect a woman's reporting of the incident to campus police.

The emphasis in current research has been to determine whether it is simply participation in varsity college sports that is related to violence against women, or whether violence is the result of behavior indirectly related to sport (e.g. hostile attitudes toward women, peer group support for violence) (Crosset et al., 1996). Part of the debate about whether or not athletes indeed have a higher rate of sexual assault is possibly due to the lack of specificity about what components of athletes' experiences lead to sexual

assault. The direct relationship of sport participation to sexual aggression is blurred with additional factors that need investigation (Crosset et al., 1996). A variety of strategies have been suggested and used to distinguish between groups on campus that may have a higher or lower propensity to sexual assault. One suggestion has been to label athletic teams based on college student perceptions of them as "high-risk" or "low-risk", with the recent finding that teams perceived as "high-risk" actually do seem to have a higher rate of sexual assault (Humphrey & Kahn, 2000).

One of the strategies used to specify a particular component of the athletic peer group experience has been to group sports according to whether they are contact or non-contact. Contact sports, which involve players' physical contact with one another, are sometimes assumed to be more fostering of aggressive behavior, and therefore, sexual assault (Caron et al., 1997). One study has shown that collegiate male athletes on competitive teams that also happen to be contact sports (e.g. football, hockey) are less egalitarian in their views toward women's roles than their peers who are part of non-contact sports (e.g. track and field, swimming, golf) (Caron et al., 1985). However, a specific connection of participation in contact sports with sexual aggression or responsiveness to sexual assault prevention education has not yet been supported in the research (Koss & Cleveland, 1996).

It has been suggested that it is not just whether a man participates in sports (or even contact sports), but that something else within the athlete's experience might contribute to their increased likelihood to sexually aggress (Benedict, 1998; Koss & Cleveland, 1996). Researchers have reduced the variable of sports participation into various types of sport participation (e.g. contact/non-contact, club sports, varsity sports),

but very few have gone the step further to investigate what exactly about the athlete's experience – not just the level of sport played – has a role in possible sexual aggression. Perhaps it is not just simply the type of sports participation, but rather a combination of specific athlete characteristics or behaviors associated with sport participation and the team "type" that are associated with increased sexual aggression toward women.

The only study to date that has looked at additional sport-specific individual factors is Caron et al (1997). Using the Sport Orientation Questionnaire (Gill & Deeter, 1988), they measured not just type of sport participation, but also level of competitiveness, win orientation, and goal orientation. Their study is the most recent to distinguish between level of sports involvement (high school v. college), and compare level of involvement to specific athlete characteristics (e.g. competitiveness). A significant positive correlation was found between athletic participation in high school and competitiveness, but no significant correlations were found between athletic participation and win orientation or goal orientation. However, the relationships between sport participation in *college* and scores on all three of the Sport Orientation Questionnaire's subscales were positively significant, indicating that intercollegiate athletes have more extreme levels of sport-specific personality characteristics (e.g. competitiveness).

It is important to view these results in consideration of how such athlete-specific traits may play into abusive behaviors toward women (e.g. sexual assault). Many athletes are taught to use force to settle a conflict or problem (Caron et al., 1997), and competitiveness is necessary to win over an opponent. Winning is known to be the most important part of competition for most athletes (Kang et al., 1990; Toufexis, 1990) and

athletes learn to use their bodies as a "tool, machine, or even a weapon" in order to "defeat the objectified opponent" (Messner, 1987, p.59). When men see women as an opponent, or see sex as an accomplishment or competition, such views *at most* may seriously increase a man's ability to behave in sexually assaultive ways toward women. *At least*, such views may impede a man's likelihood of understanding issues related to sexual assault against women, especially if such aggressive behaviors are considered normative in the athletic culture in which he exists.

Although the above findings are helpful in determining the intra-individual factors involved in an athlete's sexual aggression, there has been no empirical research on the group factors that may play a role in an athlete's decision to sexually aggress or prevent a teammate from sexually aggressing. Although most of the qualitative accounts of the male athlete culture describe the strength with which the team holds together and enforces uniform behavior among its members, empirical studies have only measured intra-individual characteristics of each player (Crosset et al., 1996). It would be helpful to measure to what extent the team component of an athlete's collegiate sport experience has on his willingness to take part in sexually aggressive activities or to intervene with teammates who are doing something sexual to a woman who is not willingly participating.

Rape Prevention Education

Although researchers have not identified the specific causal link between collegiate male sport culture and sexual aggression, enough evidence of a prevalence of sexual assault by athletes has been found to support the need for prevention education among student

athletes (Crosset et al., 1996; Crosset et al., 1995; Koss & Cleveland, 1996; Koss & Gaines, 1993). There are a few rape and dating violence prevention programs in the country that have targeted college student athletes (Parrot, 1994; Katz, 1995). These programs will be discussed in more detail in later sections, as first a discussion of the rationale and findings related to sexual assault prevention education is necessary. Although most prevention education programs have not focused on collegiate athletes, there are findings within the field that can be used in the design of effective programs with collegiate athletes.

Over the past twenty-five years there has been an increasing number of studies and theoretical papers focusing on rape and its prevention. A variety of disciplines, including social work, psychology, criminology, and sociology have looked at the issue of rape prevention through different lenses of analysis. Traditionally, researchers and theorists have focused the prevention of sexual assault on either individual "risk-factors" (a man's poor impulse control, or a woman's 'provocative' attire), or specific situational factors (drinking and dark alleys). A sample of prevention program strategies has included: increased campus lighting, self-defense training, educational presentations for high school and college students, media campaigns, and role-playing. In their 1987 review of rape prevention strategies, Fischoff, Furby, and Morgan found a total of 1,140 possible strategies.

Female-focused programs. In the last ten years, in response to the findings that college women are more at risk for being sexually assaulted than any other age group (Koss, 1987), there has been an increase in the number of programs that target female college students. Many colleges have attempted to educate women about the risks

associated with sexual assault and "protective measures" they can take to increase their safety. Unfortunately, most colleges lack programs aimed at men and their own role in campus sexual assault. Despite some philosophical support of programs targeting females (Breitenbecher & Scarce, 1999; Hanson & Gidycz, 1993; Yeater & O'Donohue, 1999) there has been a sea of debate surrounding the ethical underpinnings of these programs as well as doubt as to their ultimate effectiveness in preventing rape. A wide number of researchers and theorists have been involved in the discourse around the efficacy of female-focused interventions (Katz, 1995; Funk,1993; Berkowitz,1994; Lee,1987; Schmidt & Peter,1996; Matabuti,1993; Lonsway et al.,1998; Foubert & Marriot,1996; Ring & Kilmartin,1992; Schewe & O'Donohue,1993 and 1996; Dworkin,1993). These writers have all contended that when we limit intervention programs to women and girls, and teach them to behave in "rape appropriate" ways, we are sending the message that they can prevent a rape, and that they themselves are in control of whether they are raped or not. As Feltey et al. (1991) put it, "When only females are educated and informed, they are ultimately being held responsible for their own victimization." Lonsway (1996) has called such "prevention" efforts more of a deterrent approach, rather than actual prevention:

> Because men who rape select potential victims on the basis of vulnerability (Brownmiller, 1975), it makes sense that a deterred attempt will only result in the victimization of another, more vulnerable individual. Rape deterrence strategies can therefore only protect individual women (albeit with no guarantees), but can never reduce the vulnerability of women as a group (p.232)

Schewe & O'Donohue (1996) reason that:

> Not only are these forms of "prevention" unacceptable on the basis of a severe restriction of basic human rights, but also these tactics

> will never be completely successful. Despite the fact that women take these and other precautions, the fact remains that no one can be constantly and perfectly vigilant. Thus, no matter how well trained potential victims become in avoidance, escape, and physical self-defense, they will be vulnerable to rape to the extent that there are men who will attempt to commit acts of sexual violence (p.456)

While such programs give women the responsibility for stopping rape, they also ignore the fact that violence against women concerns men as well as women. Katz (1995), who has developed an extensive violence prevention program for male collegiate athletes, considers this lack of male inclusion one of the main factors involved with violence against women. He states, "Calling this violence a "women's issue"...is in fact part of the problem. Why? It sends a signal to guys that it is not our concern: Why would a man concern himself with *women's* issues?" (p.163)

Mixed-sex programs. Katz, as well as a good number of other researchers and activists (Berkowitz,1994; Dworkin,1984; Foubert & Marriot,1996; Funk,1993; Lee,1987; Lonsway,1998; Matabuti,1993; Ring & Kilmartin,1992; Schewe & O'Donohue,1993 and 1996; Schmidt & Peter,1996) has started approaching the issue of sexual violence prevention from a male inclusionary perspective. These researchers have acknowledged the fact that when a woman is raped it affects men as individuals and as a whole, and there is sufficient reason for men to become involved in the movement to end rape. As an effort to include males in the prevention of rape, mixed-sex programs as well as male-focused programs have been developed and some evaluated over the past fifteen years.

Operating on the assumption that both males and females will benefit from a change in rape-supportive attitudes, many programs have been set up that target a mixed-

sex audience, usually in a classroom setting. This notion of mutual benefit has been a topic of theoretical discussion within the literature for years (Berkowitz, 1994), and has more recently been applied to the study of rape prevention education.

A common format for mixed-sex interventions has been a lecture-based presentation with or without the use of brochures and efforts to reduce rape myth adherence. One of the most widely used techniques in rape prevention programs is the challenging of adherence to rape myths, as well as a measure of a person's acceptance of interpersonal violence and hostility toward women. Most mixed-sex programs that entail some form of dispelling rape myths report positive short-term outcomes among women and occasionally some men. However, men in general are more resistant to rape prevention programs, adhere more strongly to rape myths than do women, and support sexually coercive behavior (Buckley & Masters, 1992; Feltey, Ainslie, & Geib, 1991; Heppner, Humphrey, Hillenbrand-Gunn & DeBord, 1995; Lenihan, Rawlins, Eberly, 1992; Proto-Campise et al., 1998). So while women leave the program with a significant amount of positive attitude change, men do not always have the same magnitude of attitude change, and may even become *more* resistant to attitude change (Berg,1993; Borden, Karr, & Caldwell-Colbert,1988; Krulewitz & Kahn,1983; Lenihan et al., 1992; Proto-Campise,1998) . In addition, it has been shown through follow-up surveys that men have a higher "rebounding" rate, or return to original ideals than women after an intervention (Heppner et al., 1995). This has consistently been found in the literature for over thirty years (Borden et al., 1988; Lonsway, 1996).

One way of teasing apart the gender differences has been to differentiate between rape-specific attitudes and more general, contextual level variables, such as sex role

stereotyping (Fonow et al., 1992). Rape specific attitudes have mainly been measured by the rape myth acceptance scale developed by Burt in 1980, or a variation of the scale into some related form. Contextual-level variables have included measurement of attitudes on a variety of social and interpersonal beliefs (e.g. sex role stereotyping, hostility toward women, and acceptance of interpersonal violence). It has been widely supported in the literature that adherence to contextual-level variables is strongly related to adherence to rape myths and more rape supportive attitudes (Fonow et al., 1992). However, the majority of evaluated mixed-sex programs that report some reduction of rape-supportive attitudes also have found little or no significant change in contextual-level attitudes for both males as well as females (Dallager & Rosen, 1993; Fonow et al., 1992; Lonsway, 1996). Because contextual-level variables make up the day-to-day worldview of an individual, it has been suggested that only programs that include an in-depth discussion of societal norms and stereotypes can accomplish this level of attitude change (Fonow et al., 1992; Lonsway, 1996).

The gender gap that exists in males' and females' understanding and acceptance of rape-supportive attitudes has been well documented (Proto-Campise,1998), and researchers are now beginning to acknowledge that rape prevention education needs to take into account the specific needs of males and females (Fonow et al., 1992). However, this shift has been slow in coming. The majority of programs still have outcomes that reflect this gender difference in attitudes, and researchers have continuously acknowledged that it is a problem, yet have rarely gone beyond a mention to create a conducive solution.

Male-focused programs. A number of strategies have been implemented to tap into the complex attitude changes required of males. The recent emergence of all-male (or male-focused) programs has brought some insight into more effective strategies for attitude change with males. As a whole, male-focused programs are more intense and interactive than mixed-sex or all-female programs, with the intent of helping men recognize and understand the implications rape has on themselves and the loved ones in their lives. Researchers are now starting to recommend the use of all-male programs mainly because their interactive and intense atmosphere affords the focus and attention on male-specific culture and constructs (sex roles, masculinization) that may promote significant behavioral change (Yeater & O'Donohue, 1999).

One factor that seems to be stressed more than others in male-focused programs is generation of empathy for a victim of sexual assault. Lonsway (1996) notes that "because empathy leads to more situational attributions for the behavior of others, it is reasonable to suggest that individuals with more empathy for victims will be less likely to attribute rape to personal characteristics such as victim appearance or behavior, and more likely to blame the man or society for the attack" (p.249). Empathizing with the victim and women's constant threat of rape also helps men understand that any woman in their lives may have been or may be in the future a victim of rape.

In her review of acquaintance rape education programs, Lonsway (1996) found that three programs for men have reported desirable attitude change with a strategy of empathy induction (Gilbert et al, 1991; Gray et al, 1990; Lee, 1987), whereas another two have not (Berg, 1993; Ellis et al, 1992). The reason for this difference is not very clear, since both sets of programs used similar techniques for inducing empathy. All of these

programs used empathy inducing techniques that included having the group of male participants either listen to, read about, or watch a video of another man or boy tell his story and experience of being a victim of sexual assault. This strategy of "seeing oneself as a potential victim" was used in these programs to induce empathy from the participants, and conclusively lead to higher sensitivity to issues around rape and less rape myth acceptance. However, only the first three programs (Gilbert et al, 1991; Gray et al, 1990; and Lee, 1987) reported a positive outcome and increase in empathy for rape victims, whereas the other two programs (Berg, 1993; Ellis et al, 1992) reported no increase in empathy. In fact, Berg et al (1993) had divided the intervention into two groups of men: one that heard a woman's story of being assaulted, and another that heard a man's story of being assaulted. Both groups reported no significant change in victim empathy, while the group that heard the woman's story actually reported a *greater* likelihood of sexual aggression than before hearing the story.

Berg (1993) and Lonsway (1996) have both hypothesized as to why men may have trouble at first with victim empathy. One idea is that since acquaintance rape is largely seen as a crime in which women are the victims, men automatically assume the role of observer or aggressor (Berg,1993). Programs that are more intense and involve personal interaction may allow men the freedom to work out feelings of anxiety and resistance to prevention programs in general.

This need for increased intensity in education programs involving men is something that has been voiced by many researchers. Borden et al. (1988), after unsuccessful efforts at changing attitudes through lecture presentations, argued for "new, more dynamic, vivid interactive program formats to enhance the desired effects of

consciousness raising, attitude change, and empathy toward rape" (p.135). This suggestion, coupled with the finding that men do not easily empathize with rape, may account for the fact that there is so much resistance and lack of attitude change among men.

A common strategy for enhancing intensity is interactive participation by the participants. Programs that include some form of participant interaction generally report outcomes with desirable attitude change (Lonsway, 1996). Interactive program techniques may entail small discussion groups, role-playing (Gilbert et al., 1991; Gray et al., 1990; Ring & Kilmartin, 1992), and even interactive dramatic performances (Mann et al, 1988). The importance of such interactive participation in programs that involve changing men's attitudes, is just now being fully understood. For example, a program evaluated by Gilbert, Heesacker, & Gannon (1991) presented a combination of lecture-based information about rape as well as empathy induction techniques to 75 undergraduate men. Male participants reported feeling more comfortable with the presented lecture material only after partaking in the discussion group. Lonsway (1996) notes that "such interaction apparently played an important role in addressing men's concerns, thereby easing their discomfort" (p.248). This "discomfort" may be part of the resistance seen from men to empathy-inducing strategies, as well as prevention programs in general. Since most interventions are short-term and are held in a mixed-sex classroom setting, men may be dealing with a wide range of emotions that are brought up by the setting of the program itself. Theorists like Funk (1993) have noted how intense feelings of guilt often encompass men when the subject of rape is addressed. This guilt is uncomfortable, and to avoid this discomfort, men often choose to resist what messages

are causing their feelings of guilt. Discussion groups and more interaction among audience members may help to override men's initial guilt that provokes resistance to sexual assault prevention programs.

Another benefit of all-male groups is that in some ways they replicate the all-male groups in which rape-prone male bonding occurs. Especially in relation to student athletes, who exist as a unified group (i.e. team) through most of their years in college, this all-male group structure is a place to more appropriately address many of the activities than male peer groups engage in and feelings that men may have that are conducive to a rape prone sub-culture. Yet, only one program targeting male collegiate athletes has discussed sexual violence against women in the context of peer group influence, and this program has not yet evaluated its effectiveness at attitude or behavior change (Katz, 1995).

Programs targeting collegiate athletes. There are a few rape and dating violence prevention programs in the country that work with male collegiate athletes. A few have been described in the literature, yet none of those published have been formally evaluated. One prevention and education program was designed for and used with student athletes at Cornell University in 1990. Both the men's rowing team and football team participated in the workshop, the goals of which were to "educate students about the risks and consequences of committing sexual assault, the behaviors that can lead to rape, and the consequences of these acts" (Parrot et al., 1994, p.180). The program also attempted to "challenge attitudes that demean or objectify women and the messages and norms that condone and perpetuate a rape-prone environment" (Parrot et al., 1994, p.180).

According to the authors, this program was well received by both the players and the athletic department, and was given funding to continue in future years with certain teams. Although the authors were able to suggest certain steps to take in the development and implementation of a program with collegiate athletes, actual attitude or knowledge change among the athletes was not formally evaluated. In addition, the narrow scope of the program (only rowing and football took part in the program) disallowed any exploration of sport-specific factors that may play a role in the effectiveness of such a program (e.g. contact or non-contact sport, team influence).

Katz and his colleagues (1995) have designed and implemented perhaps the most extensive sexual assault education program with male student athletes. The Mentors in Violence Prevention Project (MVP) trains student athletes (both male and female) to work on campus to prevent rape, battering, sexual harassment, and other forms of violence against women (Northeastern University Student Handbook, 1999).

The MVP program is focused on the underlying assumption that the "sociocultural construction of manhood is central to the problem of men's violence against women, as well as the basis of potential sources of prevention" (Katz, 1995, p.163). For the men's program, two male facilitators go into the locker rooms of men's college teams and do a series of workshops with each team. They work in an all-male environment and incorporate exercises that induce empathy, increase interaction among the team members, and directly address issues of masculinity, male peer groups, and athletes' celebrity role and power on the college campus. One of the more innovative characteristics of the MVP program is its focus on the influence that the team atmosphere has on collegiate athletes' decision-making. Specifically, MVP directly discusses the

"bystander effect" that occurs when one or more teammates socially misbehave in group settings (e.g. a party) and other teammates, although not directly participating in the behavior (e.g. raping the woman), stand to the side and watch, without intervening to stop the other teammates' actions. Although many of the men who are bystanders may be uncomfortable with the behaviors of their teammates, the social pressure to conform to the group (i.e. team), and not deviate from the group norm is especially strong in a team environment that's purpose is to achieve the goal of athletic success (Hackman, 1976).

Berkowitz (1994) has found evidence that many men feel uncomfortable when other men brag about their sexual exploits or comment on women's bodies in sexually suggestive ways. These men have been labeled as belonging to a "silent majority" of men who "keep their discomfort to themselves rather than express disagreement or intervene in an environment which they perceive as unsympathetic" or as threatening their status in the group itself. Although not directly participating in the behavior, lack of intervention is a serious problem that allows the behavior to continue without question. The MVP Program talks with men about their bystander role in such situations, and helps them work on ways in which they can intervene, as well as the consequences of such intervention.

Although Katz et al. (1995) report "success" through the acceptance of their program and the use of the *Playbook*, a manual of activities used in the program, they have not yet published a formal evaluation of attitude or knowledge change. Even more striking is the fact that the MVP program is the only published program that directly targets the peer-group component of the male collegiate athlete culture, yet this component, to date, has gone without evaluation.

Group-Level Change via Individual Change

Considering how much peer support is involved in the male athletic culture, it is necessary to be familiar with and use the various theories pertaining to group-level change via the individual person. The following section reviews some of the work within the social psychological field of minority dissent and how this may affect group norms of behavior. According to this literature, there are two ways that a training such as the one evaluated in the current study can help create group-level change: 1) programs targeting collegiate athletes can help individuals to withstand group pressure and be minority dissenters, and 2) the training can help minority dissenters feel confident enough to stand up to group pressure and gradually change group norms of behavior. Both components will be discussed in the following section, starting with a discussion about the group dynamics through which norms and social pressure occur on a team. Understanding these dynamics will help clarify how a group can be influenced by one or more individuals within that group, which will be discussed later in this section.

Group pressure and norms of behavior. Athletic teams are especially prone to intense levels of group (i.e. peer) pressure, mainly because of their structural make-up and purpose. The main purpose of a team is to attain the goal of being successful against opponents in the game of sport. As Hackman (1976) notes, one of the conditions for which a group often exerts more social pressure on its members is to produce uniformity for the purpose of attaining a common goal. Hackman (1976) explains, "it may be useful for group members to hold similar beliefs about the external environment, especially if the group must respond as a unit to that environment" (pg. 1473). Collegiate sports

Group-Level Change via Individual Change

Considering how much peer support is involved in the male athletic culture, it is necessary to be familiar with and use the various theories pertaining to group-level change via the individual person. The following section reviews some of the work within the social psychological field of minority dissent and how this may affect group norms of behavior. According to this literature, there are two ways that a training such as the one evaluated in the current study can help create group-level change: 1) programs targeting collegiate athletes can help individuals to withstand group pressure and be minority dissenters, and 2) the training can help minority dissenters feel confident enough to stand up to group pressure and gradually change group norms of behavior. Both components will be discussed in the following section, starting with a discussion about the group dynamics through which norms and social pressure occur on a team. Understanding these dynamics will help clarify how a group can be influenced by one or more individuals within that group, which will be discussed later in this section.

Group pressure and norms of behavior. Athletic teams are especially prone to intense levels of group (i.e. peer) pressure, mainly because of their structural make-up and purpose. The main purpose of a team is to attain the goal of being successful against opponents in the game of sport. As Hackman (1976) notes, one of the conditions for which a group often exerts more social pressure on its members is to produce uniformity for the purpose of attaining a common goal. Hackman (1976) explains, "it may be useful for group members to hold similar beliefs about the external environment, especially if the group must respond as a unit to that environment" (pg. 1473). Collegiate sports

teams eat meals, travel, room, and socialize with each other throughout the calendar year, essentially sharing both the sports world, as well as their external social environment. Outside of their task of playing a sport, teams often have a vested interest in keeping one another uniform and acting as a whole to preserve the integrity of the team. Hackman (1976, pg. 1474) again explains that "groups may ... seek uniformity for purely "maintenance" reasons; that is, keeping the group intact and functioning as a unit, independent of task-related activities. Too much individualistic or idiosyncratic behavior on the part of a few members, for example, can threaten the very survival of the group." One of the ways that groups attain and maintain uniformity is by establishing group norms of behavior and attitudes, with which members of the group are expected to follow, or risk exclusion from the group (Hackman, 1976; Moskovici, 1980).

Changing group norms: the role of the minority dissenting opinion. Despite the lack of independence among group members for fear of group exclusion (Hackman, 1976; Moskovici, 1980), it is possible for a member of a group to dissent from the majority opinion and change group norms. This person takes the role of a minority dissenter, or one who holds a minority dissenting opinion. One of the main factors that determines whether or not a member of a group will comply with group norms is whether or not the behavior expected by the norm is congruent with the personal attitudes and beliefs of the individual group members (Hackman, 1976). This is perhaps the component of group norms relating to behavior change that is most relevant to intervention with male student athletes. It is possible that by changing or enforcing a team member's attitudes or beliefs about sexual assault issues, that he would have the tools needed to deviate from the group norm. In doing so, he would be one step closer to

providing the minority dissenting opinion that is the first step to group-level change (Nemeth et al., 1988).

It has been shown that exposing a group that holds a majority viewpoint to a person who is willing to offer a dissenting opinion is a very powerful mechanism by which to increase the chances that other group members will develop independent judgments, rather than relying on group norms (Nemeth et al., 1988). Although people sometimes assume minority opinions are incorrect, and therefore dismissed, perseverance and consistency by the minority person increases the chances that the majority group takes the minority viewpoint seriously and considers alternate opinions (e.g. "How can that person be wrong, and yet so sure of themselves?"). The majority group is "stimulated to reappraise the entire situation, which involves a consideration of numerous alternatives, one of which is the position proposed by the majority" (Nemeth, 1986, p. 26). Essentially, it is not whether or not the minority opinion is correct, but rather simply that he or she spoke up against the majority view, resulting in the majority opinion being opened to questioning from all sides. As Nemeth (1986, p. 26), explains, "as such, the thought processes [of the majority group] are marked by divergence and hence, the potential for detecting novel solutions or decisions."

This divergence within the group is what contributes to individual group members' level of independence and ability to withdraw from group normative behavior (Nemeth et al., 1988). Individuals are faced with confrontation and a divergent viewpoint, which "makes each individual a better problem solver or decision maker by stimulating him or her to examine and reexamine premises" (Nemeth, 1986 p. 30). Nemeth (1986, p. 30) again explains that "the presence of dissenting minority views and

the expression of those views thus aid the consideration of alternatives at a group level." Hence, although educational programs like the one evaluated for this study function at changing individuals' attitudes and behaviors, individuals are perfectly capable of creating group-level change within their social group (i.e. team).

As a last point, it has been found that "ingroup" minorities (e.g. teammates) are more effective than "outgroup" persons (e.g. non-teammates or prevention program facilitators) at altering group normative behavior or attitudes (Clark & Maas, 1988; Nemeth, 1995; Volpato et al., 1990). This underscores the importance that trainings involving athletes work to increase individual team member's propensity to act with a minority dissenting opinion when involved in a situation that contradicts their own personal judgments. To increase the chances that an individual can actually change group norms of behavior, educational programs such as the one evaluated for this study should be designed to help individuals gain the knowledge and tools necessary to hold a consistent minority dissenting opinion when faced with group normative pressure.

Only one sexual assault prevention program to date emphasizes the importance of minority dissent in the prevention of male sexual violence, and even so, the focus is on fraternity groups (Mahlstedt & Jacobson, unpublished manuscript 2000). In the Fraternity Violence Education Project, Mahlstedt & Jacobson (unpublished manuscript, 2000) explain that "the goal [of educating men to become minority dissenters] is that they become a minority group that creates tension in the larger fraternity culture, provide an alternative model, will be present at the parties to influence the climate so that it will be a safe one for women, and intervene when necessary" (p. 1). The pressure that minority

groups and individuals exert on the group norms of a rape-supportive culture is exactly what changes the norms of that culture over time.

Conclusion

Considering that there is now some evidence that college sport participation may have some connection to increased sexual aggression (Crosset, 1996), it is useful to see if programs aimed at changing collegiate athletes' attitudes and knowledge about sexual assault are making any kind of impact. The programs that have been implemented with athletes seem to be of good quality and philosophy and it is important to start investigating the effectiveness of such potentially groundbreaking programs. As with the numerous prevention and education programs targeting the general college student body, programs targeting student athletes need to be evaluated for their usefulness so that efforts at improvement can be made and successful formats passed on to others. Perhaps it is even more important to explore programs targeting athletes, as student athletes' schedules are extremely pressed for time, and more effective workshops will undoubtedly have more support from athletic department administrators and coaches.

There are certain factors associated with an individual's change in attitudes or knowledge due to an intervention that have been evaluated within the general rape prevention literature. For example, acceptance of interpersonal violence and hostility toward women are two of the factors most often associated with a person's level of attitude or knowledge change. However, because student athletes have additional factors that may play a role in their level of sexual aggression (e.g. discouragement from identifying with anything considered "feminine" – extreme sex role socialization, high

need for achieving a goal or winning a competition) it is necessary to explore whether these additional factors also play a role in their attitude and knowledge change after participation in an educational intervention. Although they have not been as thoroughly investigated, many of these variables have been outlined above, in addition to a few that have been suggested by researchers as having an impact (e.g. contact versus non-contact sport participation).

One of the most salient issues in working with a group culture such as collegiate athletes is how important it is to understand and acknowledge if intervention targeting a group-level change in behavior is possible. Considering the literature documenting the influence peer support has on individual behavior (Hackman, 1976), it is especially important to attempt change at the group, as well as the individual level. The current program that specifically targeted collegiate athletes was uniquely equipped with the exercises and environment that would make group change possible. One of the program's goals was to give men the tools they need to confront peer pressure and act as minority dissenters, which is an essential component of any group-level effects.

Hypotheses

The current study evaluated attitude and knowledge change in male student athletes after they had taken part in a sexual assault prevention and education program at a large mid-western university. The evaluation addressed the following research hypotheses:

1. Involvement in this program will decrease men's reports of their rape myth acceptance and likelihood of sexually aggressing.
2. Involvement in this program will increase men's reports of their likelihood of confronting a situation in which there is sexual aggression.

Effectiveness of the workshop (defined as significant positive change on rape myth acceptance, likelihood of sexually aggressing, and likelihood of confronting) is expected to be predicted by a number of men's prior attitudes and experiences. Specifically, the workshop is expected to be less effective for those men who report pre-workshop:

3. Higher goal orientation, win orientation, and competitiveness
4. More extreme levels of prior sexual aggression
5. Higher hostility toward women
6. Higher sex role stereotyping
7. Higher acceptance of interpersonal violence
8. Higher acceptance of general violence
9. Involvement in contact sports
10. More years participated in intercollegiate sports

Chapter 2

METHOD

Sample

The workshop that was evaluated targeted all male student athletes at a large mid-western university who at the time were not members of the freshman academic class. Ten program sessions were conducted, each of which was an hour and a half in duration. Approximately 180 people attended the program, and 150 evaluation packets were collected. Power analyses indicated that a minimum sample size of 125 would give power of .80 at $p<.05$ for all analyses used. Power analyses were conducted using PASS: Power Analysis and Sample Size (Version 6.0) Kaysville, UT: NCSS. More information about the power required for each analysis is available in the statistical analysis section at the end of this chapter.

The Program

Out of Bounds: An Anti—Violence Workshop for Student Athletes at MSU

The workshop was mandated by the Provost of the University to provide student athletes with education about sexual assault, sexual harassment, and relationship violence. In addition to sexual assault, other topics of abuse were added to the training content, to capitalize on the opportunity of having a training of this nature. A planning committee of campus stakeholders was formed to develop and implement the trainings with the student athletes. All of the people on the planning committee had multiple years

of experience in and/or knowledge about relationship violence education and prevention. Members included the following: representatives from the campus sexual assault counseling and crisis center (each with over fifteen years of experience), the director of the campus domestic violence shelter (over fifteen years of experience), two male outreach coordinators from the campus shelter and counseling program (over ten and four years of experience, respectively), three campus police officers (about four years of experience each), a representative from the campus women's resource center (about seven years of experience), two members of the student athlete support services (non-athletic department), one program evaluator (author of this paper), as well as additional people involved with the facilitation of the workshops.

Each workshop session was approximately one and a half hours in length, single-sex (all men). Having an all-male audience followed on the suggestion of previous researchers that a male majority environment lends for more open, safe, and honest discussion about the sensitive topic of sexual assault (e.g. Katz, 1995). Often male participants in mixed-sex workshops feel targeted by just the presence of women in the audience and the presentation of the issue of sexual assault. By keeping the participants in a single-sex environment, the chances for men being defensive and unwilling to participate due to other women athletes' presence was hopefully lowered. Facilitators were men and women of varying ethnicities, and care was taken to ensure that all sessions included male facilitators.

The workshop activities were developed by using a combination of reports from other college programs working with athletes, and the various programming experience of the members of the planning committee. A pilot workshop was held with all freshman

student athletes, and feedback from the evaluation of that session was also used to revise certain activities and program format. The current program's workshops were held in an auditorium with tables and movable chairs, which made mobility of participants for activities easier than in most auditorium settings. The auditorium was also used as a study hall and team meeting room for the athletes on a regular basis, and therefore was known to the athletes as "their territory." It was the desire of the planning committee to hold the program in a setting that was well known to the athletes, to increase the chances of the program discussion being seen as something that mattered in their lives as an athlete, rather than as a separate and therefore forgettable event.

The main goal of this workshop was to increase education about relationship violence, and help men learn ways to intervene with teammates or friends if they thought something inappropriate was occurring. The planning committee decided unanimously that a lack of "freely given consent" was the underlying common thread between all forms of intimate violence. The concept of "freely given consent" was understood by the facilitators as incorporating the following main points:

1. Consent is based on choice
2. Consent is active, not passive
3. Consent is possible only when there is equal power
4. Giving in because of fear is not consent
5. Going along with something because of wanting to fit in with the group, being deceived or feeling bad, is not consent
6. If you can't say "no" comfortably, then "yes" has no meaning
7. If you are unwilling to accept a "no," then "yes" has no meaning (Vanburen-Hay, 1999)

As such, the whole framework of the presentation was centered on the concept of consent, and each of the points above were explained with examples to the audience at various times during the program.

At the beginning of the workshop, a brief introduction video was shown to the participants. The video was professionally produced for this particular group of presentations, as an effort to not only capture participants' attention from the start, but also as an explanation of the importance of their attendance at the workshop that day. The video featured a former football star from the university who later played professional football before becoming a campus police officer at the university these sessions were held. With a backdrop of contemporary music, video clips of sporting events, and newspaper clippings from past stories of athletes who were arrested or accused of committing intimate partner violence, the officer explained the special role that athletes have in their community and the importance of them taking their prestige seriously. It was explained that not only did their prestige on the college campus and in the community buy them privileges; their fame also focused the spotlight of media attention to personal wrongdoings more intensely than on other students at the university. He thanked them for coming, and urged their attention throughout the workshop.

After the video, the facilitators introduced themselves and reviewed an overhead of the five main points of the workshop:

1. Definitions
2. Consent
3. Laws
4. Choices
5. Resources

It was explained to the participants that each person in the room had the ability to make his own decisions, and every action he took as an individual was his own choice, despite how much group pressure he felt. In addition, it was emphasized that every choice has good and/or bad consequences, and that more discussion about consequences and ways to

intervene would be explained later in the program. A brief explanation of how each main point would be addressed throughout the program activities was explained by one of the facilitators.

After this initial introduction, participants raised their hands as a group to signify on what athletic team they participated. Certain workshops had more than one team present, so the planning committee felt it was important to have the players be familiar with each other enough to know that they were accounted for and not invisible to the group or the facilitators. A facilitator, at this point, explained what the purpose of this workshop was, and the importance of talking about sexual assault. They also acknowledged that some people in the room may have already been abused, either as children or adults, and that sexual abuse is not only a crime against women.

Because attendance at workshops ranged between 30-75 participants per workshop, the decision was made to incorporate interactive discussion-based activities. The first activity was the "Ball Toss," in which the participants were seated as a larger group. One of the facilitators stood on the front stage and threw a miniature soft ball to the crowd. Whoever caught the ball responded to the question "How do you know if someone wants to kiss you?" The first person gave his response and then threw it to another person in the audience who answered the same question. This process repeated for about six responses, and then the ball was thrown back to the facilitator for discussion. About three questions were asked and answered in this manner as an icebreaker and warm up for the group. This activity also encouraged participation right from the start of the workshop and sensitized the participants to the topics of sexual assault and relationship violence.

The next activity was a discussion about the myths and facts of intimate partner violence. There were a wide variety of myths and facts displayed on individual overheads, with the sexual assault myths paralleling the myths used on the pre and post-test questionnaires. For each myth, participants were asked to raise their hand signifying if they thought it was true or false. The complimentary "fact" slide was shown after the "myth" slide. The facilitator discussed each myth with individuals who brought up concerns.

The next part of the program consisted of a short video clip and discussion about consent. The video clip was a scene from the recent popular series "Party of Five," in which one of the college age female characters is involved in an attempted rape by her current boyfriend at a party. After the video, facilitators engaged the audience in a discussion about what happened in the video and whether or not she freely gave consent to have sex. This activity usually had the most interaction, as many people had opinions about the woman's behavior in the situation and whether or not drinking (which the characters were doing at the party) affected someone's ability to give or receive consent.

After the consent piece was completed, participants were presented with a short computer overhead presentation about the laws regarding criminal sexual conduct, domestic violence, and sexual harassment. Questions were taken from the group.

The last exercise was another discussion-based interactive activity that was aimed at helping men decide what their options for action were when faced with being a bystander in a situation where something sexually abusive was (or would soon be) occurring. Three scenarios were developed specifically about situations where male athletes may be involved. This activity was based on a similar, yet different exercise

created by Katz (1995), which has been used by the Mentors in Violence Prevention Project. The scenarios were real-life situations that most men have experienced, or at least known about in their families or communities. All scenarios were read from the bystander's perspective, not as a perpetrator or victim. As mentioned previously, it is essential in a workshop with student athletes to discuss the issue of being a bystander to situations that might bring up ethical and moral concerns for a person. Perhaps the most salient reason for targeting athletes for prevention/education trainings is the research documenting that persons who would not typically victimize a person by themselves are often pressured into doing so in a group situation heavily guided by male bonding and team membership (Boeringer, 1999). Asking participants to consider their opinions about what they would and possibly should do when faced with group pressure is essential to tap into this phenomenon.

For example, one of the scenarios was "You see a teammate of yours with a woman who is dancing very provocatively and appears to be really drunk. After they finish dancing, he grabs her by the hand to lead her upstairs. She doesn't seem like she is into it and appears to be having trouble standing and walking." After reading the scenario out loud, the facilitator walked participants through their thought processes if they were actually in that situation. Steps included a discussion about the following:

1. Facts of the scenario (e.g. he is your teammate, she is drunk)
2. His options (for this scenario, options usually included walking away, intervening between the two of them, taking your teammate to the side and telling him what he's doing is wrong, etc.)

3. The consequences of his decision for each of the options presented (e.g. she is not assaulted, your teammate may get upset, she may be assaulted and you witnessed it enough to be prosecuted, you may feel stupid in front of your teammates).

This exercise always opened up a lively discussion about a person's options for action when he is faced with tough, often peer influenced decisions in real life.

After the scenarios were completed, facilitators explained what campus resources were available to participants and/or anyone in their lives who may need help with any of the issues discussed in the program.

Evaluation

The evaluation consisted of a pre-test and post-test that were given matching numbers to ensure the ability to match them in the event that they became separated. One pre-test and one post-test were placed into a manila envelope, which was labeled with the same identifying number. A cover sheet on both the pre-test and post-test explained that participation in the survey was voluntary, and that all information would be kept strictly confidential. A similar cover sheet was used for both test administrations, and explained that the project was interested in learning more about students' perceptions about relationships and themselves. Prior to the start of the program, the pre-test and the post-test were placed in an envelope and set on the tables at which the participants sat for the duration of the presentation. Care was taken to ensure that there was ample space between participants to ensure confidentiality. All questionnaires were filled out in the room in which the presentation was held. As participants entered the room for the training, a facilitator at the entrance greeted them and instructed them to take a seat where

there was already an envelope and start filling out the green packet (pre-test). The remaining facilitators stood at the front of the room to ensure that no one spoke or looked at the post-test, and that each person kept his answers to himself. As soon as people were finished filling out the green packet, they placed them back into the envelope and pushed the envelope to the side until the presentation was over. The entire pre-test took each person between 15 and 20 minutes. To minimize any coercion a participant would feel to complete the test packet, no coaches or persons with athletic department authority were present in the room.

After the presentation content was completed, one of the facilitators introduced the principal investigator of the evaluation, who then explained to participants the process of completing the post-test. The evaluator attended and explained the post-test procedure at every presentation to ensure that participants were given identical information at each presentation. Participants filled out the post-test in the same fashion in which they completed the pre-test, placed it into the envelope, and dropped the envelope in a box by the door on their way out. As participants left the room, they were given a sheet with a list of resources and information about obtaining counseling, which was meant to minimize individuals' embarrassment or uneasiness at having to request such resources. The decision to hand out these sheets at the door was made to ensure that those people who opted to not complete the survey would still receive the list of resources and information. A file was created for each participant in a locked file cabinet at the university that was only accessible to the project's investigators and research assistants. No names or any other identifying information were required or collected. Only the numbers printed on the pre-test and post-test in each packet with no identifying

information were entered into the data set. Post-test completion time ranged from 10-15 minutes, and procedures for ensuring confidentiality were the same as with the pre-test conditions.

In addition to administering the pre and post-tests, the principal investigator attended each of the sessions to observe the interactions of the audience and facilitators, as well as to observe the overall tone of each presentation. As noted later in the discussion section of this paper, the researcher was able to observe the apparent receptiveness of participants to their attendance at the workshop, in addition to their overall response to the pre and post-test. The researcher was only visible to the audience at the end of the presentation, when she explained the procedures related to the completion of the post-test. Otherwise, the researcher stayed at the back of the room, far away from any of the participants to eliminate the possibility that participants felt they were being "watched."

Measurement

Ten measures were used in this study. Demographics, life experiences, and attitudinal scales related to predictor variables were included only in the pre-test packet because they were not a target for change via the workshop. Pre-test attitudinal variables included intra-individual factors that have typically been measured in rape prevention program evaluations (e.g. sex role stereotyping, hostility toward women), in addition to sport-specific factors that have not yet been measured in the context of an evaluation (e.g. competitiveness). Post-test attitudinal variables included all outcome variables that were a target for change via the workshop. Also included in the post-test were group-

utilization variables that tested whether or not group-level change was possibly achieved as a result of the workshop.

Demographics

Data was collected on the type of sport played (e.g. contact/non-contact), and number of years the student participated as an intercollegiate athlete. These measures addressed the environmental factors that may have played a role in not only a man's sexual aggression, but also his level of attitude change due to the intervention.

Contact vs. Non-Contact Sport Participation

All sports offered as intercollegiate varsity sports at the participating university that were classified as non-contact were listed in a box, and participants were asked to check the box if it contained the sport they participated in as an intercollegiate athlete. Teams classified as non-contact included: tennis, volleyball, cross country, track & field, golf, baseball, swimming, gymnastics and crew. Contact sports included: football, basketball, wrestling, soccer, and ice hockey. To ensure confidentiality, participants were not asked their specific team membership, as it would have been difficult to ensure anonymity when reporting results on a team-by-team basis.

Competitiveness, Goal Orientation, Win Orientation

Competitiveness, Goal Orientation, and Win Orientation were measured using the Sport Orientation Questionnaire (SOQ) developed by Gill & Deeter (1988). Original reliability analyses on each of the three subscales (win orientation, goal orientation, and competitiveness) indicated alpha coefficients of .72, .78, .91, respectively (Gill & Deeter, 1988). The alpha coefficient for the combined three subscales was .92. The questionnaire was developed as a "sport-specific multi-dimensional measure of

achievement orientation" (Gill & Deeter, 1988, p. 192). It captures not only an individual's motivation for achievement within the world of sports, but also a person's level of interpersonal achievement. The authors suggest that such personal qualities as competitiveness and achievement orientation may easily cross over from sports into an individual's personal life. Respondents were asked to indicate how strongly they agreed with 25 statements about winning (6 items), goal attainment (6 items), and competitiveness (13 items) on a scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). Examples of statements included on the questionnaire were: "I am a competitive person," "Losing upsets me," "I look forward to the opportunity to test my skills in competition," and "The best way to determine my ability is to set a goal and try to reach it." For the current study, reliability analyses on each of the three subscales (win orientation, goal orientation, and competitiveness) indicated alpha coefficients of .79, .72, .93, respectively. Range of corrected item-to-total correlations are listed below in Table 1. The alpha coefficient for the combined three subscales was .93. The mean scores for each of the three subscales (or the mean score of the entire scale with all three dimensions included) were utilized for analyses in this study.

Table 1

Sport Orientation Subscale Item-to-Total Correlations

	# Items in Subscale	Lowest Item-to-total Correlation	Highest Item-to-total Correlation	Coefficient Alpha
Win orientation	6	.36	.71	.79
Goal Orientation	6	.42	.57	.72
Competitiveness	13	.56	.84	.93

Attitudes Toward General Violence and Interpersonal Violence

Respondents' general attitudes toward violence, as well as their attitudes toward interpersonal violence were both measured by the Attitudes Toward Violence Scale developed by Lonsway & Fitzgerald (1995). This scale had recently been used in rape prevention evaluations, as a result of Lonsway & Fitzgerald's (1995) finding that other attitudinal scales commonly used (e.g. hostility toward women) confounded a respondent's attitudes toward violence. This scale more accurately differentiates a respondent's acceptance of general violence from his or her acceptance of interpersonal violence in a way that is not as confounded by other attitudinal variables (e.g. hostility toward women). Sample items included "Violent crimes should be punished violently," "The government should send armed soldiers to control violent university riots," "Giving mischievous children a quick slap is the best way to quickly end trouble," and "It is alright for a partner to hit the other if they are unfaithful." Respondents indicated using a scale of 1 (not at all agree) to 7 (very much agree) how much they agreed with each statement. Lonsway & Fitzgerald reported an α of .87 for the entire scale, which consists of 20 items (10 general violence, 10 interpersonal violence). Corrected item-to-total correlations for the entire 20-item scale ranged from .23 to .65. Although the questions were split equally between conceptual constructs, the original developers of the scale did not analyze or report subscale psychometrics. To explore the possibility of analyzing this scale as two separate subscales, factor analyses and reliability tests were run.

Exploratory factor analysis with varimax rotation yielded three factors. The first factor included the items measuring acceptance of violence against children, the second factor included items measuring acceptance of violence against intimate partners, and the

third factor included items measuring the acceptance of general violence. Since this scale was developed to measure two factors, including acceptance of general violence and acceptance of interpersonal violence, reliability tests were run to determine if the first two factors could be analyzed as one subscale, despite their possible separation into two factors. The alpha coefficient for the first two factors together was .88 (corrected item-to-total correlations ranged from .40 to .78). The alpha coefficient for the third factor was .77 (corrected item-to-total correlations ranged from .21 to .55). Since it was conceptually desirable to use the first two factors together as a measure of acceptance of interpersonal violence, the decision was made to use the mean score of the first two factors to create one subscale that measured acceptance of interpersonal violence. The mean score of the last factor was used to create the second subscale that measured acceptance of general violence.

Sex Role Stereotyping

Sex role stereotyping was measured using the Sex Role Stereotyping Scale developed by Burt (1980). This 9-item scale was created for the purpose of measuring the degree to which a person assigns men and women to traditional sex-specific roles. In Burt's (1980) study, Cronbach's alpha was reported as .80. Example statements included: "It is acceptable for the woman to pay for the date" and "A wife should never contradict her husband in public." Respondents indicated using a scale of 1 (not at all agree) to 7 (very much agree) how much they agreed with each statement. Three items were reverse coded, and reliability analyses indicated an alpha coefficient of .60. Corrected item-to-total correlations ranged from .16 to .43. The mean score of all nine items was used for analyses in this study.

Hostility Toward Women

Hostility toward women was measured by the Hostility Toward Women Scale, which was originally developed by Check, Malamuth, Elias, and Barton (1985), and later modified by Lonsway & Fitzgerald (1995). Coefficient alpha for this 10-item scale was reported by Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1995) as .83. A list of ten statements was used to assess a person's level of hostility toward women. Respondents indicated using a scale of 1 (not at all agree) to 7 (very much agree) how much they agreed with each statement. Examples of statements included "I believe that most women tell the truth," "I am easily angered by women," and "Sometimes women bother me just by being around." Two items were reverse coded, and the alpha coefficient for all items was .83. Corrected item-to-total correlations in this study ranged from .37 to .68. The mean score of all ten items was used for analyses in this study.

Sexual Aggression Severity

A respondent's severity of prior sexual aggression was measured by a revised 14-item version of the original 11-item version of the Sexual Experiences Survey that was developed by Koss et al. in 1985 and revised by Koss & Gaines in 1993. Internal consistency ratings for the original SES (Koss et al., 1985) were reported at .89, with test-retest agreement between 1-week apart test administrations reported to be 93%. The 1993 version includes more concise wording of items and incorporates a wider variety of sexually coercive and abusive behaviors (including not just individually coercive behaviors, but also incorporating gang rapes). For example, questions were added asking if the respondent had ever made "catcalls" (i.e. sexual harassment) to a woman or had ever stood in line to have sex with a "party girl" (i.e. gang rape). Two additional

questions were added for the current study that specifically asked about a respondent's involvement with "groupies," since these women are often prominent figures in an athlete's social life. These two questions asked how often a respondent has "had sex with a groupie" and "stood in line to have sex with a groupie." Using a 5-point scale ranging from "Never" to "Often", respondents indicated how often since they were 14 years old they had engaged in each of the listed behaviors.

Dependent Variables

Three instruments were used to measure the three dependent variables including 1) Rape Myth Acceptance, 2) Likelihood of Sexually Aggressing (i.e. Likelihood to Use Force, Likelihood to Rape, Likelihood to Use Coercion, Likelihood of Using Alcohol), and 3) Likelihood of Confronting someone in or after a sexually aggressive situation. Group (Team) Utilization was also measured at post-test, as an attempt to capture the possibility that group change (i.e. across a team) would occur after the presentation. Since the three dependent variables measured the outcome of the intervention, all of them, with the exception of the group utilization items, were measured at both pre and post-test. Group utilization, described later in this section, was measured only at post-test. For the remaining five outcome variables, scale construction was conducted independently with pre and post-test scores. These variables were measured as follows:

Rape Myth Acceptance

Rape myth acceptance was measured using the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale – Short Form (IRMA-SF), developed by Payne, Lonsway, and Fitzgerald in 1999. This scale was developed as a more accurate measure of rape myth acceptance than Burt's (1980) original Rape Myth Acceptance Scale. Coefficient alpha for the scale constructed by Lonsway & Fitzgerald (1994) was reported as .87 (corrected item-to-total correlations ranged from .34 to .65). The definition of rape myths that are measured using the IRMA-SF are an expanded version of Burt's (1980) original cultural definition of rape myths, and include multiple dimensions of rape myth acceptance. The IRMA-SF measures the extent to which a respondent adheres to rape myths, defined as "attitudes and beliefs that are generally false but are widely and persistently held, and that serve to deny and justify male sexual aggression against women," (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994, p. 134). Sample statements include "It is usually only women who dress suggestively who are raped" and "Rape happens when a man's sex drive gets out of control." Respondents indicated how much they agreed with each statement using a scale of 1 (not at all agree) to 7 (very much agree). For both pre and post-test scores, three items were reverse coded, and the mean was taken of all items on each test occasion to create a scale score. Alpha coefficient for the pre-test was .82 and .86 for the post-test. Corrected item-to-total correlations ranged from -.18 to .76 for the pre-test and from -.11 to .74 for the post-test.

Behavioral Intentions (Likelihood to Use Force, Likelihood to Rape, Likelihood to Use Coercion, Likelihood of Using Alcohol, Likelihood to Confront)

All behavioral intentions were measured as part of a questionnaire developed by Berg, Lonsway, and Fitzgerald (1999). The first two behavioral intentions, Likelihood to Use Force (LF) and Likelihood to Rape (LR), were originally developed by Briere and Malamuth (1983), and reworded to their current form by Berg et al. (1999). Two of the other behavioral intentions, Likelihood to Use Coercion (LC) and Likelihood to Confront (LCon) were originally developed by Berg et al (1999). All items measuring the first three behavioral intentions (LF, LR, LC) were included as statements within a list of various sexual behaviors and actions. The fourth variable, Likelihood of Using Alcohol (LA), was created for the current study in response to the growing number of studies that have found alcohol and/or other substance use as significant predictors of sexual aggression or sexual force among both athletes as well as non-athletes (Boeringer, 1996; Koss and Gaines, 1993; Schwartz & Nogrady, 1996).

There were a total of eleven statements, seven of which were distracter items. Respondents rated on a scale of 1 (never) to 5 (always) how often they would engage in each behavior if they could be assured that no one would know. Higher scores indicated an individual's higher self-reported likelihood of engaging in sexually coercive behaviors (Berg et al., 1999). Although previous researchers have reported each of the behavioral intentions as a separate variable, it was a possible reliability concern that each intention was measured by using only a one-item statement. For example, the construct "Likelihood to Rape" has typically been measured only by the following statement: "If you could be assured that no one would know, how often would you force a woman to

have sex when she doesn't want to?" Other researchers have just explicitly asked a man if he would rape if he was assured no one would know and he would not be punished (Boeringer, 1999). The other behavioral intention measures consisted of similar statements that capture the variety of ways that men may attempt to engage in sexual behavior with an unwilling woman (e.g. coercion, force).

An exploratory factor analysis using varimax rotation was used to determine if these items would be more valid as several indicators of a central construct of "Likelihood of Sexually Aggressing." This analysis indicated that at pre-test, all four items loaded highly on one component (.81, .76, .82, .86) and accounted for 66% of the total variance. At post-test, the same four items loaded even higher on the first component (.93, .96, .98, .90) and accounted for 89% of the total variance. Additionally, reliability tests with pre-test data indicated that the four items taken together as one scale resulted in an alpha coefficient of .82 (corrected item-to-total correlations ranging from .58 to .72), while the post-test alpha coefficient was .96 (corrected item-to-total correlations ranging from .87 to .95). Therefore, for conceptual ease of purpose, as well as psychometric clarity, the mean of the scores for each of the four behavioral intention measures (likelihood to use force for sexual acts, force for intercourse, coercion, and alcohol), was used to create a scale score measuring the construct of "likelihood of sexually aggressing."

The fifth behavioral intention measure, Likelihood to Confront, was designed by Berg et al., (1999) "to assess the level of confrontation that participants would engage in when they have reason to believe that a woman is being made to do something that she does not want to do" (Berg et al., 1999, p. 224). Respondents were asked to respond to

six scenarios by choosing one of four different options. Relationships of either the person instigating the behavior or receiving the behavior were varied. For example, the person instigating the sexual behavior was either the respondent's "teammate" or " a man" (i.e. stranger), and the woman in the scenario was either "a good friend" of his or someone he "does not know." The use of the relationship of a "teammate" in the scenario was reworded for the current study from "roommate" to "teammate" in order to make the question more relevant to student athletes' experiences of being involved in a team culture. In addition, different intensities of sexual acts were also varied for each scenario (e.g. kissing or making her do "something sexual" she doesn't want to do). Response options ranged from "do nothing" to "interrupting the situation to see if everything is alright." Although each scenario was created to be conceptually unique from the other scenarios, reliability analyses indicated that all six items held together as one scale measuring a person's "likelihood to confront" (scale coefficient alpha = .74; corrected item-to-total correlations ranged from .40 to .68). For ease of multivariate analyses, all six items were combined to make one scale measuring the outcome variable "likelihood to confront." This scale was used in all multivariate analyses for this study. However, items were also analyzed separately (i.e. not as a scale) for descriptive purposes. Descriptive analyses are discussed later in the results section.

Program Utilization

A selection of questions gauged at measuring projected group-level change (within each team), as well as individual utilization of program information was also developed for this study. The questions developed for this study followed the concept of

a type of evaluative technique termed "utilization-focused evaluation" (Patton, 1990). This final collection of "group utilization" outcome variables is unique from the other outcome variables for this study because it was only measured at post-test, rather than at both pre-and post-test. One of the purposes of the utilization-focused evaluation technique is to ensure that the event that is evaluated (e.g. an informational workshop) is actually relevant to the population that is expected to use the information from the event (Patton, 1990). Although this type of evaluation is often considered a process that requires participant participation throughout the entire evaluation planning and implementation (Patton, 1990), for this study, only the practicality of this concept was used, so program participants were not directly involved in the development of evaluation questions. For example, the practicality of asking participants how much they will use the information that was provided at the workshop was what was deemed important for the current study, whereas in other studies the participants might have been involved in the practicality of the evaluation itself, rather than just the program information's practicality to them.

The group utilization items for this study focused on exploring whether or not the information provided by the program was meaningful and useful to the program participants. In this sense, this technique offers a very practical way of asking how useful the workshop was for participants, as well as a check on the accuracy of findings from pre-post test measures. For example, since the current study evaluated change by administering pre and post-tests only an hour apart, it was a good additional measure to find out if participants directly believed that the information presented was something they would put to use or not, regardless of attitudinal or abstract pre-post test attitudinal

measures. The practicality of just asking participants directly whether or not they will use the program information is regarded as one of the strengths of the utilization-focused evaluation approach. Patton (1990, p. 405) states, "A utilization-focused approach to analysis can help keep the findings from becoming too abstract, esoteric, or theoretical." The level of program usefulness that the program participants report is an important and direct way of knowing whether or not the workshop information will actually be used and make a difference in their lives.

Aside from exploring individuals' use of the information, utilization questions for this study were used to help determine the likelihood that other team members would use the information. Asking an individual team member how much his team would use the information from the workshop goes a step farther into a participant's estimation of group-level change. As noted earlier, no other program targeting athletes has attempted to measure whether change at the group level of interaction may occur as a result of an intervention (Katz, 1995; Parrot et al., 1994). Other ways of determining group-level change (e.g. participant observation of group behaviors, focus groups held months after the intervention) were impractical for this type of study. Therefore, the decision to use utilization questions was made to ensure that at least some estimation of group behavior was attained.

General program usefulness. Items developed for this study measured varying components of behavioral impact. For example, to find out the general usefulness of such a presentation (and therefore likelihood of making an actual behavioral impact) the question was asked "How much do you think you will use some of the information that was presented in this workshop?" To capture not only individual utilization, but also the

possibility of team utilization, the question was asked "How much do you think members of your team will use some of the information that was presented in this workshop?" Respondents answered both of these questions using a scale ranging from 1 "very much" to 4 "not much at all." Blank space for clarification on both of these questions was also available to respondents (asked in the form of the question "what makes you say that?"). All open-ended responses for individual utilization items were reviewed and then coded into six emergent categories of response by the researcher (see Table 2). Two coders were trained in the use of the coding categories, then independently read and coded the responses according to the predetermined categories. Initially, out of sixty-three coded responses, coders agreed on fifty-nine. Thus, initial inter-coder agreement was 94%.

Table 2

Individual Utilization Coding Categories (n = 65)

Coding Category	Example of response included in category
1. No new information/ common sense (n = 29)	"I know most of it" "Because I didn't learn anything new" "It's common sense!"
2. These situations do not happen often (n = 7)	"Not confronted with it a lot" "Hasn't happened yet" "Don't go to places it would happen"
3. Would behave in the ways suggested by the program anyways (n = 4)	"I already would do that" "Cuz I'm not gonna sexually harass anyone" (sic)
4. Would not behave in the ways suggested by the program anyways (n = 3)	"I wouldn't do it anyway" "Because sexual assault will always be present"
5. New information (n = 15)	"It's good to know the definitions" "There is some information I did not know"
6. These situations happen often (n = 4)	"I'm in these situations often" "A lot of these instances occur" "It happens a lot (these situations)"

As with the individual utilization items, all open-ended responses for team utilization items were reviewed and then coded into six emergent categories of response by the researcher (see Table 3). Two coders were trained in the use of the coding categories, then independently read and coded the responses according to the predetermined categories. Twelve responses were thrown out because they did not answer the question, were incomplete, or did not make sense to either of the coders. Initially, out of fifty-five coded responses, coders agreed on fifty-one. Thus, initial inter-coder agreement was 93%.

Table 3

Team Utilization Coding Categories (n = 55)

Coding Category	Example of response included in category
1. Lack of attentiveness or caring for program material (n = 16)	"I don't think a lot of my teammates would care" "They all thought it was stupid we had to attend this meeting" "It all depends on how well they paid attention"
2. Information was "common sense" (n = 9)	"We learned this is third grade" (sic) "Common sense" "We all know"
3. Team is inherently bad (n = 6)	"There are some dirty pigs on my team" "We're gross!" "They do not care. NO respect" "They are pretty bad guys who think they deserve it all"
4. Team lacks intelligence (n = 5)	"Because they are idiots!" "Some of them aren't very smart" "Their jocks" (sic)
5. New information (n = 10)	"It was informative" "Because they learned" "It seemed like everyone got something from what was said"
6. Team is inherently good (n = 9)	"We don't do this crap" "We are a good team"

Confrontation with a teammate. Two items were created to more directly determine if the intervention helped participants receive the behavioral or attitudinal tools they would need to assume the role of a minority dissenter. As a follow-up to the scenario questions involving confrontation (described above), the first item asked respondents "What factors would influence your decision to confront a teammate who was making a woman do something sexual that she does not want to do?" All open-ended responses were reviewed and then coded into seven emergent categories of response by the researcher (see Table 4). Two coders were trained in the use of the coding categories, then independently read and coded the responses according to the predetermined categories. Eleven responses were thrown out because they did not answer the question, were incomplete, or did not make sense to any of the coders. Initially, out of seventy-five coded responses, coders agreed on sixty-six. Thus, initial inter-coder agreement was 88%. Coding categories were further discussed between the researcher and the two coders and revised so that all three were in agreement with the defining features of each category. Responses were again independently reviewed by each coder, and as a result, coders agreed on seventy-three out of the seventy-five responses, indicating a 97% inter-coder agreement.

An additional item was also added that asked respondents "How much do you think the information that was presented to you in this workshop would help you stand up to a teammate if he was doing something with a woman that you thought was wrong?" For this item, respondents indicated on a scale ranging from "won't help me at all in any situation" to "will help me in all situations," in addition to one answer choice "I already

would have stood up to a teammate in any situation." Respondents who answered that it would not help them in any situation were asked to briefly explain why they didn't think the information would help them. Very few respondents (n= 7) answered this last open-ended question, so it was not used in any of the analyses for this study.

Table 4

Coding Categories for Factors Influencing Participants' Confrontation of a Teammate (n = 75*)

Coding Category	Example of response included in category
1. Cues from the woman (n = 19)	"The way the female is acting" "If she was upset or mad" "If she was screaming help or something else" "Amount of resistance by the woman"
2. Situational factors (n = 15)	"Environment and time" "Atmosphere and setting and extent of the situation" "Where it is at"
3. Protecting teammate (n = 13)	"If he was doing something criminal" "If he was going to get himself in trouble" "Don't want him to get in trouble"
4. Personal morals (n = 12)	"I don't care who it is, I don't think it's right" "It is not right" "Rights of everyone – it's common sense"
5. Relationship with teammate (n = 12)	"Who the teammate was" "How well you know him, if they're violent" "How close of a friend he is"
6. Relationship with woman (n = 9)	"How well I know her" "If she was my sister or relative, someone close" "Who the woman was, if she could handle herself or not"
7. Cues from teammate (n = 8)	"The way he is touching her" "If he was forceful" "If they're violent"

*n = 73 responses, but some responses listed multiple factors. The total number of factors given was n = 93.

Statistical Analyses

Multivariate Analyses

To test the hypotheses that involvement in this program would decrease men's reports of their rape myth acceptance and likelihood of sexually aggressing and increase men's reports of their likelihood of confronting a situation, repeated measures multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to initially compare pre and post-test scores. Power analyses indicated that for MANOVA, N =125 (answering both pre and post-tests) gave power = .80 to find pre-post change significant at $p < .05$ if the effect size is at least as big as .25 standard deviations. Power analyses were conducted using PASS: Power Analysis and Sample Size (Version 6.0) Kaysville, UT: NCSS.

When preparing to run the repeated measures MANOVA, it became apparent that there were a number of respondents who were listwise deleted from the analysis. Case summaries were run to determine what cases were missing from the dataset, which revealed that the majority of cases that were listwise deleted consisted of seventeen football players and ten members of others teams who did not complete their entire post-test. Although these players had completed most scales on their post-test, because they were missing one or more scales, listwise deletion procedures (used in general multivariate analyses) deleted them from all analyses.

To more accurately estimate the values of this missing data, an expectation maximization procedure was run. Expectation maximization (EM) is an estimating procedure that is known for producing more realistic estimates of variance than other methods of missing data estimation (e.g. mean imputation) (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2000). Tabachnick and Fidell (2000) explain: "EM forms a missing data correlation (or

covariance) matrix by assuming the shape of a distribution (such as normal) for the partially missing data and basing inferences about missing values on the likelihood under that distribution" (p.63). By using estimates based on the distribution of existing data, this procedure of estimating missing data not only more accurately reflects the actual sample population, but also avoids impossible matrices and overfitting (making the estimation look better than it actually is). The results of t-tests that were run to determine if cases in which data were estimated were different than cases without estimated data are provided at the beginning of the results section. A total of 60 out of 720 values (or 8.33% of the data matrix) were estimated using EM procedures.

Predictors of Post-Intervention Change

To examine the relationships between predictor variables and participants' post-scores, a sequential regression (also called hierarchical regression) of predictors on post scores was conducted for each outcome variable. Pre-scores were co-varied out of the equation by entering them into the first block of each regression equation. Sample size for all sequential regressions was N = 120, which yielded only slightly lower power than had been anticipated. For sequential regression analyses, power analyses indicated that N =125 should give power = .80 at ($p < .05$) to find significant an R square change = .05 when pre-scores account for 25% of the variance (implying pre-post stability, or the correlation between pre and post-scores = .5). Power analyses were conducted using PASS: Power Analysis and Sample Size (Version 6.0) Kaysville, UT: NCSS. All data were entered into and analyzed with the Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS), version 10.0. A total of 116 out of 1920 values (or 6.04% of the data matrix) were estimated using EM procedures.

Chapter 3

RESULTS

Of the 150 survey packets collected, 120 were used for analyses in the current study. Six surveys were deleted from the dataset due to a lack of information on both the pre and post-test. Twenty-four surveys could not be used for one or more of the following reasons:

1. Incomplete post-test (less than one page completed). n = 4
2. Incomplete pre-test (less than one page completed). n = 3
3. Answers to one or more of the measurements were clearly fabricated or answered with sarcasm. n = 17

Cases that fell under the last criterion above were determined through inspection of numerical answers to items on the scales included in either the pre or post-test. Items that were numerically answered with an obvious pattern were included under this third criterion for exclusion. For example, if all twenty-five items on a scale were marked as "undecided" and/or answers increased numerically in order from lowest option to highest, and then repeated, such as 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,1,2,3,4,5,6,7...), or if items were answered without regard to the reverse coded items (e.g. answering the reverse coded items within the same range as the non-reverse coded items were answered), the case was excluded from analyses. Surveys that fell under the third criterion for exclusion above at *either* the pre-test *or* the post-test were excluded from analyses. This decision was made with the assumption that scores that were fabricated or answered sarcastically by a person on

either the pre or post-test could not be assuredly deemed as reliable on the opposite test administration.

Independent sample t-tests indicated that people who were excluded from analyses using the above selection criteria were significantly different than people who were included in analyses. As Table 5 indicates, participants who were excluded from analyses had slightly higher sex role stereotyping (excluded participant mean score: 3.68; included mean scale score: 3.10) and severity of prior sexual aggression (excluded mean scale score: 1.87; included mean scale score: 1.27) than participants who were included in the analyses.

Table 5

Independent Sample T-Tests for Cases Excluded From Analyses Based on Selection Criteria

Variable	T	df	Sig. (two-tailed)
Rape Myth Acceptance	-.307	142	.759
Likelihood of Sexually Aggressing	-1.849	142	.067
Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence	-1.466	142	.145
Likelihood of Confronting	.763	142	.446
Acceptance of General Violence	-1.636	142	.104
Contact vs. Non-Contact Sport Participation	.298	142	.766
Hostility Toward Women	-.471	142	.639
Sex Role Stereotyping	-2.392	142	.018
Severity of Sexual Aggression	-2.386	142	.018
Competitiveness	-.011	142	.992
Goal Orientation	.451	142	.653
Win Orientation	.418	142	.677
Years played intercollegiate sports	-.553	109	.581

Independent sample t-tests were also run to determine if cases for which post-test data were estimated (through EM procedures) were significantly different from non-estimated cases. T-tests indicated that people who did not completely fill out their post-tests were significantly different from the group that did complete the post-test on only one of the thirteen variables. As Table 6 indicates, participants who did not complete their entire post-test scored significantly higher on acceptance of interpersonal violence than participants who completed the entire post-test (uncompleted post-test mean scale score: 2.97; completed post-test mean scale score: 2.47).

Table 6

Independent Sample T-Tests for Estimated Cases Based on Missing Partial Post-Test

Variable	T	df	Sig. (two-tailed)
Rape Myth Acceptance	.056	142	.955
Likelihood of Sexually Aggressing	.883	142	.379
Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence	-2.008	142	.047
Likelihood of Confronting	.710	142	.479
Acceptance of General Violence	-.704	142	.483
Contact vs. Non-Contact Sport Participation	1.287	142	.200
Hostility Toward Women	-1.240	142	.217
Sex Role Stereotyping	-1.787	142	.076
Severity of Sexual Aggression	-.796	142	.427
Competitiveness	-.170	142	.865
Goal Orientation	-.430	142	.668
Win Orientation	-.142	142	.887
Years played intercollegiate sports	-.812	109	.419

Pre-Test Descriptives

Fifty-seven percent of the sample were members of a contact-sport, and forty-three percent were members of a non-contact sport. Respondents ranged between one and four years of collegiate sports participation, with most having played for one year (33%). Twenty-three percent had participated for two years, 12% had participated for three years, and 9% had participated for four years or more. Twenty-three percent of the respondents did not answer how many years they played sports. This is most likely due to the location of the question on the questionnaire page (very top of second page), which probably made it easier to skip than subsequent questions.

Descriptive findings for variables measured on the same 7-point scale are listed in Table 7. Overall, respondents were somewhat less supportive of the use of interpersonal violence than they were of general violence. However, the majority of responses indicated that respondents were generally unsupportive of all types of violence. Respondents generally reported low hostility toward women, although only 3% indicated that they did not at all agree with statements endorsing hostility toward women. The majority of respondents (66%) reported that they mostly or somewhat did not agree with statements indicating hostility toward women. Respondents were also generally unsupportive of sex role stereotypes. Only seven percent of respondents indicated that they at least somewhat agreed with sex role stereotypes, and not one person indicated that they very much agreed with the statements. Twenty-five percent of respondents were undecided about the statements.

Table 7

Predictor Variable Scale Percentages at Pre-Test (measured on a 7-point scale)

Variable	1 Not at all agree	2 Mostly do not agree	3 Some-what do not agree	4 Un-decided	5 Some-what agree	6 Mostly agree	7 Very much agree	Scale Mean	Scale SD
Acceptance of general violence	1	10	26	39	19	1	1	3.74	1.00
Acceptance of interpersonal violence	22	37	24	14	2	0	1	2.50	1.11
Hostility toward women	03	30	35	22	8	1	0	3.05	1.03
Sex role stereotypes	06	23	38	25	4	2	0	3.05	1.07

Not surprising with collegiate-level athletes, there was not a large amount of variance among responses on all three of the sport-orientation variables (see Table 8). The most variability was seen with respondents' win orientation, while the least variability was seen with respondents' goal orientation. No one indicated that they strongly disagreed with any of the statements on any of the three subscales, although a few people indicated some disagreement with some of the items.

Table 8

Sport Orientation Scale Percentages at Pre-Test

Variable	1 Strongly agree	2 Slightly agree	3 Neither agree nor disagree	4 Slightly disagree	5 Strongly disagree	Scale Mean	Scale SD
Competitiveness	88	11	1	1	0	1.15	.50
Win orientation	58	36	5	1	0	1.48	.63
Goal orientation	79	20	0	1	0	1.23	.47

To measure sexual aggression severity, items were scaled in accordance with the classification procedures outlined by Koss & Gaines (1993) in order to score a man according to the most severe level of sexual aggression he had perpetrated (4-point scale, 0 = sexual nonaggression, 4 = attempted or completed rape). A score of 0, representing *sexual nonaggression,* was assigned to the men who responded "never" to all of the SES items. This score was obtained from 18% of the current study's sample (see Table 9). A score of 1 represented *uninvited sexual advances* (e.g. cat calls and wolf whistles to women) and was obtained by 56% of the sample. A score of 2, representing *unwanted sexual contact* (e.g. unwanted touching of a woman's buttocks, breasts, or genital area), was obtained by 13% of the sample. A score of 3, representing *sexual coercion,* was obtained by men who answered yes to items indicating that they had attempted or completed unwanted sexual intercourse by using continual arguments and menacing verbal pressure (2%). Finally, men who answered yes to items indicating that they had attempted or achieved unwanted penetration by giving a woman more alcohol or drugs than she could handle, threatening bodily harm, using physical force, or overcoming her by a group of men (Koss & Gaines, 1993) received a score of 4, representing *attempted*

or completed rape. The score of 4 was obtained by 11% of the sample. The sample mean for this scale was 1.31, SD = 1.13.

Table 9

Percent Sexual Aggression Severity at Pre-Test

	0 Sexual non-aggression	1 Uninvited sexual advances	2 Unwanted sexual contact	3 Sexual coercion	4 Attempted or completed rape	Scale Mean	Scale SD
% at Pre-test	18	56	13	2	11	1.31	1.13

The scale mean for pre-test scores of rape myth acceptance was 2.55, SD = .76 (7-point scale; 1 = not at all agree, 7 = very much agree). Respondents were generally unsupportive of rape myths, although only 4% said that they did not at all agree with rape myth supportive statements. Eighty-two percent of respondents said that they either mostly did not agree or somewhat did not agree with statements endorsing rape myths. Seven-percent stated that they were undecided, and only one percent somewhat agreed with the statements. No one stated that he mostly agreed or very much agreed with the statements.

At pre-test, most participants reported a relatively low likelihood of sexually aggressing (scale mean = 1.15, SD = .47) (5-point scale; 1 = never, 5 = always). Eighty-eight percent of participants stated that they would never do any of the sexually aggressive behaviors listed, even if they thought no one would know. Over 9% of participants stated that although it would be rarely, they would be willing to force a woman into doing something sexual by using verbal coercion, alcohol, or physical force.

One percent stated that they would sometimes do any of the behaviors (score of 4). The remaining two percent stated that they were unsure whether they would do any of the sexually aggressive behaviors listed, and no one stated that he would always do any of the behaviors (see Table 11).

Table 10

Percent Rape Myth Acceptance at Pre-Test

	1 Not at all agree	2 Mostly do not agree	3 Some-what do not agree	4 Un-decided	5 Some-what agree	6 Mostly agree	7 Very much agree	Scale Mean	Scale SD
% at Pre-test	4	51	31	7	1	0	0	2.55	.76

Table 11

Percent Likelihood of Sexually Aggressing at Pre-Test

	1 Never	2 Rarely	3 Unsure	4 Sometimes	5 Always	Scale Mean	Scale SD
% at Pre-test	88	9	2	1	0	1.15	.47

At pre-test, overall, participants reported a relatively high proclivity of confronting a person if they thought a woman was being forced to do something sexual that she did not want to do (see Table 12). Percentage of respondents claiming they would interrupt the situation while it was happening ranged from 56% to 85% across all scenarios. Percentage of respondents who stated that they would wait and talk with the

man ranged from 6% to 29% across all scenarios. The percentage of respondents who stated that they would wait to talk with the woman was slightly lower, ranging from 4% to 9% across all situations. A range of 3% to 29% of respondents claimed that they would do nothing. Participants were most likely to intervene when both the man and the woman in the scenario were known to the participant. For example, in the scenario in which a teammate is kissing a woman who is a good friend of the participant, 85% of respondents claimed that they would interrupt the situation. Likewise, in the scenario in which a teammate is making a woman do something sexual and she is a good friend of the participant, 82% of respondents stated that they would interrupt the situation. The above two scenarios were also the two scenarios in which participants were least likely to do nothing. Only 3% of respondents stated that they would do nothing if they knew both people in the situation.

Table 12

Percent of Responses by Item for Likelihood of Confronting at Pre-Test

	Do nothing	Wait & talk with woman	Wait & talk with man	Interrupt the situation
Sit. 1 See a teammate kissing a woman...do not know woman	20%	4%	20%	56%
Sit. 2 Know a man is making a woman do something sexual...do not know man	14%	9%	10%	68%
Sit. 3 Know a teammate is making a woman do something sexual...woman is good friend	3%	5%	10%	82%
Sit. 4 See a teammate kissing a woman...woman is good friend	3%	6%	6%	85%
Sit. 5 Know a teammate is making a woman do something sexual...do not know woman	18%	4%	19%	59%
Sit. 6 See a man kissing a woman...do not know man	29%	9%	6%	57%

Multivariate Analyses

To test the hypotheses that involvement in this program would decrease men's reports of their rape myth acceptance and likelihood of sexually aggressing and increase men's reports of their likelihood of confronting a situation, repeated measures multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to initially compare pre and post-test scores. Dependent variables for the MANOVA were rape myth acceptance, likelihood of confronting, and likelihood of sexually aggressing. The independent variable was time (two time-points of pre-test and post-test). Total N = 120.

Table 13 Correlation Matrix of Variables Used in Multivariate Analyses

	LSA1	LSA2	CON1	CON2	RMA1	RMA2
Likelihood of Sexually Agressing at Pre (LSA1)	1.000	.480**	-.122	-.164	.449**	.246**
Likelihood of Sexually Aggressing at Post (LSA2)	.480**	1.000	-.038	-.277**	.357**	.428**
Likelihood of Confronting at Pre (LC1)	-.122	-.038	1.000	.725**	-.256**	-.156
Likelihood of Confronting at Post (LC2)	-.164	-.277**	.725**	1.000	-.300**	-.397**
Rape Myth Acceptance at Pre (RMA1)	.449**	.357**	-.256**	-.300**	1.000	.670**
Rape Myth Acceptance at Post (RMA2)	.246**	.428**	-.156	-.397**	.670**	1.000
Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence (AIV)	.421**	.306**	.103	-.037	.336**	.319**
Acceptance of General Violence (AGV)	.316**	.280**	-.064	-.077	.270**	.356**
Hostility Toward Women (HOS)	.386**	.250**	-.123	-.157	.576**	.480**
Sex Role Stereotyping (ROL)	.334**	.322**	-.066	-.065	.467**	.380**
Severity of Prior Sexual Aggression (SVR)	.245**	.210*	-.088	-.223*	.269**	.355**
# Years Participated in Intercollegiate Sports (YRS)	-.171	-.030	.130	.076	-.261**	-.012
Contact or Non-Contact Sport Participation (CON)	-.123	-.148	.048	.131	-.135	-.106
Competitiveness (COMP)	.098	-.011	.044	.092	.084	.073
Goal Orientation (GOAL)	.048	-.031	-.005	.040	.066	.154
Win Orientation (WIN)	.033	-.070	.088	.171	-.075	-.132

Table 13 Correlation Matrix of Variables Used in Multivariate Analyses

	AIV	AGV	HOS	ROL	SVR	YRS
Likelihood of Sexually Agressing at Pre (LSA1)	.421**	.316**	.386**	.334**	.245**	-.171
Likelihood of Sexually Aggressing at Post (LSA2)	.306**	.280**	.250**	.322**	.210*	-.030
Likelihood of Confronting at Pre (LC1)	.103	-.064	-.123	-.066	-.088	.130
Likelihood of Confronting at Post (LC2)	-.037	-.077	-.157	-.065	-.223*	.076
Rape Myth Acceptance at Pre (RMA1)	.336**	.270**	.576**	.467**	.269**	-.261**
Rape Myth Acceptance at Post (RMA2)	.319**	.356**	.480**	.380**	.355**	-.012
Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence (AIV)	1.000	.456**	.421**	.355**	.144	-.016
Acceptance of General Violence (AGV)	.456**	1.000	.147	.343**	-.002	-.011
Hostility Toward Women (HOS)	.421**	.147	1.000	.458**	.282**	-.053
Sex Role Stereotyping (ROL)	.355**	.343**	.458**	1.000	.188*	-.224*
Severity of Prior Sexual Aggression (SVR)	.144	-.002	.282**	.188*	1.000	.116
# Years Participated in Intercollegiate Sports (YRS)	-.016	-.011	-.053	-.224*	.116	1.000
Contact or Non-Contact Sport Participation (CON)	-.278**	-.130	-.183*	-.389**	-.199*	-.117
Competitiveness (COMP)	-.105	-.100	.108	-.093	.148	.091
Goal Orientation (GOAL)	-.030	.075	.160	-.019	.162	.296**
Win Orientation (WIN)	-.170	-.250**	-.085	-.298**	.022	.027

Table 13 Correlation Matrix of Variables Used in Multivariate Analyses

	CON	COMP	GOAL	WIN
Likelihood of Sexually Agressing at Pre (LSA1)	-.123	.098	.048	.033
Likelihood of Sexually Aggressing at Post (LSA2)	-.148	-.011	-.031	-.070
Likelihood of Confronting at Pre (LC1)	.048	.044	-.005	.088
Likelihood of Confronting at Post (LC2)	.131	.092	.040	.171
Rape Myth Acceptance at Pre (RMA1)	-.135	.084	.066	-.075
Rape Myth Acceptance at Post (RMA2)	-.106	.073	.154	-.132
Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence (AIV)	-.278**	-.105	-.030	-.170
Acceptance of General Violence (AGV)	-.130	-.100	.075	-.250**
Hostility Toward Women (HOS)	-.183*	.108	.160	-.085
Sex Role Stereotyping (ROL)	-.389**	-.093	-.019	-.298**
Severity of Prior Sexual Aggression (SVR)	-.199*	.148	.162	.022
# Years Participated in Intercollegiate Sports (YRS)	-.117	.091	.296**	.027
Contact or Non-Contact Sport Participation (CON)	1.000	.187*	.116	.344**
Competitiveness (COMP)	.187*	1.000	.709**	.670**
Goal Orientation (GOAL)	.116	.709**	1.000	.419**
Win Orientation (WIN)	.344**	.670**	.419**	1.000

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

After the training, participants were marginally significantly *more* likely to sexually aggress (F = 3.87, p = .051), and *less* likely to confront a situation in which a person was making a woman do something sexual that she did not want to do (F = 3.66, p = .058). Participants did not experience a significant change in their level of rape myth acceptance (F = .685, p = .409). These results suggest the opposite of the first two hypotheses purported at the beginning of this study. Namely, the hypotheses that 1) involvement in this program would decrease men's reports of their rape myth acceptance and likelihood of sexually aggressing and 2) increase men's reports of their likelihood of confronting a situation. Table 14 displays the means and standard deviations of each of the three outcome measures at pre and post-test.

Table 14

Mean Scale Scores for Outcome Variables at Pre-Test and Post-Test

Outcome variable	Pre-test mean	Pre-test standard deviation	Post-test mean	Post-test standard deviation	Univariate F	p-value
Likelihood of sexually aggressing	1.21	.49	1.31	.63	3.87	.051
Likelihood of confronting	3.33	.68	3.22	.94	3.66	.058
Rape myth acceptance	2.55	.74	2.50	.85	.68	.409

Post-Test Descriptives

Due to the complex nature of the constructs being measured as outcome variables, it is important and interesting to explore individual scale differences between pre-test and

post-test. Scale means for all post-test outcome variables can be found in Table 14. Broken down by responses given, there was an increase of three percentage points from pre-test of participants who indicated that they did not at all agree with rape myth supportive statements (7% post-test) (see Table 15). Fifty-two percent of respondents indicated that they mostly did not agree with rape myth supportive statements (a 1% increase from 51% at pre-test), and 26% stated that they somewhat did not agree (a 5% decrease from 31% at pre-test). Fourteen-percent stated that they were undecided, doubling the amount of people who stated they were undecided at pre-test (7%). Similarly to the pre-test, one percent somewhat agreed with the statements, and no one stated that he mostly agreed or very much agreed with the statements.

Table 15

Percent Rape Myth Acceptance at Pre and Post-Test

	1 Not at all agree	2 Mostly do not agree	3 Some-what do not agree	4 Un-decided	5 Some-what agree	6 Mostly agree	7 Very much agree	Scale Mean	Scale SD
% at Pre-test	4	51	31	7	1	0	0	2.55	.76
% at Post-test	7	52	26	14	1	0	0	2.50	.85

At post-test, the scale mean for likelihood of sexually aggressing actually slightly increased, rather than decreased as had been anticipated. Similar to the pre-test, 88% percent of participants stated that they would never do any of the sexually aggressive behaviors listed, even if they thought no one would know. Two percent of participants

stated that although it would be rarely, they would be willing to force a woman into doing something sexual by using verbal coercion, alcohol, or physical force. This reflects a 5% decrease in response as compared to pre-test (7%). The percentage of participants who stated that they were unsure whether they would do any of the sexually aggressive behaviors increased from 2% (pre-test) to 8% at post-test. Two-percent stated that they would sometimes do any of the behaviors (score of 4), and no one stated that he would always do any of the behaviors.

Although the scale mean was used for all analyses in this study, it is interesting to look at each of the listed behaviors individually, since they represent different although psychometrically and logically similar types of sexual aggression. Table 16 is a percent breakdown of each type of behavior endorsed at pre and post-test.

Table 16

Percent Likelihood of Sexually Aggressing at Pre and Post-Test

	Never		**Rarely**		**Unsure**		**Sometimes**		**Always**	
	% Pre	% Post	% Pre	% Post	% Pre	% Post	% Pre	% Post	% Pre	% Post
Force a woman to do something sexual she doesn't want to do	93	88	2	2	4	8	1	2	0	0
Talk a woman into doing something sexual she doesn't want to do	81	81	12	7	3	9	3	3	1	0
Force a woman to have sex when she doesn't want to	95	90	3	0	1	8	0	2	1	0

Use alcohol in hopes of having a woman give into something sexual she wouldn't give in to if not drinking	82	82	12	8	3	8	2	2	1	0

The post-test results for likelihood of confronting were somewhat disappointing, as well as surprising. Although the scale mean did not experience a large change from pre to post-test, it is interesting to note which situations did experience change, and in what direction. Even though participants were again most likely to interrupt the situations in which they knew both of the people involved, they were less likely to interrupt these situations after participating in the intervention than before the intervention (see Table 17). For example, participants' likelihood of interrupting the situation in which a teammate is making a woman who is the participant's good friend do something sexual reduced from 82% at pre-test to 73% at post-test.

For a similar scenario, in which a teammate is kissing a woman who is the participants' good friend, participants' likelihood of interrupting the situation reduced from 85% at pre-test to 74% at post-test. Even more disturbing, it appears as though for this latter scenario, most of the variance from the pre-test option of interrupting the situation shifted to the option of doing nothing (3% doing nothing at pre-test up to 15% doing nothing at post-test).

It is also possible that these shifts in variance are partially due to the fact that the above-mentioned scenarios were the items most highly endorsed at pre-test, which implies that they may have experienced some regression to the mean. However, the lowest response both for these items ("do nothing") did not shift toward the mean to the

same extent from pre-test to post-test, suggesting that regression to the mean may not have been very prevalent.

As opposed to the above scenarios in which both people were known to the participant, at post-test respondents were more likely to interrupt two of the situations in which one or both of the people was unknown to the participant. For one situation, in which a teammate is making an unknown woman do something sexual, participants indicated more that they would interrupt the situation after the workshop (68% at post-test) than before the workshop (59% at pre-test). This stands in contrast to the similar situation described above in which the woman is known to the participant and he was less likely to interrupt after the workshop. Additionally, for another situation in which both the people are unknown to the participant (man is kissing a woman and man is unknown), respondents were also more likely to interrupt the situation at post-test (65%) than at pre-test (57%).

It is worth noting that at post-test respondents indicated they were more likely to do nothing for every scenario described, except the last one in which the man was unknown and the woman was unspecified. Percentage change scores ranged from 1% to 12%. The highest change (12%) was indicated for the scenario in which a teammate is kissing a woman who is a good friend of the participant, and the least change was seen for the scenario in which a teammate is making an unknown woman do something sexual (1%).

Table 17

Percent Likelihood of Confronting at Pre and Post-Test

	Do nothing		Wait & talk with woman		Wait & talk with man		Interrupt the situation	
	% Pre	% Post	% Pre	% Post	% Pre	% Post	% Pre	% Post
Sit. 1 See a teammate kissing a woman...do not know woman	20	23	4	4	20	15	56	58
Sit. 2 Know a man is making a woman do something sexual...do not know man	14	22	9	5	10	10	68	63
Sit. 3 Know a teammate is making a woman do something sexual...woman is good friend	3	8	5	7	10	12	82	73
Sit. 4 See a teammate kissing a woman...woman is good friend	3	15	6	6	6	5	85	74
Sit. 5 Know a teammate is making a woman do something sexual...do not know woman	18	19	4	1	19	12	59	68
Sit. 6 See a man kissing a woman...do not know man	29	24	9	5	6	6	57	65

Predictors of Post-Intervention Change

To more fully examine the relationships between participants' characteristics and pre-post change, a sequential regression (also called hierarchical regression) of predictors on post scores was conducted for each outcome variable. Pre-scores were co-varied out of the equation by entering them into the first block of each regression equation. Sample

size for all sequential regressions was N = 120, which yielded only slightly lower power than had been anticipated. These analyses tested the remaining hypotheses # 3 – 10 stating that men who had higher levels of goal orientation, win orientation, competitiveness, prior sexual aggression severity, hostility toward women, sex role stereotyping, acceptance of interpersonal violence, acceptance of general violence, participated in more years in intercollegiate sports, and involvement in contact sports would experience less attitude change due to the workshop (post-test scores).

A total of 10 predictors were entered into each of the three regression equations. The order of variables that were entered into all three of the equations was the following (the first block changed in each equation to reflect the pre-score of the outcome variable post score being used as the dependent variable): first block: rape myth acceptance (pre-score); second block: acceptance of interpersonal violence, acceptance of general violence, hostility toward women, sex role stereotyping, sexual aggression severity; third block: win orientation, number of years participated in intercollegiate sports, goal orientation, contact vs. non-contact sports participation, competitiveness. The sport-specific variables were entered into the last block to more closely determine whether the sport-specific characteristics of athletes make a significant contribution to the variance of the equation, over and above the non-sport-specific variables typically associated with the effectiveness of rape prevention education workshops.

The first sequential regression predicted how much variance the ten predictor variables accounted for in a participants' post-score on likelihood of sexual aggression (with pre-scores for likelihood of sexual aggression co-varied out). None of the predictor variables significantly contributed to participants' outcome scores for likelihood of sexual

aggression. Only the first block, participants' pre-intervention likelihood of sexually aggressing, significantly increased R-square (R-square change = .23, F (1,118), p = .000). As Table 18 shows, the second block that included all of the predictor variables did not significantly increase R-square (R-square change = .047, F (5,113), p = .201). The third block, which included only sport-specific variables (e.g. competitiveness), did not significantly increase R-square (R-square change = .012, F (5,108), p = .863), nor did it include any coefficients that were significantly different from zero.

The second sequential regression predicted how much variance the ten predictor variables accounted for a participants' post-score on likelihood to confront (with pre-scores for likelihood to confront co-varied out). As Table 19 shows, the first block, participants' pre-intervention likelihood of confronting, significantly increased R-square (R-square change = .525, F (1,118), p = .000). Although the second block did not significantly increase R-square (R-square change = .036, F (5,113), p = .113), the coefficient for one of the variables in the block, severity of prior sexual aggression, was significantly different from zero (β = -.15, p = .021). None of the other variable coefficients were significantly different from zero. The third block, which included only sport-specific variables (e.g. competitiveness), did not significantly increase R-square (R-square change = .015, F (5,108), p = .574), nor did it include any coefficients that were significantly different from zero.

Table 18

Summary of Sequential Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Participants' Likelihood of Sexually Aggressing (Post-Test) (n = 120)

	B	β
Model 1		
Likelihood of sexually aggressing (pre-test)	.62**	.48**
Model 2		
Likelihood of sexually aggressing (pre-test)	.47**	.36**
Acceptance of interpersonal violence	.03	.05
Acceptance of general violence	.06	.09
Hostility toward women	-.01	-.01
Sex role stereotyping	.08	.13
Severity of sexual aggression	.05	.09
Model 3		
Likelihood of sexually aggressing (pre-test)	.48**	.37**
Acceptance of interpersonal violence	.02	.03
Acceptance of general violence	.07	.11
Hostility toward women	.00	.00
Sex role stereotyping	.10	.16
Severity of sexual aggression	.05	.09
Win orientation	.02	.02
Year participated in collegiate sports	.06	.10
Goal orientation	-.21	-.13
Contact or non-contact sport participation	.02	.01
Competitiveness	.05	.03

** $p<.00$
*$p<.05$

Model 1: $R^2 = .230$
Model 2: $R^2 = .278$ $\Delta R^2 = .047$
Model 3: $R^2 = .290$ $\Delta R^2 = .012$

Table 19

Summary of Sequential Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Participants' Likelihood to Confront (Post-Test) (n = 120)

	B	β
Model 1		
Likelihood to confront (pre-test)	.99**	.72**
Model 2		
Likelihood to confront (pre-test)	.99**	.72**
Acceptance of interpersonal violence	-.09	-.10
Acceptance of general violence	.00	.00
Hostility toward women	.00	-.00
Sex role stereotyping	.04	.05
Severity of sexual aggression	-.13*	-.15*
Model 3		
Likelihood to confront (pre-test)	.97**	.71**
Acceptance of interpersonal violence	-.07	-.08
Acceptance of general violence	.00	.00
Hostility toward women	-.01	-.02
Sex role stereotyping	.09	.10
Severity of sexual aggression	-.14*	-.16*
Win orientation	.18	.11
Year participated in collegiate sports	.01	.01
Goal orientation	.06	.02
Contact or non-contact sport participation	.07	.04
Competitiveness	-.03	-.01

** $p<.00$
*$p<.05$

Model 1: $R^2 = .525$
Model 2: $R^2 = .561$ $\Delta R^2 = .036$
Model 3: $R^2 = .576$ $\Delta R^2 = .015$

The third sequential regression predicted how much variance the ten predictor variables accounted for in a participants' post-score on rape myth acceptance (with pre-scores for rape myth acceptance co-varied out). As Table 20 shows, the first block, participants' pre-intervention rape myth acceptance, significantly increased R-square (R-square change = .448, F (1,118), p = .000). The second block also significantly increased R-square (R-square change = .080, F (5,113), p = .003). The coefficients for two of the variables in the block, severity of prior sexual aggression (β = .19, p = .007) and acceptance of general violence (β = .21, p = .005), were significantly different from zero. This finding suggests that acceptance of general violence and severity of prior sexual aggression predict pre-post change in rape myth acceptance. In other words, participants who had a higher acceptance of general violence and more severe prior sexual aggression before the workshop were less likely to have decreased acceptance of rape myths after participating in the workshop. None of the other variable coefficients were significantly different from zero.

With the addition of the third block, which included only sport-specific variables (e.g. competitiveness), the model did not significantly increase R-square (R-square change = .023, F (5,108), p = .357), nor did it include any coefficients that were significantly different from zero.

Table 20

Summary of Sequential Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Participants' Rape Myth Acceptance (Post-Test) (n = 120)

	B	β
Model 1		
Rape myth acceptance (pre-test)	.77**	.67**
Model 2		
Rape myth acceptance (pre-test)	.58**	.50**
Acceptance of interpersonal violence	-.01	-.02
Acceptance of general violence	.19*	.21*
Hostility toward women	.10	.11
Sex role stereotyping	.00	-.01
Severity of sexual aggression	.15*	.19*
Model 3		
Rape myth acceptance (pre-test)	.63**	.54**
Acceptance of interpersonal violence	.00	.00
Acceptance of general violence	.15*	.17*
Hostility toward women	.07	.08
Sex role stereotyping	.02	.03
Severity of sexual aggression	.14*	.17*
Win orientation	-.15	-.10
Year participated in collegiate sports	.10	.12
Goal orientation	.09	.04
Contact or non-contact sport participation	.16	.09
Competitiveness	.04	.02

** $p<.00$
*$p<.05$

Model 1: $R^2 = .448$
Model 2: $R^2 = .528$ $\Delta R^2 = .080$
Model 3: $R^2 = .551$ $\Delta R^2 = .023$

Program Utilization

General Program Usefulness

Approximately seventy-five percent (n ranged from 93 to 95) of the respondents answered the three closed-ended utilization questions at the end of the post-test, while slightly fewer respondents answered the open-ended items (n ranged from 55 (46% of respondents) to 75 (62% of respondents)).

Individual-utilization. Even though sixty-percent of respondents stated that they would either somewhat (44%) or very much (16%) use the information presented in the workshop, forty-percent of respondents stated that they would not very much (21%) or not much at all (19%) use the information presented in the workshop. The mean for this question was 2.44, SD = .98 (four-item scale, ranging from 1 = very much to 4 = not much at all) (n = 94, 76% of respondents).

Factors determining individual-utilization. When asked to explain their reasoning for using or not using information from the workshop, respondents indicated a variety of reasons (n = 63). The highest percentage of responses reflected whether or not the respondents felt the program offered new information (see Table 21).

Team utilization. Interestingly, respondents reported about the same percentage for individual (self) utilization as they did for the extent to which they thought that their teammates would use the information presented at the workshop. Fifty-eight percent of respondents stated that their teammates would either somewhat (48%) or very much (10%) use the information presented in the workshop. Forty-two percent of respondents stated that their teammates would not very much (24%) or not much at all (18%) use the

information presented in the workshop. The mean for this question was 2.51, SD = .90 (four-item scale, ranging from 1 = very much to 4 = not much at all) (n = 93, 74%).

Table 21

Factors Determining Individual Utilization (n = 63)

	Will use the information "not very much" or "not much at all" n=44[a]	Will use the information "very much" or "somewhat" n=19[a]
1. No new information/common sense	66% (n = 29)	
2. These situations do not happen often	16% (n = 7)	
3. Would behave in the ways suggested by the program anyways	9% (n= 4)	
4. Would not behave in the ways suggested by the program anyways	7% (n = 3)	
5. New information		79% (n = 15)
6. These situations happen often		21% (n = 4)

[a] percent is broken into two categories of response "will use information" or "will not use information". Each category totals 100%.

Factors determining team utilization. When asked why they thought that their teammates would or would not utilize the information provided in the workshop, respondents indicated a variety of reasons (see Table 22) (n = 55). It is interesting to note that three of the four categories of response given for why a team would not use the

information refer to inherent factors within the team, rather than factors relating directly to the program (one of the four factors given). Yet, for responses indicating that the team would use the information, one of the two reasons given referred to inherent factors within the team, while the other referred to the program itself.

Table 22

Factors Determining Team Utilization (n = 55)

	Team will use the information "not very much" or "not much at all" n=36[a]	Team will use the information "very much or somewhat" n=19[a]
1. Lack of attentiveness or caring for program material	43% (n = 16)	
2. Information was "common sense"	26% (n = 9)	
3. Team is inherently bad	17% (n = 6)	
4. Team lacks intelligence	14% (n = 5)	
5. New information		53% (n = 10)
6. Teammates are inherently good		47% (n = 9)

[a] percent is broken into two categories of response "will use information" or "will not use information". Each category totals 100%.

Confrontation With A Teammate

Findings suggest that respondents felt the workshop would help them most with their ability to confront a teammate. Overall, respondents reported that the information presented in the workshop would help them confront a teammate in certain situations in which he was doing something with a woman that they thought was wrong (n = 95,

76%). Forty-four percent of respondents stated that the information presented in the workshop might help them in certain situations, while seventeen percent stated that the workshop would help them in most situations. Almost 12% of respondents stated that the information presented in the workshop would help them in all situations, while 10% stated that the information presented would not help them at all, in any situation. Fifteen percent of respondents stated that they would have already stood up to a teammate before the intervention.

Factors determining confrontation with a teammate. The seven categories of responses that were coded for this open-ended item are listed in Table 23 (n = 75).

Table 23

Factors Influencing Respondents' Decision to Confront a Teammate (n = 75*)

Factor	Percent coded "yes"[a]
1. Cues from the woman (n = 19)	25
2. Situational factors (n = 15)	20
3. Protecting teammate (n = 13)	17
4. Personal morals – it's just wrong (n = 12)	17
5. Relationship with teammate (n = 12)	16
6. Relationship with woman (n = 9)	13
7. Cues from teammate (n = 8)	9

[a] Total table percent sums to over 100% because respondents could list more than one factor.

*n = 75 responses, but some responses listed multiple factors. The total number of factors given was n = 93.

Chapter 4

DISCUSSION

The current study was the first to not only evaluate the effectiveness of a sexual assault education program targeting male collegiate athletes, but also the first to explore factors specifically related to the sports experience that may influence a program's effectiveness. Researchers have suggested that collegiate athletes have special characteristics that make them more prone to sexually aggress (Crosset et al., 1996), and worthy of a tailored prevention program format which reflects their special life experiences (Katz, 1995). The findings of this study addressed these issues, and reflect many of the challenges that are faced when delivering a sexual assault prevention program to a specific population like male collegiate athletes. Although some of the findings of this study were disappointing (and at times downright disturbing), they offer valuable information pertaining to the planning and implementation of sexual assault prevention programs targeting male student athletes.

The core finding that the program was unsuccessful in attaining its three specific goals of 1) reducing men's rape myth acceptance, 2) reducing men's likelihood of sexually aggressing, and 3) increasing men's likelihood of confronting, was disappointing. Even more disturbing was the reverse effect seen with men's increased likelihood of sexually aggressing and lessened likelihood of confronting after attending the workshop. Although there are many factors to consider when interpreting these

findings, these results reflect the difficulty in targeting male collegiate athletes with sexual assault prevention programming. Open-ended responses from participants helped to clarify areas of improvement for the development and implementation of this type of educational workshop. Even so, the apparent lack of effectiveness of such programming needs to be seriously considered when efforts are made to develop future programs.

One of the attitudes most commonly targeted for change via workshops such as the current one is participants' acceptance of rape myths. It is interesting to note that even on such a seemingly basic concept to rape prevention education, no positive change was found for the current study. One of the reasons for this lack of significance may have been the scale's limited range seen through the low acceptance of rape myths at *both* pre and post-test. It is possible that the scale was designed to be applicable for an audience with a wider range of attitudes about rape myths than those exhibited by male collegiate athletes. Indeed, the original scale psychometrics were obtained from an undergraduate non-intercollegiate athlete population consisting of both males and females in psychology classes (Payne, et al., 1999). It is possible that although a general undergraduate population is sometimes viewed as a narrowly defined population, attitudes of people within that population may consist of a wider range than an even more specific population like male collegiate athletes. A more appropriate scale for an audience of male collegiate athletes would have captured more of a range of their attitudes.

Nevertheless, although mean differences between test administrations on participants' rape myth acceptance (the first outcome measure) were deemed non-significant, it is worthwhile to note the response differences between pre and post-test. It

is interesting that more people were undecided about their adherence to rape myths after the intervention than before the intervention. At first it might be construed that an increase in this percentage is a positive outcome, given that being undecided about rape myths is at least better than agreeing with them. However, the percent of agreement with rape myths actually stayed relatively equal between pre and post-test (1% for both pre and post-test). This indicates a rather negative outcome, in that some participants actually moved from disagreeing with rape myths to being undecided about their agreement with them. It is important to note, though, that participants started the intervention largely unsupportive of rape myths (pre scale mean = 2.52, SD = .76; 7-point scale; 1 = not at all agree, 7 = very much agree), so there was not much room for change in attitude. One of the goals of the intervention was to reduce support for rape myths, yet the level of reduction may have been limited by participants' reported low acceptance of rape myths before the intervention (at pre-test). The myths and facts exercise that incorporated rape myths was introductory in nature, and mainly intended for an audience who had never been presented with rape myths or topics related to sexual assault before. For reasons discussed later in this section, it is possible that a more in-depth discussion of rape myths was necessary for creating attitudinal change that would have been reflected in the outcome measures used for this study.

The findings that were the most disappointing, however, were the possible "boomerang," or rebound effects that the program seemed to have on participants' likelihood of sexually aggressing and likelihood of confronting (the two remaining outcome measures). Despite the fact that there was no significant change in participants'

acceptance of rape myths, participants were slightly *more* likely to sexually aggress and *less* likely to confront after participating in the workshop.

The potential boomerang effect seen with participants' likelihood of sexually aggressing and likelihood of confronting is not unique to this study. Berg et al (1993) conducted an intervention divided into two groups of men: one group that heard a woman's story of being assaulted, and another that heard a man's story of being assaulted. Both groups reported no significant change in victim empathy, while the group that heard the woman's story actually reported a *greater* likelihood of sexual aggression than before hearing the story. Although Berg et al (1993) hypothesized that men's lack of empathy may be due to their lack of connection to the issue of sexual assault; the rebounding effect may in fact be due to other reasons.

It is possible that giving participants information they already feel they know or do not want to hear has a threshold of acceptance for the participant, which results in the dismissal of information that pushes participants past their threshold. Persuasion researchers have studied this effect and have incorporated it into social judgment theory (O'Keefe, 1990). Social judgment theory asserts that people have issue-specific latitudes of acceptance (the positions that the respondent finds acceptable), latitudes of rejection (the positions that the respondent finds unacceptable), and latitudes of noncommitment (the positions that the respondent neither accepts nor rejects). A person's attitude change (or adherence to persuasive information like that which was provided in the current study's program) depends on where they fall on these three latitudes. For example, if information about sexual assault prevention falls into a participant's latitude of acceptance, that person will more likely be persuaded by the information (they already

agree with the position being advocated). On the other hand, if a person (pre-workshop) does not agree with being educated about sexual assault prevention, they will be harder to persuade. O'Keefe (1990) explains how the concept of attitudinal latitudes may contribute to the boomerang effect seen in the current study:

> "A communication that is perceived to advocate a position that falls in the latitude of acceptance or the latitude of noncommitment will produce attitude change in the advocated direction (that is, in the direction sought by the message), but a communication that is perceived to advocate a position that falls in the latitude of rejection will produce no attitude change, or perhaps "boomerang" attitude change (that is, change in the direction opposite that advocated by the message)". (p. 37)

Additionally, if a person is highly personally involved with the topic (i.e. "ego-involved") the size of their latitude of rejection will be extremely large, while their latitude of acceptance and noncommitment will be small. This is mainly due to the fact that the more involved someone is with an issue, the more opinionated they tend to be – they have thought about the issue and have formed strong opinions about it, so they are less likely to want to change those opinions and more likely to be oppositional to contradictory or new information. At first, it may seem that since some men have traditionally not considered sexual assault an issue that is relevant to their lives (i.e., it's a "woman's issue"), their level of involvement should be low. If their involvement were low, we would expect to see a larger latitude of acceptance and a smaller latitude of rejection. However, it is very possible that at least some of the athletes who attended the current study's program were actually highly involved in the topic of sexual assault prevention. This is not to say that they were supportive of sexual assault prevention itself, but rather involved in their attendance at the program and the fact that they felt unfairly targeted for a prevention intervention. This would support the possible

boomerang effects seen with two of the outcome measures. As a result of respondents being more personally involved with the intervention, they possibly had a limited latitude of acceptance and a high latitude of rejection.

It is also probably not just coincidence that the potential boomerang effect was seen on the two outcome measures that were obviously related to a person's personal involvement with sexual assault prevention (confronting a perpetrator and actually sexually aggressing). Although rape myths (the other outcome measure) are undoubtedly related to sexual assault (Fonow et al., 1992; Koss & Gaines, 1993), they are more clearly connected to people's opinions about the issue of sexual assault, and not as obviously related to a participant's behavior or personal decisions. This may be one reason why rape myth acceptance did not endure a boomerang effect – participants were less "ego-involved" when just asked to provide their opinions. The more personal an outcome measure was, the higher possibility that it provoked the participant to feel "on guard" or personally attacked, which would involve them more with the issue of being unfairly targeted for the intervention. Indeed, the attitude seen with many of the current program's participants seemed to be one of skepticism and reluctance to attend. In candid conversations the researcher had with participants after workshops, some men actually still questioned why they had to be there and were visibly upset that they had to attend the program. A few participants asked if non-athletes on campus had to go through the same program, explaining that they felt the athletes were being unfairly targeted. Even the name of the program was changed to try and cover it's targeting of athletes, and to hopefully prevent their feeling unfairly targeted (the word athlete was not included in the program name when it was delivered to participants).

Some of the results from the utilization questions at the end of the program evaluation reflected some of the resentment that participants felt for having to attend. Respondents claimed that the main reason they (as individuals) would *not* utilize the program information was because they had already "heard the information before," indicating that the possibility that participants had a low latitude of acceptance for the information was prominent. The fact that "already knowing the information" was the second main reason why participants felt their teammates would not use the information, preceded by their teammates not caring about the program material or wanting to pay attention, further supports the possibility that participants rebounded because the information given in the program fell directly into their latitude of rejection. Unfortunately, only 46% of respondents chose to answer the open-ended question relating to why their teammates would or would not use the program information, and only 52% of respondents answered the question relating to why they as individuals would or would not utilize the program information. As a result, the interpretation of these results must be taken with caution. It is possible that a higher response rate would be necessary to capture the complexity of reasoning behind why people think their teammates or themselves would use information from a program such as this.

The interpretation of these findings is not to say that programs should avoid delivering new information to people with high latitudes of rejection, or low latitudes of acceptance. Rather, solutions offered by the persuasion literature advocate for more formative evaluation to help tailor the delivery of information at a rate that is acceptable (and therefore less likely to boomerang) for the audience (O'Keefe, 1990). In other

words, it is essential to know where your audience is coming from before trying to change where they are going.

Lonsway (1996) stated in her review of rape prevention programs that program developers need to look to the field of persuasion research and tap into the strides that persuasion researchers have made with program message effectiveness. The findings from this study not only support Lonsway's assertion, but also add more information on which to base the assertion. Namely, not only do persuasion theories need to be used in the development of program content and delivery, but also a more in-depth investigation of the targeted audience needs to inform the program developers in their choice of persuasive theories and rate of information delivery. Programs targeting specific populations (such as male collegiate athletes) who may have multiple resistances to the program, are in special need of clearly pre-defining the attitudes of the target audience to optimize the persuasive effectiveness of the program. Although most exploration of target audience attitudes is done through surveys, as discussed later in this section, involving students athletes themselves in the development and implementation of the program would be another way of ensuring that the program is appropriately addressing issues that are salient to a male collegiate athlete's life.

Despite the value of understanding the function of boomerang effects and how to avoid them, it is still important to review some of the implications of the results found for respondents' likelihood of sexually aggressing. Participants' responses to the pre-test and post-test measures of this outcome tell a more detailed story than that allowed by only reporting (and using) the scale mean. A participant's likelihood of sexually aggressing is also important to interpret in the context of how it was measured. An increase in score

(and therefore "likelihood of sexually aggressing"), while not ideal, may not be as dire as it seems upon first glance. While a score of 1 indicated that a person would never do the aggressive behavior, and a score of 5 indicated that a person would always engage in the aggressive behavior, a score of 3 indicated that he was unsure of whether or not he would be sexually aggressive. The mean score for participants' likelihood of sexually aggressing increased slightly (1.21 at pre-test to 1.31 at post-test) indicating that participants were more likely to sexually aggress after the intervention. Interestingly, the only category of response that increased at post-test was "undecided", while more extreme responses (scores of 4 "sometimes" or 5 "always") remained consistent.

Although uncertainty was not the goal of the workshop, nor is it a particularly desirable response, it may be viewed as more positive than if someone says they rarely will sexually aggress. Even if someone is rarely sexually aggressing, they still are sexually aggressing, whereas if they are unsure as to whether they would or not, they are considering possibly not doing it. In addition, the scores for this scale must be viewed in the context of the limited number of people who stated they would sexually aggress at pre-test. Since most people were already reporting they would never or rarely sexually aggress, there was a much narrower gap to close than if more people had reported at pre-test that they would sometimes or always sexually aggress.

It is also important to note that the skewness of the likelihood of sexually aggressing variable at pre-test may have complicated multivariate analyses. Considering that at pre-test the majority of respondents answered that they would "never" do any of the sexually abusive behaviors (scale mean = 1.15), there was little room for positive change at post-test due to the workshop.

The open-ended and closed-ended utilization questions added interesting insight into the possibility of group-level attitude and/or behavior change. As mentioned earlier, one of the most important factors in determining whether or not a member of a group will take the minority position and resist the majority pressure is if they feel confident and informed enough to take that action. It was encouraging that 86% of respondents stated that the information presented in the workshop would help them confront a teammate if that teammate was making a woman do something sexual that she did not want to do. Even though some respondents did not mention a teammate's actions as a factor worthy of confrontation, the fact that some people did (and some were morally opposed to sexual assault), lent some hope that these latter people would be the ones to take a dissenting minority position that would start group-level change. Interactive discussions that incorporated realistic scenarios in which peer pressure is used by teammates were purposefully incorporated to increase men's ability to stand up to their teammates.

It was encouraging to see that although attitude change was harder to come by, giving participants the right information about sexual assault and peer confrontation was something that helped most men feel more able to confront their teammates. Indeed, most of the participants who stated that they would use the information presented in the workshop said that the reason it would help them was due to new or useful information that the program offered. Unfortunately, due to the lack of people who chose to answer this open-ended question (52% of respondents) the number of people who said that the program offered new or useful information was only fifteen people. These results must be interpreted with caution, as a higher response rate must be attained to determine the strength of any findings such as the ones presented here. Nevertheless, it is interesting to

consider that the factors related to participants' confrontation of a teammate might stand in the way of any action being taken by participants who end up actually being in a situation like one of those described in the workshop.

Two additional utilization-focused items aid in the discussion of what factors participants felt would influence their decision to confront a teammate. Eighty-six percent of respondents reported that they thought the information presented in the workshop would help them confront a teammate. Yet, this high percentage stands in conceptual contrast to the fact that all but one of the factors respondents stated would influence their decision to confront their teammate were *not* discussed in the workshop. For example, the factor given most frequently was the woman's behavior or cues from the woman, and the factor least given was their teammate's behavior or cues from the teammate. Their teammate's behavior was the only factor that was at all advocated in the intervention, as part of the goal of helping participants learn how to confront a teammate. This discrepancy is concerning, given the fact that participants reported the program information was useful, yet the factors they considered most important when deciding to confront a teammate had little to do with the information from the workshop. Essentially, the information about confronting a teammate provided by the workshop will be useful to them when they decide that the factor most important in a particular situation is related to their teammate's behavior. Although a high percentage of respondents indicated that the information from the program would be useful, the likelihood that it would actually be put to use needs to be viewed in the context of the limited teammate-centered factors participants felt indicated that a situation was worthy of confrontation. It is important to consider these somewhat contradictory findings in light of the number of people who

chose to answer the open-ended question that captured what factors participants would consider when deciding to confront a teammate. It is possible that clarifying information relating to the actual use of program information would have been more feasible if more than just over half (62%) of respondents had answered the question.

One of the reasons for the lack of desirable responses to the confrontation questions may be related to the fact that the scenario exercise did not often culminate into a right or wrong set of answers. The program developers and facilitators had wanted to engage the participants in a discussion about each scenario, and in doing so, discussed each person's options and consequences around certain decisions for action. However, after participants gave their ideas for behavioral options, the facilitators did not specifically say that the decision was a wrong one, or clearly state what the right decision would be. The intention of this approach was to emphasize to participants that each person has multiple decisions to make in a situation and each decision has a good or bad consequence, depending on the situation. It is up to the participant to decide on his own what consequence is best based on each unique situation. This approach was modeled after the Mentors in Violence Prevention Project, which has taken a similar stance: "When we discuss with the young men their options for intervention in the various scenarios, we are careful not to choose for them the "best" option; that choice is for each person to make based on a unique set of circumstances" (Katz, 1995, p.168). Yet, the lack of explicitly labeling each decision as "good" or "bad" may have prevented participants from considering certain decisions more desirable than others. More clarity and a well-stated consistent program stance on certain options given by the audience would most likely help to more clearly advocate one decision over another and be more

effective at desirable attitude change among participants. This finding is particularly salient in light of the fact that the current study is the first to evaluate this approach for presumed effectiveness. Although the current program was significantly shorter in length than the Mentors in Violence Prevention Project (one hour or multiple sessions, respectively), it is worth further exploration into whether concise directional messages are needed to have an attitudinal impact for shorter programs.

Another interesting finding that emphasizes the importance of team relations to athletes is the fact that the third largest factor in participants' decision to confront a teammate was to protect their teammate, while *not one person* mentioned that protecting the woman was a factor. It could be construed that the respondents who stated that a factor in confrontation was their moral opposition to sexual assault could have been considering women's best interests in being against sexual assault. However, the fact that many respondents would act on behalf of their teammate's best interests, yet no one specifically mentioned acting on behalf of the woman's best interests, shows the strong influence that peer relations have in a team setting. It is for this reason that the current workshop focused on empowering members of a team to confront and sometimes use peer relations as a primary component to create group-level change within the team.

However, as reflected by the lack of desired significant findings for this study, it is doubtful that much peer interaction would take place as a result of the workshop (resulting in a lack of group-level change). One of the best ways to influence such a peer-focused group is to use peer facilitators in the development and delivery of the workshop itself (Lonsway et al., 1998; Mahlstedt & Jacobson, 2000; Smith & Welchans, 2000; Vickio et al., 1999). Unfortunately, student-athletes were not used in the program

development for the current workshop, nor were they used as facilitators. It is likely that the use of student athletes in the development stages of the workshop may have tailored the workshop in a more effective way, since student athletes are most familiar with what information is relevant to their lives. Peer involvement would not only aid in better curtailing the program's delivery and content; peer facilitators would help bring the attention and focus of participants back to the program. Merely by their visibility, peer facilitators would help to convince participants that the program material was relevant and worthwhile to their lives, and may increase the chances that individuals would be more likely to take the chance of being a minority dissenter and help create group-level change.

Other programs, such as the Mentors in Violence Prevention Project (Katz, 1995), the Fraternity Violence Education Project (Mahlstedt & Jacobson, 2000), and the First Step Peer Education Project (Smith & Welchans, 2000) strongly advocate the use of peer facilitators. Although research on the effectiveness of such programs in reducing rape-supportive attitudes is relatively scant, there is support that peer facilitation is an effective method of intervention for short-term attitude change (Foubert & Marriot, 1997; Heppner et al., 1995; Smith & Welchans, 2000). Not only do peer-facilitated programs offer a "safe" environment for men to discuss their honest feelings about the issue of sexual assault, it is possible that athletes involved in peer facilitation may actually gain a sense of "ownership" of the program and become more heavily involved in the marketing and delivery of the program to their fellow student athletes. Incorporating the use of student athletes into the design and implementation of a program targeting student athletes is of utmost importance and may indeed result in a much different (and positively significant)

outcome than seen in the current study which neglected to utilize current student athletes at all stages of implementation.

The concept of using student athletes to "sell" the program to other student athletes is related to the larger issue of ensuring that participants see how the program is relevant to their own lives and experiences. After examining participants' open-ended responses to the question of why they felt they would or would not use the information presented in the workshop, it was apparent that people thought they were either previously well educated about the topics presented ("already knew the program information, information was common knowledge") or were previously uneducated about the topics presented ("program offered new/useful information").

One issue that is also related to participant's latitude of acceptance, is that collegiate athletes often receive a high amount of programming about how to behave appropriately through "life skills" programming on topics such as dangers of drug use, how to stay off of academic probation, and relationship issues. It was not surprising that some of the players felt that they had "already heard this stuff before" if they were considering this program just one of many that they were presented during the course of one semester. Indeed, the program was scheduled and promoted by the same student athlete academic support center that provides other "life skills" trainings. If participants perceived the program as nothing new or useful, it is highly likely that the information given would have fallen directly into their level of rejection, thereby reducing program effectiveness.

This underscores the importance that future programming efforts targeting athletes take care to market their programs as being different than other "life skills"

trainings throughout the year. Having the participants know that the program they are attending is not just another "lecture" on how to stay out of trouble might help them to pay attention and come into the program expecting to learn something unique (which may also function to increase their latitude of acceptance). Again, it is important to note that the main reason people indicated that their teammates would not use the information presented in the workshop was that they thought their team "did not pay attention during the program or did not care about the program material." Although it is improbable that the marketing for one workshop could work to undo years of sexist comments that make men feel that sexual assault is just a "woman's issue," and therefore not worthy of their attention, having the program be viewed as unique and useful to the players (and not just "targeting" them) should help to keep their attention and increase their level of acceptance for the information presented.

Although program marketing and scheduling may seem like a peripheral concept for a sexual assault prevention program, it is of utmost importance when programs target a particular population of people (such as student athletes) who have an unequal amount of power and privilege compared to the rest of the general population. There are many reasons why a program needs to essentially be "sold" to male collegiate athletes. One reason (as discussed above) is that many male collegiate athletes feel unfairly targeted as "guilty" because they are asked to attend a program about sexual assault prevention. Although the issue that some athletes may have felt negatively targeted was taken seriously by the current program's developers (seen through change in program title, and the use of a video and discussion throughout as to why they were there), it seems as though the scope of this problem is almost too extreme for one program to conquer.

However, there are ways to increase the interest of participants and decrease the amount they feel unfairly targeted. Aside from peer involvement in the planning and implementation of the program, one helpful tool in marketing a program is coach involvement in the planning and implementation of the program. Unfortunately, coach involvement was severely lacking in the current study's program development, which undoubtedly impacted the reluctance of many of the program participants to participate in the workshop. When coaches are involved in the planning of a program, they may not only offer needed insight into the players' lives which helps frame program content and scheduling (e.g. scheduling the workshop when teams are out of season and have more time), they may also help influence whether or not players feel justified in going to the program. Even though collegiate athletes have elevated power over most domains of the college campus, they rarely have power over their coaches who decide the fate of their athletic career on a daily basis (Benedict, 1998). Having coaches involved with and openly supportive of the program helps set the standard for player involvement and accountability. Although coaches were not involved in the planning of the current program, coach involvement at the trainings themselves obviously played a role in players' willingness to participate. The three sessions that had the highest attendance and best audience participation were swimming, football, and basketball. For all three trainings, the head coach was present at either the beginning or the end of the program, and in some cases even introduced the program to the team. It was clear through the introduction, as well as simply the coaches' presence at the training, that the coach felt the program was important and worthy of the team's attention.

The strength of the effect of coach involvement is even more pronounced when considering that men's football and basketball are the two most high profile teams on campus, often resulting in a lack of player accountability (Benedict, 1998). It was amazing to not only get some players from these teams to the trainings, but *most* players from these teams to the trainings. This was indeed a clear sign that coach involvement with and visibility to the players increased players' accountability to the prevention program. It is highly likely that only through increased player and coach involvement will participant accountability for and attendance at a prevention program be increased.

The findings related to which characteristics of the athlete (sport-specific or non sport-specific) predicted post-intervention change are interesting to consider. There are many sport-specific factors that have been suggested to predict the effectiveness of a sexual assault prevention program targeting male collegiate athletes (e.g. competitiveness, contact vs. non-contact sport participation, number of years participated in intercollegiate sports). It is interesting to note that none of the sport specific variables measured in this study contributed a significant amount of unique variance to any of the three outcome variables. Three of the variables (win orientation, competitiveness, and goal orientation) were used to identify if there was a component of an athlete's sport-related personality that would be more closely associated with his attitude change due to participation in the workshop. The other two sport variables (contact vs. non-contact and number of years participated in intercollegiate athletics) are both components of the extra-individual sport experience that have been suggested in the literature to have a possible relationship with an athlete's sexual aggression (Benedict, 1998; Boeringer, 1996; Koss and Gaines, 1993).

However, neither extra-individual characteristics of the sports experience, nor intra-individual personality factors played a significant role in athletes' attitude change due to participation in the workshop. Rather, significant factors included non sport-related variables that are commonly used in the field of sexual assault research. Participants' acceptance of general violence as well as their severity of prior sexual aggression both significantly predicted change in participants' rape myth acceptance due to the workshop. It is unclear why participants' acceptance of general violence, and not their acceptance of interpersonal violence, was significantly related to the outcome of the workshop. One would think that statements endorsing general violence (e.g. "any prisoner deserves to be mistreated by other prisoners in jail") would be less related to attitudes around sexual assault, than statements endorsing interpersonal violence (e.g. "it is alright for a partner to hit the other if they flirt with others"). It is possible that there is a more complex relationship between participants' attitudes about sexual assault and their acceptance of general and interpersonal violence that was not captured within the scope of the analyses used in this study.

It was not surprising that participants' level of prior sexual aggression significantly predicted participants' post-intervention change in rape myth acceptance. It is likely that the more severely a man sexually aggresses, the more convoluted and extreme his perceptions of sexual assault and rape victims are, hence less of a chance that his attitudes about rape myths would be affected by a one-hour workshop. This would also serve to further expand participants' latitude of rejection, which reduces the chances of attitude change due to the workshop.

It was not surprising either, that the only variable that significantly predicted participants' post-intervention change in likelihood of confronting was participants' severity of prior sexual aggression. For the same reasons listed above, attitude change would be more difficult if a person had perpetrated some level of sexual aggression and had in any way started to justify or ignore his actions. People who have more severe levels of sexual aggression may also be less likely to recognize situations that are potentially abusive, so educating them about the warning signs of abuse and how to intervene could possibly take longer than the short period of time allotted for the current program.

Initially, the lack of significant sport-specific predictors related to post-intervention change does not support the inferences that have been made suggesting that athletes have specific factors that are associated with their level of sexual assault. Although the addition of sport specific variables to each of the three regression equations did not significantly predict post-intervention change, it is important to recognize two reasons for why these sport-specific variables were not found to be significant. One reason may be their interrelatedness to other non sport-specific variables that were found to be significantly related to change in attitude at post-test. It is possible that involvement in sports may less overtly affect a man's scores on other attitudinal factors related to program effectiveness (e.g. severity of sexual aggression). For example, it has been found that a man's hostility toward women is significantly related to his severity of sexual aggression (Koss & Gaines, 1993). Men's sports are largely known to foster an anti-female sentiment, and be socially degrading toward women, female sexuality, and anything feminine (Crosset et al., 1996; Nelson, 1994). It is this overt opposition to

anything feminine in men's sports that may increase some male athlete's hostility toward women. A further investigation of this relationship is warranted, however, because not all male athletes are hostile toward women. This relationship, as well as the relationships between other general attitudinal and sport-specific factors could only be explored with the use of a non-athlete comparison group, which was not included in the current study. However, more work needs to be done to determine the effects of sport-specific characteristics on general attitudinal variables that are related to sexual assault and the effectiveness of sexual assault prevention programs. Before researchers conclude that sports involvement (or the culture) is indicative of sexual assault, the missing link between sports involvement and general attitudes related to sexual assault needs to be clarified.

In addition to the above needed conceptual clarifications, a second reason for the lack of sport-specific variable significance in the prediction of post-intervention attitudinal change may be the possible limitation of testing intra-individual sport variables (e.g. competitiveness) with a specifically defined group such as intercollegiate athletes. A restriction of scale range seemed to be prevalent as seen through the lack of variability on each of the sport scales (most participants scored high on all three of the scales) used in the current study. This was not surprising, when taking into account how devoted and focused on sports one must be to compete at the intercollegiate level. Nevertheless, this lack of variability may explain to some extent the lack of relationship that each of these three sport variables had with the criterion variables. The scales used to measure the three attitudinal sport-specific characteristics (i.e. competitiveness, win orientation, goal orientation) may have been psychometrically unsound for a population

as specifically defined as male collegiate athletes. Not only were the sport orientation scale psychometrics obtained from the general student body at a large university, the scale itself was not specifically designed for intercollegiate athletes (Gill & Deeter, 1988). Because the developers of the scale intended for it to capture a person's sport achievement orientation both in noncompetitive and competitive sports involvement, it may have offered too narrow a range of responses for the level of sports achievement seen at the intercollegiate level. It is possible that (as seen in the current study) male collegiate athletes hold extreme enough attitudes for each of the sport scales used that the full range of respondents' attitudes about sport involvement were not captured. A scale that is able to discern between varying levels of sport-specific attitudes *within the collegiate athlete population* would be necessary to more accurately test whether sport-specific characteristics truly account for any differences in the prediction of attitude change after attending a sexual assault prevention workshop.

As a whole, the lack of sport-specific characteristics that were related to the effectiveness of a program targeting athletes emphasizes two points. First, that prevention programs targeting athletes need to target men's general attitudes about women and sexual assault, rather than just sport-specific characteristics of the athletes. Although the experience of being an athlete may contribute to attitudinal factors related to sexual assault prevention program effectiveness, the underlying general attitudinal factors (e.g. acceptance of general violence) are still the most salient contributors to a program's effectiveness. This is not to say that program content should not be tailored to the specific experiences of a collegiate athlete. Rather, programs need to focus overall goals of attitude change toward general attitudes about women and sexual assault (e.g.

hostility toward women), and incorporate the athletic experience into the details of the workshop (e.g. through examples given in exercises). For example, the scenarios used in exercises should be relevant to the life of an athlete (e.g. including discussions about "groupies"). Yet the desired attitudinal change should be focused on reducing rape myths and decreasing the likelihood that the participant may choose to sexually assault a person in the future. The fact that the audience consists of male collegiate athletes should guide the development of examples and situations discussed, yet the goal of attitude change for the workshop should not differ drastically from any prevention program targeting college men, which usually aims to reduce acceptance of rape myths, likelihood of sexually aggressing, etc.

The fact that involvement in sports may contribute to general attitudinal factors related to sexual assault leads to the second point taken from the lack of sport-specific predictors. Prevention program efforts that target student-athletes may serve as the bare minimum required to actually change a culture that may be supportive of sexual assault. Although the current program aimed to change the athlete peer group culture by increasing the chance that participants would hold teammates accountable for their actions and help break the protection of the male peer environment, it is apparent that players' decisions for intervening are based on a myriad of different reasons. Considering that one of the most mentioned reasons for confronting a teammate was to protect him from "doing something that would get him in trouble," it is obvious the weight that outside punitive actions and player accountability from outside of the peer group of a team has on players' decisions to take action. Although it would be ethically desirable for male collegiate athletes to want to take steps to prevent sexual assault

because of the heinous and destructive nature of the crime, the fact that sexual assault is a crime may take precedent to actually create change in the behavior of this group's culture as a whole.

The role of administrators, coaches, and the general public in holding collegiate athletes more accountable for their off-the-field behavior may be the critical link that is missing from the prevention of sexual assault within this group culture (Benedict, 1998). As seen with the current study, the individual characteristics of being an athlete may not be related to the effectiveness of prevention programming, but the *experience* of being an athlete and how accountability among players is handled may indeed be related to the effectiveness of any prevention efforts. It has been found that non-athlete collegiate men are not always given the same punitive leniency as some collegiate male athletes (Benedict, 1998), which indicates that the prevention of sexual assault seems to be more linked to changing the way the system of male collegiate sports treats athletes, rather than solely focusing on changing the athletes themselves.

It is much easier to point the finger of blame at individuals, because change at the individual level is seen as simpler and more cost-effective. Changing athletes' individual attitudes, which in turn may change some team norms, is a start. Yet the level of intervention needs to transcend the individual-level of athletes and reach the systemic-level in which they operate that allows sexual assault and lack of accountability for offenses to occur. The fact that coach involvement greatly increases the chance that players are accountable for merely attending and participating in a workshop, indicates the strength with which changes made to the world outside of the athlete may enhance sexual assault prevention efforts. If sexual assault truly is a cultural phenomenon as

Sanday (1990) asserted years ago, it is necessary to explore areas outside of even group-level characteristics which are a determinant of intra-individual student athlete characteristics, and look to change systematic factors such as coaches, athletic administrators, apparel and equipment sponsors, fans, and campus administration. As Benedict (1998, p. xiii) concluded, "the problem of rape by athletes is much more a result of their celebrity than their athleticism." We must actually strive to change the culture in which male collegiate athletes exist in order to effectively change their behavior within that culture.

Measurement Design Limitations and Suggestions

As a final note, it is important to note the limitations of the particular measurement design used in this study. Self-report questionnaires may have resulted in a degree of social desirability for some respondents. This may be reflected in respondents' extremely low pre-test scores for certain outcome measures (e.g. likelihood of sexually aggressing). As stated above, participants knew they were attending a program about relationship violence, so it is possible that they may have initially endorsed low levels of sexual aggression, as well as other attitudes that are seen as socially undesirable to the majority American culture (e.g. hostility toward women). Additionally, to more accurately interpret program evaluation results like those found in the current study, it would be necessary to compare all results to a comparison (or control) group who did not receive the workshop. By using a control group, issues such as social desirability may be more easily identified, as a control group that does not know about or attend a

relationship violence intervention may possibly have lower social desirability than the target group who receives the intervention.

Finally, it is also important to strive to conduct pre-post tests at time points that are separate from the program being evaluated (e.g. one week or more apart from the program). Conducting immediate pre and post-tests could possibly have an effect on both the pre and post-tests scores (including social desirability). It is also important to incorporate follow-up testing to measure any rebounding effects that may occur after the intervention, as well as to capture any general attrition of attitudinal change. The planning committee and evaluator of the current study negotiated with numerous individuals responsible for scheduling the program yet were unable to arrive at a compromise for conducting pre and post-tests apart from the workshop. Scheduling the workshop itself was also quite challenging, due to conflicting team schedules and lack of coach and player interest. It was seen as too time consuming and almost logistically impossible to schedule times for team members to complete pre or post-tests at a time apart from the time scheduled for the workshop. The challenge of scheduling evaluation time further emphasizes the importance of building collaborative relationships with stakeholders in the athletic department, including players, coaches, and administrators. Only when those people who are directly affected by programming (e.g. players, coaches and administrators) value the importance of sexual assault prevention workshops, will they build time into their busy schedules that allows for more effective measurement designs to be possible.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

Baker, P. (1992). Maintaining male power: Why heterosexual men use pornography. In C. Itzen (Ed.), Pornography: Women, violence, and civil liberties (pp. 124-144). New York: Oxford University Press.

Baron, L., & Strauss, M. (1989). Four theories of rape. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Benedict, J., & Klein, A. (1997). Arrest and conviction rates for athletes accused of sexual assault. Sociology of Sport, 14, 86-94.

Benedict, J. (1998). Athletes and acquaintance rape. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Berg, D. R., Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1999). Rape prevention education for men: The effectiveness of empathy induction techniques. Journal of College Student Development, 40(3), 219-234.

Berger, N.-M. (1994). An exploration of the effectiveness of an acquaintance rape prevention program designed for male intercollegiate athletes. Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: the Sciences and Engineering, 54(9-B), 4907.

Berkowitz, A. (1992). College men as perpetrators of acquaintance rape and sexual assault: A review of recent research. Journal of American College Health, 40(4), 175-181.

Berkowitz, A. D., Burkhart, B. R., & Bourg, S. E. (1994). Research on college men and rape. In A. D. Berkowitz (Ed.), Men and rape: Theory, research, and prevention programs in higher education (Vol. 65, pp. 3-20). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boeringer, S. B., Shehan, C., & Akers, R. (1991). Social contexts and social learning in sexual coercion and aggression: Assessing the contribution of fraternity membership. Family Relations, 40, 58-64.

Boeringer, S.-B. (1996). Influences of Fraternity Membership, Athletics, and Male Living Arrangements on Sexual Aggression. Violence Against Women, 2(2), 134-147.

Boeringer, S.-B. (1999). Associations of rape-supportive attitudes with fraternal and athletic participation. Violence Against Women, 5(1), 81-90.

Bohmer, C., & Parrot, A. (1993). Sexual assault on campus: The problem and the solution. New York: Lexington.

Borden, L. A., Karr, S. K., & Caldwell-Colbert, A. (1988). Effects of a university rape

prevention program on attitudes and empathy toward rape. Journal of College Student Development, 29, 132-136.

Breitenbecher, K.H. (2000). Sexual assault on college campuses: Is an ounce of prevention enough? Applied and Preventive Psychology, 9, 23-52.

Brownmiller, S. (1975). Against our will: Men , women and rape. New York: Fawcett Columbine.

Bryson, L. (1987). Sport and maintenance of masculine hegemony. Women's Studies International Forum, 10, 349-360.

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

Caron, S.L., Carter, D.B., & Brightman, L.A. (1985). Sex role orientation and attitudes toward women: differences among college athletes. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 61, 803-806.

Caron, S.L. (1993). Athletes as rape-awareness educators: Athletes for Sexual Responsibility. Journal of American College Health, 41(6), 275-276.

Caron, S.L., Halteman, W.A., & Stacy, C. (1997). Athletes and rape: Is there a connection? Perceptual and Motor Skills, 85(3, Pt 2), 1379-1393.

Carroll, K., & Jackson, T.L. (1996). Rape education and prevention training. In Jackson, Thomas L. (Eds.), Acquaintance rape: Assessment, treatment, and prevention (pp. 177-213). Sarasota, FL, USA: Professional Resource Press/Professional Resource Exchange, Inc.

Check, J. V. P., Malamuth, N. M., Elias, B., & Barton, S. (1985, April). On hostile ground. Psychology Today, 56-61.

Clark, R.D., and Maass, A. (1988). A social categorization in minority influence: The case of homosexuality. European Journal of Social Psychology, 18, 347-364.

Crosset, T.-W., Benedict, J.-R., & McDonald, M.-A. (1995). Male Student-Athletes Reported for Sexual Assault: A Survey of Campus Police Departments and Judicial Affairs Offices. Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 19(2), 126-140.

Crosset, T.-W., Ptacek, J., McDonald, M.-A., & Benedict, J.-R. (1996). Male Student-Athletes and Violence against Women: A Survey of Campus Judicial Affairs Offices. Violence Against Women, 2(2), 163-179.

Curry, T.-J. (1991). Fraternal Bonding in the Locker Room: A Profeminist Analysis of Talk about Competition and Women. Sociology of Sport Journal, 8(2), 119-135.

Dallager, C., & Rosen, L. A. (1993). Effects of a human sexuality course on attitudes toward rape and violence. Journal of Sex Education and Therapy, 19, 193-199.

DeKeseredy, W.-S., Schwartz, M.-D., & Tait, K. (1993). Sexual assault and stranger aggression on a Canadian university campus. Sex Roles, 28(5-6), 263-277.

Dershowitz, A. (1994, August 6). When women cry rape - falsely. Boston Herald, pp. 13.

Dworkin, A. (1993). I want a twenty-four hour truce during which there is no rape. In E. Buchwald (Ed.), Transforming a Rape Culture (pp. 13-22). Minneapolis, MN: Milkweed Editions.

Ellis, A. L., O'Sullivan, C. S., & Sowards, B. A. (1992). The impact of contemplated exposure to a survivor of rape on attitudes toward rape. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22, 889-895.

Ezkenazi, G. (1990, June 3). Athletic aggression and sexual assault. The New York Times, pp. p.A27.

Feltey, K.-M., Ainslie, J.-J., & Geib, A. (1991). Sexual coercion attitudes among high school students: The influence of gender and rape education. Youth and Society, 23(2), 229-250.

Fischoff, B., Furby, L., & Morgan, M. (1987). Rape prevention: A typology of strategies. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 2(3), 292-308.

Fonow, M. M., Richardson, L., & Wemmerus, V. A. (1992). Feminist rape education: Does it work? Gender and Society, 6, 108-121.

Foubert, J.-D., & McEwen, M.-K. (1998). An all-male rape prevention peer education program: Decreasing fraternity men's behavioral intent to rape. Journal of College Student Development, 39(6), 548-556.

Frintner, M.-P., & Rubinson, L. (1993). Acquaintance rape: The influence of alcohol, fraternity membership, and sports team membership. Journal of Sex Education and Therapy, 19(4), 272-284.

Funk, R. E. (1993). Stopping rape: A challenge for men. Philadelphia: New Society Publications.

Furby, L., Fischhoff, B., & Morgan, M. (1991). Rape Prevention and Self-Defense: At What Price? Women's Studies International Forum, 14, 1-2.

Gibson, P.-R. (1992). An intervention designed to modify attitudes toward acquaintance rape in college students. Dissertation Abstracts International, 53(2-B).

Gilbert, B. J., Heesacker, M., & Gannon, L. J. (1991). Changing men's sexual aggression-supportive attitudes: A psychoeducational intervention. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38, 197-203.

Gilbert N. (1992_b, May). The phantom epidemic of sexual assault. The Public Interest, 103, 54-65.

Gill, D. L., & Deeter, T. E. (1988). Development of the sport orientation questionnaire. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 59(3), 191-202.

Gray, M. D., Lesser, D., Quinn, E., & Bounds, C. (1990). The effectiveness of personalizing acquaintance rape prevention: Programs on perception of vulnerability and on reducing risk-taking behavior. Journal of College Student Development, 31, 217-220.

Hackman, J.R. (1976). Group influences on individuals. In Dunnette, M.D. (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 1455-1525). Chicago, IL : Rand McNally.

Hanson, K.-A., & Gidycz, C.-A. (1993). Evaluation of a sexual assault prevention program. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 61(6), 1046-1052.

Helmreich, R., Spence, J., & Wilhelm, J. (1981). A psychometric analysis of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire. Sex Roles, 7, 1097-1108.

Heppner, M.-J., Humphrey, C.-F., Hillenbrand-Gunn, T.-L., & DeBord, K.-A. (1995). The differential effects of rape prevention programming on attitudes, behavior, and knowledge. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42(4), 508-518.

Heppner, M.-J., Neville, H.-A., Smith, K., Kivlighan, D.-M., Jr., & Gershuny, B.-S. (1999). Examining immediate and long-term efficacy of rape prevention programming with racially diverse college men. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 46(1), 16-26.

Humphrey, S.E. & Kahn, A.S. (2000). Fraternities, athletic teams, and rape: Importance of identification with a risky group. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15(12), 1313-1322.

Kang, L., Gill, D., Acevedo, E., Deeter, T. (1990). Competitiveness orientations among athletes and nonathletes in Taiwan. International Journal of Sports Psychology, 21, 146-157.

Kanin, E. (1957). Male aggression in dating-courtship violence. American Journal of Sociology, 63, 191-204.

Katz, J. (1995). Reconstructing Masculinity in the Locker Room: The Mentors in Violence Prevention Project. Harvard Educational Review, 65(2), 163-174.

Kidd, B. (1990). The men's cultural center: Sports and the dynamic of women's oppression/men's repression. In M. A. Messner & D. F. Sabo (Eds.), Sport, men, and the gender order: Critical feminist perspectives (pp. 31-42). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Kimmel, M.S., Messner, M.A., & Benedict, J.R. (1989). Athletes and Acquaintance Rape. In M.S. Kimmel, M.A. Messner (Eds.), Men's lives. New York, NY, USA: Macmillan Publishing Co, Inc.

Koss, M.P., & Gidycz, C.A. (1985). Sexual experiences survey; Reliability and validity. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53, 422-423.

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., & Harvey, M.R. (1991). The rape victim: Clinical and community interventions (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA, USA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Koss, M.P., & Gaines, J.A. (1993). The Prediction of Sexual Aggression by Alcohol Use, Athletic Participation, and Fraternity Affiliation. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 8(1), 94-108.

Koss, M.-P., & Cleveland, H.-H., III. (1996). Athletic Participation, Fraternity Membership, and Date Rape: The Question Remains-Self-Selection or Different Causal Processes? Violence Against Women, 2(2), 180-190.

Krulewitz, J. E., & Kahn, A. S. (1983). Preferences for rape reduction strategies. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 7(4), 301-312.

Lackie, L., & de-Man, A.-F. (1997). Correlates of Sexual Aggression among Male University Students. Sex Roles, 37, 5-6.

Lee, L. A. (1987). Rape prevention: Experiential training for men. Journal of Counseling and Development, 66, 100-101.

Lenihan, G. O., Rawlins, M. E., Eberly, C. G., Buckley, B., & Masters, B. (1992). Gender differences in rape supportive attitudes before and after a date rape education intervention. Journal of College Student Development, 33, 331-338.

Lenihan, G.-O., & Rawlins, M.-E. (1994). Rape supportive attitudes among Greek students before and after a date rape prevention program. Journal of College Student Development, 35(6), 450-455.

Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1994). Rape myths: In review. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 18, 133-164.

Lonsway, K.-A. (1996). Preventing acquaintance rape through education: What do we know? Psychology of Women Quarterly, 20(2), 229-265.

Lonsway, K. A., Klaw, E. L., Berg, D. R., Waldo, C. R., Kothari, C., Mazurek, C. J., & Hegeman, K. E. (1998). Beyond "No means no": Outcomes of an intensive program to train peer facilitators for campus acquaintance rape education. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 13(1), 73-92.

MacKinnon, C. (1987). Feminism Unmodified: Discourses on life and law. Boston: Harvard University Press.

MacKinnon, C. (1993). Only Words. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mahlstedt, D., & Jacobson, S. (2000). Innovative sexual assault prevention programs for men: Fraternity Violence Education Project. Unpublished presentation given at the National Sexual Assault Prevention Conference, May 16-19, 2000.

Makepeace, J. M. (1986). Gender differences in courtship violence victimization. Family Relations, 35, 383-388.

Malamuth, N. M., Sockloskie, R. J., Koss, M. P., & Tanaka, J. S. (1991). Characteristics of aggressors against women: Testing a model using a national sample of college students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 59, 670-681.

Mann, C. A., Hecht, M. L., & Valentine, K. B. (1988). Performance in a social context: Date rape versus date right. Central States Speech Journal, 3/4, 269-280.

Martin, P. Y., & Hummer, R. A. (1989). Fraternities and rape on campus. Gender and Society, 3, 457-473.

Matabuti, H. (1993). On Becoming Anti-Rapist. In E. Buchwald (Ed.), Transforming a Rape Culture (pp. 165-178). Minneapolis, MN: Milkweed Editions.

Messner, M. A. (1992). Power at play: Sports and the problem of masculinity. Boston: Beacon Press.

Messner, M. A., & Sabo, D. F. (Eds.). (1994). Sex, violence, and power in sports: Rethinking masculinity. Freedom,CA: The Crossing Press.

Moskovici, S. (1980). Studies in social influence: V. Minority influence and conversion behavior in a perceptual task. Journal-of-Experimental-Social-Psychology. Vol 16(3): 270-282

Muehlenhard, C., & Linton, M. (1987). Date rape and sexual aggression in dating situations: Incidence and risk factors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 6, 20-31.

Nemeth, C. J. (1995). Dissent as driving cognition, attitudes, and judgments. Social Cognition, 13 (3), 273-291.

Nemeth, C.J. and Chiles, C. (1988). Modeling courage: The role of dissent in fostering independence. European Journal of Social Psychology, 18, 275-280.

Nemeth, C. J. (1986). Differential contributions of majority and minority influence. Psychological Review, 93 (1), 23-32.

Neimark, J. (1991,). Out of bounds: The truth about athletes and rape. Mademoiselle, 97, 196-199, 244-246.

National Victim Center (1992). Rape in America: A Report to the Nation . Charleston, SC: Report prepared by the Crime Victims Research and Treatment Center, Medical University of South Carolina.

Nelson, M. B. (1994). The stronger women get, the more men love football: Sexism and the American culture of sports. New York: Avon Books.

Northeastern University Student Handbook. (1999)

O'Keefe, D.J. (1990). Persuasion: Theory and research. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Parrot, A., Cummings, N., Marchell, T.C., & Hofher, J. (1994). A rape awareness and prevention model for male athletes. Journal of American College Health, 42(4), 179-184.

Payne, D. L., Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1999). Rape myth acceptance: Exploration of its structure and its measurement using the Illinois rape myth acceptance scale. Journal of Research in Personality, 33, 27-68.

Patton, M.Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Pinzone-Glover, H.-A., Gidycz, C.-A., & Jacobs, C. (1998). An acquaintance rape prevention program: Effects on attitudes toward women, rape-related attitudes, and perceptions of rape scenarios. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22(4), 605-621.

Proto-Campise, L., Belknap, J., & Wooldredge, J. (1998). High school students'

adherence to rape myths and the effectiveness of high school rape-awareness programs. Violence Against Women, 4(3), 308-328.

Rickert, V. I., & Wiemann, C. M. (1998). Date rape among adolescents and young adults. Journal of Pediatric and Adolescent Gynecology, 11(4), 167-75.

Ring, T. E., & Kilmartin, C. (1992). Man to man about rape: A rape prevention program for men. Journal of College Student Development, 33, 82-84.

Rivera, G., & Regoli, R. (1987). Sexual victimization experiences of sorority women. Sociology and Social Research, 12, 39-42.

Sanday, P. R. (1990). Fraternity Gang Rape: Sex, brotherhood, and privilege on campus. New York: New York University Press.

Sanday, P. R. (1996). Rape-prone versus rape-free campus cultures. Violence Against Women, 2, 191-208.

Schaeffer, A., & Nelson, E. (1993). Rape supportive attitudes: Effects of on-campus residence and education. Journal of College Student Development, 34, 175-179.

Schewe, P., & O'Donohue, W. (1993). Rape prevention: Methodological problems and new directions. Clinical Psychology Review, 13(7), 667-682.

Schewe, P.-A., & O'Donohue, W. (1996). Rape prevention with high-risk males: Short-term outcome of two interventions. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 25(5), 455-471.

Schewe, P.A., & O'Donohue, W. (1998). Psychometrics of the Rape Conformity Assessment and other measures: Implications for rape prevention. Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment, 10(2), 97-112.

Schmidt, B., & Peter, A. (1996). The Petze Project: Working with teachers on the prevention of sexual violence against girls and boys in Germany. Women's Studies International Forum, 19(4), 395-407.

Schwartz, M.D., & Nogrady, C.A. (1996). Fraternity membership, rape myths, and sexual aggression on a college campus. Violence Against Women, 2(2), 148-162.

Schwartz, M.D., & DeKeseredy, W.S. (1997). Sexual assault on the college campus: The role of male peer support. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Schwartz, M.D. (1997). Researching sexual violence against women: Methodological and personal perspectives. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Smith, P., & Welchans, S. (2000). Peer education: Does focusing on male responsibility

change sexual assault attitudes? Violence Against Women, 6 (11), 1255-1268.

Sommers, C.H. (1994). Who stole feminism? New York, N.Y.: Touchstone.

Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L., & Stapp, J. (1974). The Personal Attributes Questionnaire: A measure of sex-role stereotypes and masculinity-femininity. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 4(127).

Stanko, E.A. (1990). Everyday violence: How women and men experience sexual and physical danger. London: Pandora.

Tabachnick, B. & Fidell, L. (2000). Using Multivariate Statistics. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Thorne, B. (1993). Gender play: Girls and boys in school. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Thorner-Finch, R. (1992). Ending the silence: The origins and treatment of male violence against women. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Toufexis, A. (1990, Aug. 6). Sex and the sporting life. Time, 9(No. 243), 76-77.

Turner, S.P. (1996). Male students and date rape related attitudes: A comparative study of athletes, greeks, and independents. Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: the Sciences and Engineering, 56(11-B), 6471.

Vanburen-Hay, B.E. (1999). Unpublished training materials from the Sexual Assault Program at Michigan State University.

Vickio, C.J., Hoffman, B.A., Yarris, E. (1999). Combating sexual offenses on the college campus: Keys to success. Journal of American College Health, 47, 283-286.

Volpato, C., Maass, A., Mucchi-Faina, A., and Vitti, E. (1990). Minority influence: Social categorization. European Journal of Social Psychology, 20, 119-132.

Whitson, D. (1990). Sport and the social construction of masculinity. In M. A. Messner & D. F. Sabo (Eds.), Sport, men, and the gender order: Critical feminist perspectives (pp. 19-30). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Yeater, E.A. & O'Donohue, W. (1999). Sexual assault prevention programs: Current issues, future directions, and the potential efficacy of interventions with women. Clinical Psychology Review, 19, 7, 739-771.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Pre-test Questionnaire:

Consent Form
Sport Orientation Questionnaire
Sex Role Stereotyping Scale
Sexual Experiences Survey
Likelihood of Sexually Aggressing
Likelihood of Confronting
Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale – Short Form
Hostility Toward Women Scale
Attitudes Toward Violence Scale
Thank You Form

The following pages contain questions about your attitudes and opinions about a variety of issues. Your responses are completely confidential. Please **DO NOT** write your name on any of the sheets in this packet.

Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary, and you may refuse to participate at any time. You may refuse to respond at any time to particular questions without penalty. You indicate your voluntary agreement to participate by completing and returning this questionnaire. You will have **15 minutes** to complete this packet. Some of the questions are highly personal, and in the case that any of the topics presented upsets or offends you, a list of helpful phone numbers and resources has been included in your folder. You may also contact the project investigator (Wendi Siebold) if you have any questions or concerns about this survey at: 353-5015.

Thank you for your time, and please remember that **all of your responses are strictly confidential.**

When you have completed your packet, place it in the manila envelope and hold onto it until the end of the workshop – do not show your answers to anyone else or write your name on any of the pages in the packet!

Thanks again for helping!

Please turn to the next page ⇒

Sport Orientation Questionnaire

Please circle the number of years you have participated as an intercollegiate athlete at MSU (including redshirt years):

1 2 3 4 5 more than 5

The following statements describe reactions to sport situations. We want to know how you *usually* feel about sports and competition. Read each statement and circle the letter that indicates how much you agree or disagree with each statement on the scale: A, B, C, D, E. There are no right or wrong answers; simply answer as you honestly feel. Do not spend too much time on any one statement. Remember, choose the letter that describes how you *usually* feel about sports and competition.

	Strongly agree	Slightly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Slightly disagree	Strongly disagree
1. I am a determined competitor.	A	B	C	D	E
2. Winning is important.	A	B	C	D	E
3. I am a competitive person.	A	B	C	D	E
4. I set goals for myself when I compete.	A	B	C	D	E
5. I try my hardest to win.	A	B	C	D	E
6. Scoring more points than my opponent is very important to me.	A	B	C	D	E
7. I look forward to competing.	A	B	C	D	E
8. I am most competitive when I try to achieve personal goals.	A	B	C	D	E
9. I enjoy competing against others.	A	B	C	D	E
10. I hate to lose.	A	B	C	D	E
11. I thrive on competition.	A	B	C	D	E

12. I try hardest when I have a specific goal.	A	B	C	D	E
13. My goal is to be the best athlete possible.	A	B	C	D	E
14. The only time I am satisfied is when I win.	A	B	C	D	E
15. I want to be successful in sports.	A	B	C	D	E
16. Performing to the best of my ability is very important to me.	A	B	C	D	E
17. I work hard to be successful in sports.	A	B	C	D	E
18. Losing upsets me.	A	B	C	D	E
19. The best test of my ability is competing against others.	A	B	C	D	E
20. Reaching personal performance goals is very important to me.	A	B	C	D	E
21. I look forward to the opportunity to test my skills in competition.	A	B	C	D	E
22. I have the most fun when I win.	A	B	C	D	E
23. I perform my best when I am competing against an opponent.	A	B	C	D	E
24. The best way to determine my ability is to set a goal and try to reach it.	A	B	C	D	E
25. I want to be the best every time I compete.	A	B	C	D	E

Please turn to the next page ⇒

Sex Role Stereotyping Scale

Please use the following scale to indicate how strongly you agree with each of these statements. Write the number of your choice on the line to the left of the statement.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all agree	**Mostly do not agree**	**Somewhat do not agree**	**Undecided**	**Somewhat agree**	**Mostly agree**	**Very much agree**

1. ____ A man should fight when the woman he's with is insulted by another man.
2. ____ It is acceptable for the woman to pay for the date.
3. ____ A woman should be a virgin when she marries.
4. ____ There is something wrong with a woman who doesn't want to marry and raise a family.
5. ____ A wife should never contradict her husband in public.
6. ____ It is better for a woman to use her feminine charm to get what she wants rather than ask for it outright.
7. ____ It is acceptable for a woman to have a career, but marriage and family should come first.
8. ____ It looks worse for a woman to be drunk than for a man to be drunk.
9. ____ There is nothing wrong with a woman going to a bar alone.

Please turn to the next page ⇒

Sexual Experiences Survey

Please indicate how frequently you have engaged in each of the listed behaviors. Please remember that all of your responses are strictly confidential.

The response codes indicate:
N = **Never** 1 = **Once** 2 = **Twice** S = **Sometimes** O = **Often**

	Since you were 14 years old
1. Made "cat-calls", whistled, or yelled at a woman on the street.	N 1 2 S O
2. Touched a woman's buttocks, breasts, or genital area against her wishes.	N 1 2 S O
3. Attempted sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to by overwhelming her with continual argument and pressure.	N 1 2 S O
4. Attempted sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to by giving her more alcohol or drugs than she could handle.	N 1 2 S O
5. Attempted sexual intercourse with a woman by threatening to use force.	N 1 2 S O
6. Attempted sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to by using some degree of force.	N 1 2 S O
7. Had sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to by overwhelming her with continual argument and pressure.	N 1 2 S O
8. Had sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to by giving her more alcohol or drugs than she could handle.	N 1 2 S O
9. Had sexual intercourse with a woman by threatening to use force.	N 1 2 S O
10. Had sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to by using some degree of force.	N 1 2 S O

11. Stood in line to have sex with a "party girl."	N 1 2 S O
12. Had sexual intercourse with a "groupie."	N 1 2 S O
13. Stood in line to have sex with a "groupie."	N 1 2 S O
14. Had sexual intercourse with a woman who protested, but who really wanted to have sex.	N 1 2 S O

Likelihood of Sexually Aggressing
(italicized statements are filler items)

Please use the following scale to determine your responses to the question below:

1	2	3	4	5
never	**rarely**	**unsure**	**sometimes**	**always**

If you could be assured that no one would know, how often would you engage in each of the following behaviors:

____ *Group sex*
____ *Sex with someone else besides your steady boy/girlfriend*
____ *Oral sex*
____ Force a woman to do something sexual she doesn't want to do
____ *Bondage*
____ *Anal sex*
____ Talk a woman into doing something sexual she doesn't want to do
____ *Same-sex sex*
____ Force a woman to have sex when she doesn't want to
____ Use alcohol in hopes of having a woman give in to something sexual she wouldn't give in to if not drinking

Likelihood of Confronting

People do different things under different circumstances. What do you think you would do in the following situations?

Please write the number to the left of the situation:

1 - do nothing
2 - wait for a more convenient time to talk to the woman
3 - wait for a more convenient time to talk with the man
4 - interrupt the situation to ask if everything is alright
5 - none of the above – please write what you would do next to the situation

____ You see a teammate kissing a woman who is pushing him away, and the woman is someone you do not know.

____ You know a man is making a woman do something sexual that she does not want to do, and the man is someone you do not know.

____ You know a teammate is making a woman do something sexual that she does not want to do, and the woman is a good friend of yours.

____ You see a teammate kissing a woman who is pushing him away and the woman is a good friend of yours.

____ You know a teammate is making a woman do something sexual that she does not want to do, and the woman is someone you do not know.

____ You see a man kissing a woman who is pushing him away and the man is someone you do not know.

Please turn to the next page ⇒

Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale – Short Form

Please write on the blank to the left of each question the number from the scale below that corresponds to how strongly you agree with each of the statements given.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all agree	**Mostly do not agree**	**Somewhat do not agree**	**Undecided**	**Somewhat agree**	**Mostly agree**	**Very much agree**

1. ____ If a woman is raped while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.

2. ____ Although most women wouldn't admit it, they generally find being physically forced into sex a real "turn on."

3. ____ If a woman is willing to "make out" with a guy, then it's no big deal if he goes a little further and has sex with her.

4. ____ Many women secretly desire to be raped.

5. ____ Most rapists are not caught by the police.

6. ____ If a woman doesn't physically fight back, you can't really say that it was rape.

7. ____ Men from nice middle-class homes almost never rape.

8. ____ Rape accusations are often used as a way of getting back at men.

9. ____ All women should have access to self-defense classes.

10. ____ It is usually only women who dress suggestively who are raped.

11. ____ If the rapist doesn't have a weapon, you really can't call it rape.

12. ____ Rape is unlikely to happen in the woman's own familiar neighborhood.

13. ____ Women tend to exaggerate how much rape affects them.

14. ____ A lot of women lead a man on and then they cry rape.

15. ____ It is preferable that a female police officer conduct the questioning when a woman reports a rape.

16. ____ A woman who "teases" men deserves anything that might happen.

17. ____ When women are raped, it's often because the way they said "no" was not clear.

18. ____ Men don't usually intend to force sex on a woman, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away.

19. ____ A woman who dresses in skimpy clothes should not be surprised if a man tries to force her to have sex.

20. ____ Rape happens when a man's sex drive gets out of control.

Please turn to the next page ⇒

Hostility Toward Women Scale

Please use the following scale to indicate how strongly you agree with each of these statements. Write the number of your choice on the line to the left of the statement.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all agree	**Mostly do not agree**	**Somewhat do not agree**	**Undecided**	**Somewhat agree**	**Mostly agree**	**Very much agree**

1. ____ I feel that many times women flirt with men just to tease them or hurt them.
2. ____ I believe that most women tell the truth.
3. ____ I usually find myself agreeing with women.
4. ____ I think that most women would lie just to get ahead.
5. ____ Generally, it is safer not to trust women.
6. ____ When it comes down to it, a lot of women are deceitful.
7. ____ I am easily angered by women.
8. ____ I am sure I get a raw deal from the women in my life.
9. ____ Sometimes women bother me just by being around.
10. ____ Women are responsible for most of my troubles.

Please turn to the next page ⇒

Attitudes Toward Violence Scale
(randomized order of Interpersonal and General)

Please use the following scale to indicate how strongly you agree with each of these statements. Write the number of your choice on the line to the left of the statement.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all agree	**Mostly do not agree**	**Somewhat do not agree**	**Undecided**	**Somewhat agree**	**Mostly agree**	**Very much agree**

1. ____ Violent crimes should be punished violently.
2. ____ The death penalty should be part of every penal code.
3. ____ A child's habitual disobedience should be punished physically.
4. ____ Any nation should be ready with a strong military at all times.
5. ____ Punishing children physically when they deserve it will make them responsible and mature adults.
6. ____ The manufacture of weapons is necessary.
7. ____ It is alright for a partner to hit the other if they are unfaithful.
8. ____ The government should send armed soldiers to control violent university riots.
9. ____ An adult should whip a child for breaking the law.
10. ____ It is alright for a partner to hit the other if they flirt with others.
11. ____ Our country has the right to protect its borders forcefully.
12. ____ Any prisoner deserves to be mistreated by other prisoners in jail.
13. ____ Giving mischievous children a quick slap is the best way to quickly end trouble.
14. ____ Children should be spanked for temper tantrums.
15. ____ It is alright for a partner to slap the other if insulted or ridiculed.
16. ____ Young children who refuse to obey should be whipped.

17. ____ War is often necessary.

18. ____ It is alright for a partner to slap the other's face if challenged.

19. ____ Our country should be aggressive with its military internationally.

20. ____ Killing of civilians should be accepted as an unavoidable part of war.

Please turn to the next page ⇒

Thank you

for completing the questionnaire packet! Please put it back into the envelope you got it from and place the envelope at your seat until the end of the workshop.

APPENDIX B

Post-test Questionnaire

Consent Form
Likelihood of Sexually Aggressing
Likelihood of Confronting
Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale – Short Form
Group Utilization Questions
Thank You Form

Similar to the packet you filled out before the workshop, this packet contains questions about your attitudes and opinions about a variety of issues. Remember, your responses are completely confidential. Please **DO NOT** write your name on any of the sheets in this packet.

Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary, and you may refuse to participate at any time. You may refuse to respond at any time to particular questions without penalty. You indicate your voluntary agreement to participate by completing and returning this questionnaire. **You will have 10 minutes to complete this packet.** Some of the questions are highly personal, and in the case that any of the topics presented upsets or offends you, a list of helpful phone numbers and resources has been included in your folder. You may also contact the project investigator (Wendi Siebold) if you have any questions or concerns about this survey at: 353-5015.

When you have completed your packet, place it in the manila envelope with your other questionnaire packet and give the whole envelope to the people at the door. Remember, don't put your name anywhere on the pages or the envelope!

Thanks again for helping!

Please turn to the next page ⇒

Likelihood of Sexually Aggressing
(italicized statements are filler items)

Please use the following scale to determine your responses to the question below:

1	2	3	4	5
never	**rarely**	**unsure**	**sometimes**	**always**

If you could be assured that no one would know, how often would you engage in each of the following behaviors:

____ *Group sex*
____ *Sex with someone else besides your steady boy/girlfriend*
____ *Oral sex*
____ Force a woman to do something sexual she doesn't want to do
____ *Bondage*
____ *Anal sex*
____ Talk a woman into doing something sexual she doesn't want to do
____ *Same-sex sex*
____ Force a woman to have sex when she doesn't want to
____ Use alcohol in hopes of having a woman give in to something sexual she wouldn't give in to if not drinking

Likelihood of Confronting

People do different things under different circumstances. What do you think you would do in the following situations?

Please write the number to the left of the situation:

1 - do nothing
2 - wait for a more convenient time to talk to the woman
3 - wait for a more convenient time to talk with the man
4 - interrupt the situation to ask if everything is alright
5 - none of the above – please write what you would do next to the situation

____ You see a teammate kissing a woman who is pushing him away, and the woman is someone you do not know.

____ You know a man is making a woman do something sexual that she does not want to do, and the man is someone you do not know.

____ You know a teammate is making a woman do something sexual that she does not want to do, and the woman is a good friend of yours.

____ You see a teammate kissing a woman who is pushing him away and the woman is a good friend of yours.

____ You know a teammate is making a woman do something sexual that she does not want to do, and the woman is someone you do not know.

____ You see a man kissing a woman who is pushing him away and the man is someone you do not know.

Please turn to the next page ⇒

Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale – Short Form

Please write on the blank to the left of each question the number from the scale below that corresponds to how strongly you agree with each of the statements given.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all agree	**Mostly do not agree**	**Somewhat do not agree**	**Undecided**	**Somewhat agree**	**Mostly agree**	**Very much agree**

1. ____ If a woman is raped while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.
2. ____ Although most women wouldn't admit it, they generally find being physically forced into sex a real "turn on."
3. ____ If a woman is willing to "make out" with a guy, then it's no big deal if he goes a little further and has sex with her.
4. ____ Many women secretly desire to be raped.
5. ____ Most rapists are not caught by the police.
6. ____ If a woman doesn't physically fight back, you can't really say that it was rape.
7. ____ Men from nice middle-class homes almost never rape.
8. ____ Rape accusations are often used as a way of getting back at men.
9. ____ All women should have access to self-defense classes.
10. ____ It is usually only women who dress suggestively who are raped.
11. ____ If the rapist doesn't have a weapon, you really can't call it rape.
12. ____ Rape is unlikely to happen in the woman's own familiar neighborhood.
13. ____ Women tend to exaggerate how much rape affects them.
14. ____ A lot of women lead a man on and then they cry rape.
15. ____ It is preferable that a female police officer conduct the questioning when a woman reports a rape.

16. ____ A woman who "teases" men deserves anything that might happen.

17. ____ When women are raped, it's often because the way they said "no" was not clear.

18. ____ Men don't usually intend to force sex on a woman, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away.

19. ____ A woman who dresses in skimpy clothes should not be surprised if a man tries to force her to have sex.

20. ____ Rape happens when a man's sex drive gets out of control.

Please turn to the next page ⇒

Utilization Questions

What factors would influence your decision to confront a teammate who was making a woman do something sexual that she does not want to do?

_____

_____

_____

How much do you think the information you learned in this workshop would help you stand up to a teammate if he was doing something with a woman that you thought was wrong? (Please check one)

- ❑ Won't help me at all, in any situation
- ❑ Might help me in certain situations
- ❑ Will help me in most situations
- ❑ Will help me in all situations
- ❑ I already would have stood up to a teammate in any situation

If you answered that it **won't** help you, briefly explain why you don't think it will help:

_____

_____

_____

How much do you think you will use some of the information that was presented in this workshop?

- ❑ **Very much**
- ❑ **Somewhat**
- ❑ **Not very much**
- ❑ **Not much at all**

What makes you say that?

_____

_____

How much do you think members of your team will use some of the information that was presented in this workshop?

- ❑ **Very much**
- ❑ **Somewhat**
- ❑ **Not very much**
- ❑ **Not much at all**

What makes you say that?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please turn to the next page ⇒

Thank you for participating in the workshop today and filling out the questionnaires! Your answers will help us determine how useful this workshop is to students, and learn what we can do to make it more enjoyable and helpful to you.

Please **hand in your envelope** with both of the questionnaires inside as you walk out the door.

If you have any questions or concerns about any of the questions you answered, please contact Wendi Siebold at 353-5015.

Thanks again!

APPENDIX C

Table of Sexual Assault Prevention Programs Targeting College Students

Table 24

Sexual Assault Prevention Programs Targeting College Students[1,2]

Notes and Key (Breitenbecher, 2000)
Many authors report main effects for gender on the instruments used in sexual assault prevention studies. Effects for gender are not included in this table, unless such effects represent interactions between gender and experimental condition. In addition, effects described as "marginally significant" or "significant trends" are not included. In the sample column, numbers in parentheses indicate the number of participants who completed the follow-up phase(s) of the investigation, if this number was reported as differing from the original sample size. An equal sign (=) indicates nonsignificant differences between groups. E = experimental group. C = control group. Tx = treatment. Sig = statistically significant. AR = acquaintance rape. SR = stranger rape. Wk(s) = weeks(s). Mo(s) = month(s). Min = minutes. Hr(s) = hour(s). Pre = pretest. Post = posttest. F/u = follow-up assessment. DV(s) = dependent variable(s).

Key to scale abbreviations is included at the end of the table

Author(s)	Sample	Intervention(s)	Evaluation Design	Evaluation Results
Berg, et al. (1999)	54 men	E_1 = empathy induction (audiotape of male survivor + factual info.) E_2 = empathy induction (audiotape of female survivor + factual info.)	Pretest, intervention 10 days later, 2-wk f/u	- LSA loaded on single factor - $E_1 > E_2$ and $E_2 > C$ (undesirable effect) - AIV, ASB, IRMA, RE, and ARE loaded on single factor. At f/u, $E_1 = E_2 = C$
Borden et al. (1988)	100 men and women	E = factual info., legal terms, characteristics of rapists, rape trauma syndrome, prevention (45 min) C = no tx	Pretest, 4-wk f/u	- ATR and RE: at f/u, E = C
Dallager & Rosen (1993)	145 men and women	E = human sexuality course C = education course	Pretest, posttest at end of semester	- RMA: E < C - AIV: E = C
Ellis et al. (1992)	151 men and women	Questions asking participants to consider a situation in which	Question either preceded (E) or followed	- RMA, MAR, ASB, and AIV combined to form composite score

		a friend/relative disclosed that she had been assaulted	(C) other measures	- E men > C men (undesirable effect)
Fonow et al. (1992)	582 men and women	Intervention was either a live or videotaped program addressing myths, prevalence, rape as act of violence, rape as community issue (25 min) E_1 = pre, live, post E_2 = pre, video, post C_1 = pre, post E_3 = live, post E_4 = video, post C_2 = post	Pretest, 3-wk posttest	- RMA: at posttest, pretested groups scored lower than unpretested. Also, all experimental groups scored lower than control groups. Live and video interventions were equally effective. - RB, ASB, and SRS: posttest means not reported.
Foubert & McEwen (1998)	155 men	E = Video in which man being raped is described, how to help survivor, sexual communication, confront sexism and abuse of women (60 min) C = no tx	E_1 = pretest, intervention, immediate posttest E_2 = intervention, immediate posttest C = posttest	- RMA: at post, E_1 = E_2. Also, E_1 = C. - LSA: at post, E_1 = E_2 = C. - SMCRP: was sig. Negatively correlated with post RMA and LSA for E_1 and E_2.
Gilbert at al. (1991)	75 (53) men	E = intervention based on ELM, dramatic presentation, negative intrapsychic and social consequences associated with AIV, RMA, ASB, and male dominance ideology (60 min) C = no tx	Pretest, intervention 1-2 wks later, immediate posttest, 1-mo f/u phone call	- AIV, ASB, RMA, and SRS combined into composite change score: E > C - Phone call: E listened to more of call and made more favorable comments than C. No sig difference w/respect to willingness to volunteer time - NC: 1 of 3 items measuring state motivation, 1 of 2 items measuring ability, and 1 of 2

				items measuring thought favorability were sig correlated w/change scores
Gray et al. (1990)	70 women	E = personalized intervention (e.g. local statistics) featuring role playing, myths, dating behaviors, and sexual communication C = nonpersonalized intervention featuring role playing, myths, dating behaviors, and sexual communication	Pretest, intervention, immediate posttest	- BIDB: pre-post change for E > C - Perceptions of vulnerability: pre-post change for E > C only when married women excluded from sample
Hanson & Gidycz (1993)	360 (346) women	E = myths, videos of AR and protective behaviors, prevention (60 min) C = no tx	Pretest, intervention, 9-wk f/u	- DB: at post, E < C - SAA: at post, E < C - SC: at post, E = C - SV: at post, E < C for women without histories of assault prior to intervention
Heppner, Humphrey et al. (1995)	294 (258, 133) men and women	E_1 = ELM-based intervention featuring interactive, dramatic presentation of AR and protective behaviors, sex role socialization (90 min) E_2 = didactic, video of survivors (90 min) C = stress management	Pretest, intervention 5-7 days later, immediate posttest, 5-wk f/u, 4-mos f/u, 5-mos + 1wk f/u	- ELMQ: $E_1 > E_2 > C$ - TL: $E_1 > E_2 > C$ - RMA: only difference between groups was E_2 men < C men. E_1 and E_2 showed rebounding at f/u. Rebound pattern for $E_1 = E_2$. - CCC: For men, $E_1 > E_2 > C$. For women, $E_1 = E_2 = C$. - Willingness to volunteer, time thinking, time talking, and # people talked to: $E_1 > E_2$ and C. - Fee increase and

				willingness to recommend: $E_1 = E_2 = C$.
Heppner, Neville et al. (1999)	119 (57) men	E_1 = "colorblind" intervention E_2 = culturally specific for African American participants C = not described	Pretest, 1-wk posttest, 5-mos posttest	- Factor analysis of RMA, SIARA, SA, LSA, and SVAWS-SV yielded 1 factor (rejection of rape) - Rejection of rape: ANOVA showed only sig effect was low high low (rebounding) pattern - Cluster analysis of f/u data indicated 3 groups: deteriorating, rebounding, and improving. Participants in improving group were more likely to be in either E_1 or E_2 than C - ELMQ: African Americans in E_2 > than other participants
Katz (1995)	male athletes		None	None
Lee (1987)	24 men	E = myths, account of male survivor, guided fantasy (imagine observing roommate engaging in coercive sex) (2 hr)	E_1 = pretest, intervention, immediate posttest E_2 = intervention, immediate posttest	- ATR-L: at post, $E_1 = E_2$. Also, E_1 showed sig pre-post change
Lenihan et al. (1992)	821 (445) men and women	E = video of AR effects on men and women, characteristics of rapists, cultural reasons, reasons	E_1 = pretest, intervention several days later, posttest 1 mos later C_1 = pretest,	Paired t-tests: - Women in E_1 and C_1 showed sig pre-post change on ASB, SCNS, and AIV

		why AR not identified as rape, and female survivor describing effects on her (50 min)	posttest E_2 = intervention, posttest 1 mos later C_2 = posttest	- Women in E_1 only showed sig pre-post change on RMA - Men in E_1 and C_1 did not show sig pre-post changes on any scale ANOVA: - RMA: E_1 and E_2 < C_1 and C_2 - ASB, SCNS, and AIV: E_1 and E_2 = C_1 and C_2 - ASB: 2-way interaction between pretest and experimental condition (f/u analyses not reported) - AIV: 3-way interaction between gender, pretest, and experimental condition (f/u analyses not reported)
Lonsway et al. (1998)	99 (92, 55) men and women	E = semester long course that trains students to facilitate rape education for peers C = semester long human sexuality course	Precourse assessment (E also repond to videotaped sexual conflict), postcourse assessment (E also respond to videotaped sexual conflict), 2-yr f/u	- IRMA: at post, E < C. At f/u, E< C. - AHSB: at post, E<C. At f/u, E = C. - ATF: at post, E>C. At f/u, E = C. - Responses to videotaped sexual conflict: E more likely(than at pretest) to use direct verbal resistance. E less likely to use indirect verbal resistance, indirect physical resistance, and internal monitoring. No

				change in use of direct physical resistance.
Mann et al. (1988)	92 men and women	E_1 = dramatic presentation + discussion (30 min) E_2 = dramatic presentation (15 min) E_3 = discussion (15 min) C = no tx	Intervention, immediate posttest, 5-wk f/u	Post - SAS: $E_1 > E_3 = C$ - SRAS: $E_1 = E_2 = E_3 = C$ F/u - SAS: main effect for condition sig (pattern of means not reported) - SAS: interaction between condition and previous SA, but authors warn about small cell sizes. Among those with low SA, $E_1 > E_3$ and C - SRAS: $E_1 = E_2 = E_3 = C$
Parrot et al. (1994)	male athletes		None	None
Pinzone-Glover et al. (1998)	152 men and women	E = AR prevention program, myths, characteristics and behaviors of rapists, prevention (60 min) C = sexually transmitted disease prevention program	Pretest, intervention 1 wk later, 1 wk f/u	- RE: E showed greater pre-post change than C - RMA: at f/u E = C - ATW: Among men, pre-post change for E > C. Among women, pre-post change for E = C - Responses to AR scenarios: At f/u, men in E were more likely to identify scenario as rape than men in C. At f/u, among women E = C.
Ring & Kilmartin (1992)	Men, number not reported	E = destructive aspects of men's sex role socialization, film,	No formal evaluation was conducted	Men reported greater willingness to participate because of non-threatening

		experiential exercises to increase awareness of objectification of men's and women's bodies and media's victimization of women		nature of program, feeling less defensive, and greater awareness about destructive aspects of male socialization.
Schaeffer & Nelson (1993)	160 men	Specific program not tested or described. E = men who had previously attended a rape education program C = men who had not	Quasi-experimental	- RMA: E = C - ATW: E = C
Schewe & O'Donohue (1996)	74 "high-risk" men	E1 = video of victim empathy/outcome expectancy program (50 min) E2 = video of rape supportive cognitions program (50 min) C = no tx	Pretest, intervention, 2-wk f/u	- RCA: E1 = E2 = C - AIV: E1 and E2 showed sig pre-post changes - ASB: E2 showed sig pre-post changes - RMA: E2 showed sig pre-post changes - ASA: E1 and E2 showed sig pre-post changes.

[1] Portions of this table and table format were adapted from Breitenbecher (2000).

[2] This table includes only programs that were discussed within this paper, and is not exhaustive of all programs in the literature. For a full table of programs in the literature up to the year 2000, please refer to Breitenbecher (2000).

Key to scale abbreviations (reprinted from Breitenbecher, 2000)

AHSB = Adversarial Heterosexual Sexual Beliefs Scale (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995)
AIV = Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence (Burt, 1980)
ARE = Acquaintance Rape Empathy Scale (Berg et al., 1999)
ASA = Attraction to Sexual Aggression Scale (Malamuth, 1989)
ASB = Adversarial Sexual Beliefs (Burt, 1980)
ATF = Attitudes Toward Feminism and the Women's Movement Scale (Fassinger, 1994)
ATR = Attitudes Toward Rape Scale (Field, 1978)
ATR-L = Attitudes Toward Rape Scale (Lee, 1987)
ATR-R = Attitudes Toward Rape Scale – Revised (Harrison et al., 1991)
ATSI = Attitudes Toward Sexuality Inventory (Patton & Mannison, 1993)
ATW = Attitudes Toward Women Scale (Spence et al., 1973)
BIDB = Items assessing behavioral intent to avoid high-risk dating behaviors (Gray et al., 1990)
CCC = Comprehension of Consent/Coercion Measure (Gibson & Humphrey, 1993)
DB = Dating Behavior Survey (Hanson & Gidycz, 1993)
DRAS = Date Rape Attitudes Survey (Holcomb et al., 1993)
DSPARS = Dating Self-Protection Against Rape Scale (Moore & Waterman, 1999)
ELMQ = Elaboration Likelihood Model Questionnaire (Heppner et al., 1995)
FDR = Forcible Date Rape Scale (Giarusso, 1979)
IRI = Interpersonal Reactivity Index (Davis, 1980)
IRMA = Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (Payne et al., 1999)
LSA = Likelihood of Sexual Aggression, including any modification or combination of items from the Likelihood to Rape Scale (Briere & Malamuth, 1983; Malamuth, 1981) or other items devised by the author(s) to measure this construct.
MAR = Myths About Rape (Costin & Schwarz, 1987)
NC = Need for Cognition Scale (Cacioppo & Petty, 1982)
RB = Attribution of Rape Blame (Ward & Resick, 1979, cited in Resick & Jackson, 1981)
RCA = Rape Conformity Assessment (Schewe & O'Donohue, 1993b)
RE = Rape Empathy Scale (Deitz et al., 1982)
RMA = Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (Burt, 1980)
SA = Sexual Aggression, as measured by the Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss & Oros, 1982, Koss et al., 1987)
SAA = Sexual Assault Awareness Survey (Hanson & Gidycz, 1993)
SAKS = Sexual Assault Knowledge Survey (Breitenbecher & Scarce, 1999)
SAS = Sexual Attitude Scale (Meuhlenhard & Felts, 1987)
SC = Sexual Communication Survey (originally developed by Hanson & Gidycz, 1993, and later revised by Breitenbecher & Gidycz, 1998)
SCNS = Sexual Conservatism (Burt, 1980)
SIARA = Scale for the Identification of Acquaintance Rape Attitudes (Humphrey, 1996)
SRAS = Simple Rathus Assertiveness Schedule (McCormick, 1986)
SRF = Speaker Rating Form (Heppner et al., 1995, adapted from Barak and LaCrosse, 1975)
SMCRP = State Measure of Central Route Processing developed by Gilbert et al., 1991, based on Petty & Cacioppo, 1986)
SV = Sexual victimization, as measured by the Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss & Oros, 1982; Koss et al., 1987)
SVAWS-SV = Sexual Violence Subscale of the Severity of Violence Against Women Scale (Marshall, 1992)
TL = Thought Listening (Heppner, et al., 1995, adapted from Heppner et al., 1988)