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There is a growing body of research on the effectiveness of male-targeted sexual assault prevention programs. Most of these studies have demonstrated short-term improvements in rape supportive attitudes. However, these improvements have generally not been maintained over longer follow-up periods, and few researchers have investigated the effects of prevention programming on sexually aggressive behavior. The purpose of the current study was to examine the effects of a male-targeted sexual assault prevention program on behavior, attitudes, social perceptions, and judgments of consent. Social norms theory served as a theoretical basis for program evaluated in this study. The participants were 342 college men who were randomly assigned to the control and experimental groups. Self-reported sexually aggressive behavior, rape-supportive attitudes, perceptions of other men’s attitudes about sexual aggression, and judgments of consent were assessed at pre-test, and at 3-month and 7-month follow-ups.

Participants in the experimental group reported that they found the program content to be valuable, accurate, and personally relevant. However, compared to participants in the control group, they did not demonstrate any differences in rates of sexually aggressive behavior over the course of the study. In addition, group
membership did not have a significant effect on changes in attitudes or social perceptions over the course of the study. At the 3-month follow-up, the experimental group participants, in comparison to the control group, demonstrated greater accuracy in their judgments of a sexually aggressive scenario, but these improvements were not maintained at the 7-month follow-up. The lack of evidence supporting the effectiveness of this intervention, and other interventions, suggests that brief, one-session prevention programs may not be sufficient to produce substantial change. Programs that utilize multiple exposures to information over time may be more likely to be effective. Other implications for future research on sexual assault prevention are also discussed.
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Overview

Sexual assault is a serious problem on college campuses. National studies conducted with college women have indicated that between 15% and 20% of college women have had experiences that meet the legal definition of rape (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987; Brener, McMahon, Warren, & Douglas, 1999). In addition, 25% of college men report engaging in sexually aggressive behavior (Koss et al., 1987). Women who have experienced sexual assault are at increased risk for a variety of emotional problems, including depression (Frank & Stewart, 1984), anxiety (Resnick, 1993), and posttraumatic stress symptoms (Foa, Riggs, & Gershuny, 1995). In addition, many women who have experienced sexual assault develop health problems such as chronic pain or gastrointestinal disorders (Koss & Heslet, 1992).

The magnitude of the problem of sexual assault has led to mandates that federally funded colleges and universities implement programs that address sexual assault, and there is a growing body of research evaluating such programs. While risk-reduction programs for women have yielded promising results (e.g. Hanson & Gidycz, 1993), programs aimed at reducing perpetration rates in men are also crucial to prevention efforts, and Berkowitz (1994) suggests that all male programs are more appropriate than mixed-sex programs for such efforts.

Research evaluating male targeted programs indicates that these interventions often have positive short-term effects on the rape supportive attitudes of men (e.g. Foubert & Marriott, 1997), however, there are several important limitations in the current research. At present, there is a need for theories of sexual assault perpetration
to be incorporated into programs for men. In addition, the effects of these programs on sexually aggressive behavior need to be evaluated. Finally, there is a need for greater continuity between the goals of prevention programs, the content included to address the goals, and the outcome measures selected to assess the goals (Berg, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999; Gidycz, Dowdall, & Marioni, 2002).

The Ohio Department of Health funded the current study, which evaluated a sexual assault prevention program for men. The program used in this study is based on a social norms theoretical perspective (Berkowitz, 2003), as well as the integrated model of sexual assault proposed by Berkowitz (1992), which attempts to explain how cultural, individual, and situational variables interact with each other to increase the likelihood of sexual assault perpetration. The effects of the program on sexually aggressive behavior, rape-supportive attitudes, social perceptions, and judgments of consent were assessed over a seven month follow-up period.

Review of the Literature

Sexual Assault on College Campuses

Sexual assault of women is widespread in the United States. In a recent study with a community sample of adult women, Cloutier, Martin, and Poole (2002) found that 14% of women reported that they had experienced forced intercourse or attempted forced intercourse at some point. The risk of sexual assault is particularly salient for college women. In a landmark study of college students conducted by Koss et al. (1987), one in five women reported that they had experiences that met the legal criteria for rape or attempted rape, and an additional 25% reported that they had
experienced other forms of sexually aggressive behavior. In a more recent national study, Brenner, et al. (1999) found that 20% of college women and 4% of college men had experienced rape.

Several researchers have documented high rates of sexually aggressive behavior in men. In a large sample of college men, more than 6% reported behavior that met the definition of rape or attempted rape (Lisak & Miller, 2002). In another sample of male college students, 8.5% reported engaging in behavior that met the legal definition of rape (Koss, Dinero, & Seibel, 1988). Of these men, only 16% labeled their behavior as rape. Koss et al. (1987) found that approximately 25% of college men reported having engaged in some form of sexually coercive behavior, ranging from unwanted touching or kissing to rape, a figure that is consistent with more recent data (Abbey, McAuslan, & Ross, 1998). Men who have engaged in sexually aggressive behavior are very likely to commit multiple acts of perpetration. Lisak and Miller (2002) found that nearly two-thirds of men who had committed rape or attempted rape had done so more than once. These men reported an average of 5.8 sexually aggressive episodes that met the criteria for rape or attempted rape. Furthermore, in a recent prospective study of sexual assault, 9.5% of men with a history of perpetration reported engaging in sexually coercive behavior over the course of an eight week academic quarter (Loh, 2000). In response to the high prevalence rates of sexual assault, a great deal of research has attempted to explain why sexual assault occurs.
Variables Related to Perpetration

A variety of variables have been hypothesized to contribute to the occurrence of sexual assault perpetration. Several risk factors for assault have been identified, including perpetrator personality characteristics and beliefs, socialization processes, and situational factors. Berkowitz (1992) has proposed a model of sexual assault that encompasses all of these factors and attempts to explain their relationships to each other and to sexual assault. However, these risk factors have typically been studied in isolation, and it is unclear how these variables interact to influence sexual assault perpetration.

The relationship between perpetrator attitudes and sexually aggressive behavior has been well established in the literature. Sexually aggressive men tend to be characterized by misconceptions about rape, mistrust of relationships between men and women, acceptance of interpersonal violence, and belief in traditional gender roles. Rape myths have been identified as stereotypical beliefs about the circumstances of rape and the characteristics of victims and perpetrators of rape (Burt, 1980). Several studies have demonstrated a relationship between rape myth endorsement and sexually aggressive behavior (Abbey et al., 1998; Burt, 1980; Koss et al., 1985). Similarly, a correlation between sexual aggression and lack of empathy for rape victims has been demonstrated (Rice, Chaplin, Harris, & Coutts, 1994). Researchers have also investigated the relationship between adversarial sexual beliefs and sexual assault. In particular, men who are sexually aggressive are more likely to be mistrustful of relationships with women and to view relationships
between men and women as being exploitive (Koss et al., 1985; Loh, 2000).

Sexually aggressive men are also more likely than sexually non-aggressive men to condone the use of force or coercion in interpersonal relationships (Burt, 1980).

Furthermore, traditional attitudes toward gender roles are correlated with sexually coercive behavior (Byers & Eno, 1991; Gidycz, Layman, Crothers, Gylys, Dowdall, & Matorin, 1997), particularly verbal coercion (Byers & Eno, 1991). It is important to keep in mind, however, that the majority of these studies are retrospective in nature, thus it is difficult to make attributions regarding the direction of influence between these variables. However, in a prospective study, Loh (2000) found that men who perceived women as untrustworthy were more likely to both have a history of sexually aggressive behavior and to be sexually aggressive in the future.

The socialization experiences of men have been hypothesized to contribute to rape supportive attitudes as well as sexual assault perpetration. Feminist theorists have suggested that sexually aggressive behavior is supported and perpetuated by rigid constructions of gender, in which masculinity and femininity are viewed as highly polarized (e.g. Burt, 1980; Sanday, 1981). They assert that males are socialized not only to embrace traditional masculine characteristics, but also to reject feminine attributes. Hypermasculinity has been implicated as a factor contributing to sexually aggressive behavior, and many researchers have examined the relationship between attitudes about gender-roles and sexual assault. In a meta-analysis of this research, Murnen, Wright, and Kaluzny (2002) found that several measures of
masculine ideology were significantly correlated with sexual aggression, and that the construct of “hostile masculinity” was particularly relevant.

Lisak (1991) has focused on family relationships as a central influence on the development of gender identity. He has suggested that in the absence of a positive relationship with a father figure, the process of masculine identification is disrupted, which may lead to the rigid adoption of hypermasculine traits. Lisak and Roth (1990) interviewed fifteen college men who admitted to behavior that met the definition of rape, and found that compared to other men, they had more hypermasculine attitudes and more hostility toward women. These men made more negative statements and fewer positive statements about their fathers, and were more likely to describe their fathers as physically and emotionally unavailable. Compared to sexually nonaggressive men who reported that their fathers were unavailable, the sexually aggressive men expressed more anger about their fathers’ absence.

The influence of peer relationships on gender identity and sexual aggression has also been examined. Several researchers have investigated all-male groups such as fraternities and athletic teams because these groups often provide environments in which hypermasculine attitudes are valued. Schaeffer and Nelson (1993) found that men living in single-sex residence halls and fraternities were more likely than other men to endorse rape myths. Similarly, Kalof and Cargill (1991) found that fraternity men were more likely than other college men to endorse traditional gender role attitudes with regard to male dominance and female submissiveness.
Some researchers have found higher rates of sexually aggressive behavior among athletes and fraternity members (Lackie & de Man, 1997; Frinter & Rubison, 1993), while others have found no relationship between sexual aggression and group membership (Jackson, 1991). Humphrey and Kahn (2000) suggested that these disparate findings may be accounted for by the fact that group culture varies widely among fraternities and athletic teams. They asked students to rate the degree to which fraternities and athletic teams on their campus had party atmospheres that were conducive to sexual assault. Then they assessed the self-reported sexually aggressive behavior of members of the groups perceived to have the highest and lowest risk of sexual assault, as well as men who were not members of these groups. Men from the high risk groups were significantly more likely to report sexually aggressive behavior than men from the low risk groups, and there was no difference in sexual aggression between men in the low risk groups and nonmembers. Thus, it seems that membership in groups that provide a “rape supportive” culture is associated with sexually aggressive behavior. It is not clear to what extent such groups influence their members’ behavior, or to what extent men who are already predisposed to sexually aggressive behavior self-select into these groups.

Recently, social norms theory has been utilized to explain how socialization experiences contribute to an environment that supports sexual assault (Berkowitz, 2003). Social norms theory posits that in many situations, individuals overestimate the degree to which their peers engage in or are tolerant of risky and problem behavior. For example, it has been well documented that college students
overestimate the alcohol and drug use of other students (e.g. Prentice & Miller, 1993; Pollard, Freeman, Ziegler, Hersman, & Goss, 2000). There is also evidence that college students have a variety of misperceptions about their peers’ sexual attitudes and behavior. For example, college men tend to overestimate the amount of sexual activity engaged in by other male students (Kilmartin, Conway, Friedber, McQuiod, Tchan, & Norbert, 1999). Kilmartin and colleagues (1999) also found that college men overestimated the extent to which other men are tolerant of sexist language and behavior.

Berkowitz (2003) asserts that misperceptions such as these contribute in several ways to a social environment that is permissive of sexually aggressive behavior. Men may alter their own sexual behavior in an attempt to conform to what they perceive as normative. Indeed, many men report having engaged in unwanted sexual activity as a result of perceived pressure from peers (Muelenhard & Cook, 1988). Furthermore, in one sample, sexually aggressive men were more likely than sexually non-aggressive men to report that they had experienced a great deal of pressure in high school to be sexually active (Kanin, 1985). Social misperceptions may also lead to bystander behavior, according to Berkowitz (2003). For example, men who feel uncomfortable when others use language that degrades women may be reluctant to express their disapproval, assuming that everyone else deems this behavior acceptable. When this happens on a large scale, men who are sexually aggressive, lacking social deterrents to their actions, may assume that their behavior and attitudes are normative, and that others view them as acceptable.
In addition to attitudinal and socialization factors, characteristics of dating situations have been demonstrated to play a role in sexual assault perpetration. One situational variable that plays a role in sexual assault is the misperception of sexual intent, which occurs when a person erroneously perceives another person as being sexually attracted or available (Abbey, 1987). Men are more likely than women to misperceive friendly behavior as sexual interest (Abbey, 1987), and such misperceptions are associated with higher rates of sexual assault perpetration (Kanin, 1984; Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987; Shea, 1993). In particular, when compared with sexually non-aggressive men, men who had perpetrated acquaintance assaults were more likely to feel led on by their date (Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987). Similarly, Shea (1993) found that men with a history of sexual coercion were more likely than non-coercive men to perceive a female confederate as sexually attracted to them. Men who have perpetrated acquaintance rape may also be more likely to interpret a woman who says “no” to intercourse as engaging in token resistance, or in other words, refusing sexual contact with the intention of later saying “yes” (Kanin, 1984).

Alcohol and other drug use are perhaps the most important situational variables related to coercive sexual activity among college students. Research estimates that between 50% and 75% of acquaintance assaults occur when one or both of the parties have consumed alcohol (Abbey, McAuslan, & Ross, 1998; Abbey, Ross, McDuffie, & McAuslan, 1996; Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski; Muhlenhard & Linton, 1987). In addition, the more alcohol the perpetrator
consumes, the more aggressive he is likely to be during a sexually aggressive episode (Abbey, Clinton-Sherrod, McAuslan, Zawacki, & Buck, 2003).

Abbey, McAuslan, and Ross (1998) have suggested that men’s expectations of the psychological and behavioral effects of alcohol help to explain the role of alcohol in sexual assault. For example, men often expect that alcohol will make them feel powerful, aggressive, and sexual (Abbey, McAuslan, McDuffie, Ross, & Zawacki, 1995), and these expectations may be self-fulfilling. Similarly, George and colleagues (1988) found that when college students were presented with vignettes depicting a woman drinking either soda or alcohol on a date, both men and women rated the woman drinking alcohol as more sexually available (George, Gournic, & McAfee, 1988).

Alcohol also disrupts cognitive processing in ways that may contribute to sexual assault perpetration. Alcohol has a disinhibiting effect on behavior and makes it more difficult to attend to multiple environmental cues (Steele & Josephs, 1988). As a result, a man who has been drinking may be less able to focus on his partner’s signals because he is preoccupied by his own agenda. Abbey and her colleagues (1998) have proposed that alcohol consumption and sexual assault may be linked by more than one pathway. In some instances, the perceived disinhibiting effects of alcohol may be directly linked to sexual assault. In other instances, alcohol expectancies may contribute indirectly to sexual assault, such that men who expect to feel sexual when drinking, and expect drinking women to be sexual, may be more likely to misperceive sexual intents when they have been drinking.
Although a great deal is known about variables that predict sexual assault, these variables have typically been studied in isolation. Little research has been done on how these variables interact to cause sexual assault perpetration. Berkowitz (1992) proposed a model of acquaintance assault that accounts for variables associated with both perpetration and victimization. He hypothesizes that the perpetrator’s socialization experiences, attitudes, beliefs, and life experiences define what sexual behaviors would be acceptable, including the conditions under which he would be able to justify sexually aggressive behavior. The presence of certain personality characteristics, such as the need for dominance (Malamuth, 1986), may increase the perpetrator’s willingness to act on his rape-supportive beliefs. Finally, characteristics of the dating situation, such as alcohol use or characteristics of the victim, may trigger the rape-supportive attitudes of the perpetrator. This may lead him to misperceive his partner’s intent, or believe that coercive or aggressive behavior would be acceptable, thus increasing the likelihood of assault. Although the research reviewed above supports the individual components of this model, the complete model has not yet been evaluated. Further research on the causal pathways of sexual assault perpetration is crucial to efforts to develop effective prevention programming for men.

*Prevention of Sexual Assault*

The high prevalence of sexual assault among college students has led to federal mandates that federally funded colleges and universities sponsor rape education programming (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators,
This has resulted in a proliferation of programs targeting all female, mixed-sex, and all male audiences. The goals and content of these programs have varied depending on the audience targeted.

Programs for all female audiences have been developed both for general audiences and for high-risk women with a history of sexual assault. These programs have typically focused on helping women to reduce their risk of being sexually assaulted through educating them about sexual assault and risky behavior, and teaching them how they can reduce their risk of being assaulted (Gidycz, Dowdall, & Marioni, 2002). Several outcome evaluations have assessed the effects of these programs on the incidence of sexual assault, with mixed results. In some studies, women who participated in a program reported lower rates of victimization (Hanson & Gidycz, 1993; Marx, Calhoun, Wilson, & Meyerson, 1999), while no differences between control and experimental participants were found in others (Brietenbecher & Scarce, 1999; Breitenbecher & Gidycz, 1998). In addition, Gidycz et al. (2001) found that program participants did not differ from control participants in the incidence of victimization at a two-month follow-up assessment. However, at a six-month follow-up assessment, women who had been victimized between the pretest and the two-month follow-up were less likely to have been revictimized at the six-month follow-up.

Although programs targeting all female audiences have demonstrated promising results, programming for men is also necessary in order for sexual assault to be prevented (Berkowitz, 1994). A majority of the evaluated programs that
include men have been mixed-sex interventions (Gidycz et al., 2002). Proponents of mixed-sex programming assert that it is necessary for men and women to engage in discussion about sexual assault in an environment that engenders respect for one another (Frazier, Valtinson, & Candell, 1994). The outcomes of these programs have been mixed. While several studies have reported that program participants demonstrate decreases in rape supportive attitudes compared to control participants at post-test, these changes are typically transient, and no longer present at follow-up assessments (e.g. Anderson, Stoelb, Duggan, Hieger, Kling, & Payne, 1998). In the one study that assessed self-reported sexually aggressive behavior, men in the program group did not differ from men in the control group in rates of sexual aggression (Gidycz et al., 2001). Furthermore, several studies have reported attitude change for only the women or the men involved in the program (Berkowitz, 1994). Because the goals for men and women participating in prevention programs are so different, it has been suggested that single-sex programs are more appropriate than mixed-sex programs for the task of reducing sexually aggressive behavior in men (Berkowitz, 1994).

Content of Male Targeted Prevention Programs

Theoretical foundations. A majority of the efforts in developing male targeted prevention programming have not been strongly driven by theoretical models. Programs for men have typically included content aimed at changing the variables associated with sexual assault perpetration, such as stereotypical gender roles and endorsement of rape myths. A great deal of research has been conducted
regarding the relationship between sexual assault and rape supportive attitudes (e.g. Abbey et al., 1998). As a result, prevention programs have developed a strong focus on attitude change. It has been hypothesized that by changing the attitudes associated with sexual assault, reductions in assultive behavior will follow.

Consistent with the strong focus of attitude change in prevention programming, strides have been made in incorporating theoretical models of attitude change in program development. In particular, researchers have utilized the Elaboration Likelihood Model proposed by Petty and Cacioppo (1986). The ELM is drawn from the social psychology literature on persuasion, and posits that attitude change can occur via two distinct types of cognitive processing: central route processing and peripheral route processing. Central route processing is characterized by thoughtful evaluation of information pertinent to the topic. It requires complex thinking and considerable cognitive resources. For example, a program participant engaged in central route processing might listen carefully to the ideas presented and weigh the relative merits of arguments on both sides of an issue. According to Petty and Cacioppo (1986), central route processing is most likely to occur when listeners believe the content of the message is personally relevant and important, and when they have the cognitive abilities to understand the message. Peripheral route processing is characterized by the use of simple decision rules and cues to influence attitudes, such as the aesthetic qualities of presentation materials. It is simpler than central route processing and requires fewer cognitive resources. For example,
program participants engaged in peripheral route processing might be influenced by their perceptions about how much they have in common with the presenter.

Although peripheral route processing can lead to attitude change, attitude change precipitated by central route processing are more robust. Attitudes created by central route processing have been found to last longer, exert more influence over behavior, and be more resistant to change when compared with attitudes created by peripheral route processing. (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). Programs utilizing the elaboration likelihood model have incorporated activities designed to increase central processing into their interventions. For example, such programs have included interactive theater, discussion of vignettes to encourage active engagement (Gilbert, Heesacker, & Gannon, 1991; Heppner, Neville, Smith, Kivlighan, & Gershuny, 1999), and culturally specific information to increase personal relevance (Heppner et al., 1999).

Theories about the role of gender socialization have also been incorporated into prevention programs for men. Burt (1980) suggests that men are socialized to conform to a dominant, aggressive role, and asserts that this leads to attitudes that are supportive of rape. Several programs have included discussions of sex role socialization (Ring & Kilmartin, 1992; Gilbert et al., 1991; Davis & Liddell, 2002). In addition, social norms theory has been incorporated into the program developed by Foubert and Marriot (1996), and the program developed by Berkowitz (1994). As discussed earlier, social norms theory posits that widespread misperceptions of social norms lead men to avoid confronting inappropriate behavior for fear of social
disapproval (Berkowitz, in press). Both Foubert and Marriot (1996) and Berkowitz (1994) have included components in their programs that encourage men to confront other men who are acting sexually aggressive. The program developed by Foubert and Marriot (1996) has been evaluated several times, with promising results (Foubert & Marriot, 1997; Foubert & McEwen, 1998; Foubert, 2000). The one evaluation of the program developed by Berkowitz (1994) indicated that the program effectively decreased rape supportive attitudes (Earle, 1996). However, participants in this study were not randomly assigned to groups, and it was not specified when the post-intervention measures were administered.

*Topics addressed.* A variety of content areas have been included in sexual assault programming targeted at men. Programs typically begin by providing definitions of sexual assault and statistics about the prevalence of sexual assault. Most programs also distinguish between rape myths and facts (Berg et al., 1999; Foubert, 2000; Foubert & Marriot, 1997; Foubert & McEwen, 1998; Gilbert et al., 1991; Heppner, Humphrey, Hillenbrand-Gunn, & DeBord, 1995; Heppner et al., 1999; Intons-Peterson, Roskos-Ewoldsen, Thomas, Shirley, & Blut, 1989; Johansson-Love & Geer, 2003; Lee, 1987; O’Donohue, Yeater, & Fanetti, 2003; Schewe & O’Donohue, 1996), or address the connection between rape-supportive attitudes and sexual assault (Gilbert et al., 1991; Schewe & O’Donohue, 1996). Many programs address the victim’s experience by asking participants to imagine the victim’s experience or by providing information about the negative outcomes of sexual assault (Berg et al., 1999; Gilbert et al., 1991; Heppner et al., 1995; Heppner

The importance of sexual communication has been addressed in several programs (Gilbert et al., 1991; Foubert, 2000; Foubert & Marriot, 1997; Foubert & McEwen, 1998; Schewe & O’Donohue, 1993; Schewe & O’Donohue, 1996). Other programs have addressed the impact of sex role socialization (Davis & Liddell, 2002; Gilbert et al., 1991; Ring & Kilmartin, 1992). Less commonly addressed topics include the negative consequences of sexually aggressive behavior for men (O’Donohue, Yeater, & Fanetti, 2003; Schewe & O’Donohue, 1993; Schewe & O’Donohue, 1996), the value of respect for others (Intons-Peterson et al., 1989), confronting the sexually coercive behavior of others (Foubert, 2000; Foubert & Marriot, 1997; Foubert & McEwen, 1998), helping the victims of assault (Foubert, 2000; Foubert & Marriot, 1997; Foubert & McEwen, 1998), and the healthy expression of emotions (Ring & Kilmartin, 1992).

Program formats. Several modalities have been utilized in prevention programs for men. Most programs have used a combination of methods and activities to educate participants and promote behavior change. Most programs include either live or videotaped psychoeducational components, in which information is presented didactically. Several programs incorporate group discussions (Davis & Liddell, 2002; Edigio & Robertson, 1981; Lee, 1987; Ring & Kilmartin, 1992) or small group activities (Ring & Kilmartin, 1992). Heppner and colleagues (1999) included a panel
discussion in which victims and their friends and family discussed the impact of sexual assault.

Prevention programs have utilized audiotaped and videotaped media in a variety of ways. Many interventions have used video to present information (e.g. Intons-Peterson et al., 1989). Intons-Peterson and colleagues (1989) included a video that demonstrated examples of coercive and consensual sex. Others have used audio and video to dramatize or describe incidents of sexual assault. For example, Berg and colleagues (1999) utilized audiotapes in which male or female victims described their experience, while others utilized videos of victims describing their experiences and the resulting trauma (O’Donohue, Yeater, & Fanetti, 2003; Schewe & O’Donohue, 1996). A program developed by Foubert and Marriot (1996) includes a video in which an incident of sexual assault is described in detail. Schewe and O’Donohue (1996) include a component in which participants listen to an audiotaped dramatization of a sexual assault.

Consistent with the elaboration likelihood model, several programs have also included behavioral interventions with the goal of prompting program participants to process information more actively. For example, one program included a component in which participants were asked to write and read aloud an essay about sexual assault (Linz, Fuson, & Doonerstein, 1990). Schewe and O’Donohue (1996) asked participants to generate arguments to persuade a sexually aggressive man to stop his behavior. In a program evaluated by Intons-Peterson and colleagues (1989), men were asked to use the knowledge they had acquired to evaluate a news story about a
rape trial. Another program included an interactional drama component in which actors portrayed dating situations, and audience members were asked to give suggestions regarding how the characters could have changed the situation to avoid the occurrence of a rape (Heppner et al., 1999).

Outcomes of Male Targeted Prevention Programs

*Effects on behavior and behavioral intents.* Typically, the overarching goal of prevention programs targeting male audiences is to reduce the incidence of sexual assault perpetration. To date, only one study evaluating an all male program has directly assessed sexually inappropriate behavior. Foubert (2000) found that men who participated in a one-hour program did not report significantly different rates of aggressive behavior when compared to control group men at a 7-month follow-up. Several factors may have contributed to this result, including the low number of subjects and the brief length of the program. In addition, the primary focus of the program was on how men can assist victims of sexual assault, rather than a focus on men’s own behavior in sexual situations, and men’s responsibility to prevent sexual assault. It was hypothesized that focusing on men in a positive light as potential helpers would reduce defensiveness. Although reducing men’s defensiveness is critical if prevention programs are to be effective, it is unlikely that programs can effectively decrease sexually aggressive behavior without focusing on appropriate sexual behavior.

Other studies have assessed men’s self-reported likelihood to engage in sexually aggressive behavior as a way to measure the potential effects of prevention
programming on behavior (Berg et al., 1999; Foubert & Marriott, 1997; Foubert & McEwen, 1998; Shewe & O’Donohue, 1993). The effects of prevention programming on the likelihood to rape or use force have been mixed. Three studies found that men who participated in an educational program reported lower propensities to rape than men who participated in a control group (Foubert, 2000; Foubert & Marriot, 1997; Shewe & O’Donohue, 1993). However, Foubert and McEwen (1998) found no differences between controls and program participants in the self-reported propensity to rape, and Berg and colleagues (1999) found that men who attended a program designed to increase victim empathy reported a greater likelihood of raping compared with control group men. Differences in the content of the programs involved may have contributed to these inconsistent results. For example, the program evaluated by Berg and her colleagues utilized an audiotape of a female victim describing her experience, which may have increased the men’s defensiveness, or in some cases, been arousing to some men with a propensity for sexually aggressive behavior (Malamuth, 1981).

Effects on rape-supportive attitudes and beliefs. A common goal of male targeted programs has been to reduce rape-supportive attitudes and beliefs. These goals are typically addressed in programs by presenting accurate information about sexual assault, debunking rape myths, and discussing the impact of these attitudes and beliefs on sexual assault. Some researchers sought to enhance attitude change by incorporating theoretical models of attitude change into the program content, such as the elaboration likelihood model (Gilbert et al., 1991; Heppner et al., 1999).
Programs based on the elaboration likelihood model attempt to maximize central route processing (complex, thoughtful evaluation of the topic) by increasing motivation to think about the topic, the personal saliency of the information, and the participant’s ability to think about the topic (Gilbert et al., 1991; Heppner et al., 1999).

A majority of studies examining these outcomes support the effectiveness of prevention programs in reducing rape-supportive attitudes and beliefs, at least over the short-term. Several studies found that men who participated in a prevention program demonstrated significantly greater decreases in rape myth acceptance than control group participants at post-test and follow-up assessments that ranged from two weeks to seven months (Davis & Liddell, 2002; Foubert & Marriott, 1997; Foubert, 2000; Gilbert et al., 1991; Heppner et al., 1995; Heppner et al., 1999; Intons-Peterson et al., 1989; Johansson-Love & Geer, 2003; O’Donohue, Yeater, & Fanetti, 2003). Similarly, Schewe and O’Donohue (1996) found that participants in a program targeting rape supportive cognitions demonstrated significantly greater decreases in attraction to sexual aggression, acceptance of interpersonal violence, and rape myth acceptance when compared to controls. For the two programs utilizing the elaboration likelihood model, it was found that cognitive engagement was significantly correlated with reductions in rape-supportive attitudes (Gilbert et al., 1991; Heppner et al., 1999).

Although many studies have reported initial decreases in rape-supportive attitudes following participation in sexual assault prevention programs, longer-term
Follow-up assessments have often revealed rebound effects. Foubert and Marriot (1997) found that program participants reported significant decreases in rape myth acceptance following the program, and had lower scores than a control group at post-test, but at a 2-month follow-up, there were no differences between the experimental and control groups in rape myth acceptance. In a study evaluating two prevention programs for fraternity men, Davis and Liddell (2002) found that participants in both programs endorsed significantly fewer rape myths than control group men at post-test. However, attitudes had rebounded to pretest levels six weeks later. Heppner and colleagues (1999) noted that overall, program participants showed initial decreases in rape-supportive attitudes, but that the decreases were not maintained over a 5-month follow-up period. Furthermore, they identified three separate response patterns. One subgroup of men demonstrated an “improving” response pattern, in which their rejection of rape increased significantly over time. Men in the intervention groups were more likely than men in the control group to have an improving pattern. Another subgroup of men demonstrated a “deteriorating” response pattern, in which their rejection of rape decreased significantly over time. A third group of men demonstrated a “rebounding” response pattern, in which their rejection of rape increased sharply immediately at the post-test assessment, and then decreased to pretest levels at the five-month follow-up. Thus, one can conclude that there are differences in the way individuals respond to these interventions, however, Heppner et al. (1999) did not analyze for differences between men who rebounded and those who did not.
Effects on other variables. Increasing empathy and support for sexual assault survivors has been a goal of many prevention programs. A number of activities have been included in programs to address this goal, including listening to survivors and their families discuss the impact of the assault (e.g. Berg et al., 1999; Heppner et al., 1999), imagining the victim’s experience through guided imagery (e.g. Schewe & O’Donohue, 1993), and listening to dramatizations of assault incidents (e.g. Schewe & O’Donohue, 1993). Few studies have evaluated empathy outcomes directly. However, studies that did evaluate empathy found no differences between program participants and controls (Berg et al., 1999; Schewe & O’Donohue, 1993).

Moreover, there is some evidence that interventions designed to induce empathy may produce negative outcomes. In one study designed to elicit empathy, participants listened to either a male or female rape victim describing the experience. Men who listened to the female victim demonstrated higher self-reported likelihood to rape than men in the control group (Berg et al., 1999).

Additional goals of prevention programs have been to increase knowledge about sexual assault, to change attributions of blame for sexual assault, and to reduce rape conformity. Although several researchers have cited increased knowledge as a goal of programming (e.g. Lee, 1987), changes in knowledge about sexual assault have not been formally assessed. Some success has been demonstrated in changing the attributions of blame for sexual assault. Program participants have been found to make more attributions of perpetrator blame and fewer attributions of victim blame compared to control group men (Intons-Peterson et al., 1989; Linz, et al., 1990).
Schewe and O'Donohue (1993, 1996) assessed rape conformity by utilizing Asch’s (1956) paradigm. Participants were asked to share their opinions about increasingly extreme rape-supportive statements after hearing a group of confederates express agreement with each statement. Participants who had participated in a prevention program did not differ from control participants in their conformity to rape-supportive attitudes.

*Limitations of the Research on Prevention*

Sexual assault prevention with males is a relatively new area of research, and a majority of evaluations have been conducted within the last ten years. The content of most programs has been developed on the basis of empirical correlates of sexual aggression, rather than theoretical models of perpetration. Researchers have utilized theoretical models of attitude and belief change in program development, and interventions based on these models have been shown to facilitate attitude change (Heppner et al., 1999; Schewe & O’Donohue, 1996). However, these theoretical models address the way in which persuasive messages are delivered, rather than the content of those messages. Most programs have been designed to change attitudes and beliefs such as rape myths, traditional gender role beliefs, and acceptance of interpersonal violence (e.g. Heppner et al., 1999) because they are correlated with perpetration. These interventions have been developed with the assumption that changes in rape supportive attitudes will lead to decreases in perpetration. Although a relationship has been established between attitudes and sexual aggression, it is not clear what causal role attitudes play. For example, they may have a direct effect on
sexual aggression, or as Berkowitz (1992) has suggested, their effects may be mediated through situational characteristics that act as triggers. It is likely that attitudes represent one of many factors that collectively contribute to sexual assault (Malamuth, 1986). Program development can more effectively address prevention with theoretically derived interventions. As researchers learn more about the causal pathways to sexual aggression, the development of theoretically based programs will be facilitated. The program developed by Berkowitz (1994) is one such theoretically driven intervention. While it has been implemented across the country, limited evaluation of this program exists (Earle, 1996).

Furthermore, the outcomes measured in men’s prevention research have not been sufficient to demonstrate the effectiveness of prevention efforts. Some studies have conducted no formal evaluation other than measures of consumer satisfaction (Edigio & Robertson, 1981; Ring & Kilmartin, 1992). Because the ultimate goal of prevention programming with men is to decrease sexually aggressive behavior, this behavior must be assessed in order to comprehensively evaluate the effectiveness of prevention efforts. With the exception of Foubert (2000), researchers have not evaluated the effects of prevention programs on the sexually aggressive behavior of men. Most studies have utilized various measures of rape supportive attitudes (e.g. Schewe & O’Donohue, 1996) with the assumption that decreases in attitudes will lead to decreases in aggressive behavior. Researchers have also attempted to assess the potential behavioral effects by asking men to rate their likelihood to rape or use force if they could be sure they would not be caught. However, decreased
endorsement of rape supportive attitudes or self-reported propensity to rape may not automatically translate into less aggressive behavior. Indeed, Foubert (2000) found that program participants maintained decreases in rape myth acceptance and likelihood to rape over a seven-month period, while control group participants demonstrated no changes on either measure. Despite these changes, there were no differences between the control and experimental conditions in sexually aggressive acts perpetrated over this period.

In order for evaluation research to effectively investigate the effects of prevention programming, there is a need for researchers to coordinate program goals, interventions, and outcome measures (Berg et al., 1999; Gidycz et al., 2002). In previous research, this coordination has not always been apparent. For example, in several studies, interventions designed to elicit empathy were used, but only attitudinal outcomes were assessed (e.g. Foubert & Marriot, 1997). As Berg and colleagues (1999) have suggested, the goals of the intervention should be clearly and specifically defined, and interventions should be developed to address those goals. Then a research design and outcome measures should be developed to evaluate the specific goals identified. Because the goal of this evaluation research to develop and identify effective prevention programs, there is also a need for specific programs to be evaluated and modified on an ongoing basis, as several researchers have done (e.g. Foubert, 2000).
The Present Study

The present study investigated the effectiveness of a sexual assault prevention program designed for a male audience. The program used in this study was developed by Berkowitz (1994), and was modified for the purposes of this evaluation. The goals of this program were to increase participants’ understanding of consent, to decrease rape supportive attitudes, to decrease men’s misperceptions of other men’s attitudes, to increase the likelihood that men will confront other men’s sexually aggressive behavior, and ultimately, to decrease the occurrence of sexually aggressive behavior. This program is based on a social norms theoretical perspective. In addition, the integrated model of sexual assault proposed by Berkowitz (1992) served as the theoretical basis for the development of the program content. In particular, the program content focuses on the socialization and situational components of the model. With the intent of facilitating attitude change, the elaboration likelihood model was utilized to inform the format of the program. Several elements were included to increase central route processing of the information provided. The program included a great deal of discussion, which was intended to increase the personal relevance of the information. In addition, participants were asked to generate solutions to difficult situations, which requires more active processing of the information.

Men in this study were randomly assigned to either a control group or an experimental group. They were assessed at pretest on measures of rape supportive attitudes, perceptions of other men’s attitudes, willingness to confront other men,
understanding of consent, and self-reported sexually aggressive behavior. Following this, men in the experimental group participated in the prevention program. Both groups of men were assessed on all of the measures at two follow-up sessions, one three months after the intervention, and one six-months after the intervention. It was hypothesized that men in the experimental group would demonstrate greater decreases in rape supportive attitudes, and greater increases in the understanding of consent when compared to control group men. It was also hypothesized that men in the experimental group, compared to control group men, would demonstrate more accurate perceptions of social norms at the follow-up sessions, as well as more willingness to confront inappropriate behavior in other men. Finally, it was hypothesized that men in the program group would demonstrate lower rates of self-reported sexually aggressive behavior than control group men at the follow-up sessions.

Pilot study

A pilot study was conducted to obtain feedback from male students about the sexual assault prevention program. This feedback was used to assist in refining the program’s content. Twenty undergraduate men were recruited from psychology classes (N = 10), fraternities (N = 6), and campus residence halls (N = 4). They were told that they would attend a sexual assault prevention program followed by a focus group in which they would provide feedback about the program. They were paid $20 for their participation in the pilot study.
Two program and focus group sessions were conducted. Nine participants attended the first session, and eleven participants attended the second session. The sexual assault prevention program was facilitated by a trained male graduate student, Alan Berkowitz, the consultant on the current project and developer of the program, observed the program. After the program, participants were asked to give feedback about the program in a discussion led by Alan Berkowitz and the graduate student facilitator. Participants were then asked to complete a written evaluation of the program.

The program evaluation consisted of 13 items assessing the usefulness and relevance of the prevention workshop content, as well as the quality of the group discussions. Nine of these items were rated on a five-point scale, with higher scores indicating more positive ratings of the program. The other items were open-ended questions. The feedback provided by the pilot study participants was generally positive. Participants indicated that they learned a lot about sexual assault and coercion, paid a lot of attention to the program, and were likely to use the information provided in the program. They also indicated that they found the program and the program facilitator helpful, and that they felt they had the opportunity to express their opinions in the group. They were less likely to report that the information presented in the program was new to them, that the information presented applied specifically to them, and that all group members participated equally in the discussions. The mean ratings for each item are presented in Table 1.
Table 1

*Pilot Study: Mean Ratings of Program Evaluation Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Did the program help you learn more about sexual assault and</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and sexually coercive behavior? (1 = didn’t learn at all; 5 = learned a lot)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How much of the information presented tonight was new to you? (1 =</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nothing new; 5 = all new)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How much attention did you give to the program? (1 = almost no attention; 5 = a lot of attention)</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How much of the information applied specifically to you? (1 = almost none applied specifically to me; 5 = a lot applied specifically to me)</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How helpful do you think the information provided is? (1 = not at all helpful; 5 = very helpful)</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How likely are you to use the information presented today? (1 = not at all likely; 5 = very likely)</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How interested and/or helpful did you perceive the group leader(s) to be? (1 = not at all interested/helpful; 5 = very interested/helpful)</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Did you feel like you had the opportunity to voice your opinions in the group? (1 = no opportunity to voice opinions; 5 = a lot of opportunity to voice opinions)</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Did you feel like everyone in the group participated equally in</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussions, or did a few people dominate the discussions? (1 = a few people dominated; 5 = everyone participated equally)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Independent samples t-tests were conducted on each program evaluation item to determine whether the two program groups differed in their ratings of the program. The two groups differed significantly in their ratings of Item 9, such that one group ($M = 4.22$) reported more equal participation in the discussions among all members of the group than did the other group ($M = 2.45$), $t (18) = 4.14, p < .01$. The two groups did not differ significantly in their ratings of any of the other program evaluation items.

Responses to the open ended questions were generally positive as well. The participants were asked if their opinions of what other men think changed as a result of attending the program. Eleven of the men responded that their opinions had changed, and several noted that they realized that more men have opinions that are similar to their own. Nine of the men responded that their opinions of what other men think did not change. Participants were also asked to report what they liked most and least about the program. Several people mentioned that the discussions were the best part of the program. The men also reported liking the open, non-threatening atmosphere of the program. The most common criticism was that the program was too long or slow paced. The also noted that they felt uncomfortable with the small group discussion, and that they wanted more concrete suggestions about how to handle difficult situations. On the basis of group discussions and responses on the program evaluations, some changes were made in the prevention workshop. The length of the program was reduced somewhat by eliminating some redundant material and by streamlining transitions between topics. The small group
activity was modified to include more focused discussion topics. Finally, some discussion questions were added to assist participants in generating concrete, specific guidelines for dealing with ambiguous social and sexual situations. Table 2 summarizes the responses to the open ended questions.
Table 2

*Pilot Study: Responses to Open Ended Program Evaluation Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What did you like most about the program?</td>
<td>Open/non-threatening atmosphere</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussions</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informative/increased awareness</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All male group</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size of group</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easy to relate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Not just terms and statistics”</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did you like least about the program?</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Too long/slow paced/boring</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breaking into smaller groups</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of concrete tips on dealing with</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ambiguous situations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Too short</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not everyone participated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Didn’t include women</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 20; the number of responses for each question totals more than 20 because some people provided more than one response for each question.*
Method

Participants

The participants in this study were 342 undergraduate men enrolled in psychology courses at Ohio University. A majority of the participants were Caucasian (89.2%), heterosexual (98%), first year (59.1%) students. Most of the men were not members of a fraternity (82.5%), and reported that they date casually (58.2%). A summary of the demographic data is presented in Table 3. Participants were recruited through sign-up sheets posted on a sign-up board in the Department of Psychology and randomly assigned to either an experimental group or a control group. To ensure confidentiality and anonymity, participants were identified only by subject number. Participants generated their own unique subject numbers by completing the Subject Number Calculation Form (see Appendix A), and the numbers were never linked to the participants’ names. For their participation in the first part of the study, students received course credit in their psychology class. They were paid $20 for their participation in each of the follow-up sessions. Upon completion of the study, control group participants were offered the opportunity to participate in the prevention program.
Table 3

*Participant Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) 18</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) 19</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) 20</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) 21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) over 21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Single, never married</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Married</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Divorced</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Separated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year in School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Freshman</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Sophomore</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Junior</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Senior</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dating Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Do not date</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Date casually</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Long term relationship</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Engaged</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Caucasian, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>89.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) African American</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Latino</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious Affiliation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Catholic</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Protestant</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Jewish</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Muslim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Non-denominational</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Other</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) None</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) $15,000 or less</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) $15,001 - $ 25,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) $25,001 - $ 35,000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) $35,001 - $ 50,000</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) $50,001 - $ 75,000</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) $75,001 - $100,000</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Over $100,000</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Heterosexual</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Homosexual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Bisexual</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fraternity Membership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Fraternity member</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Not a fraternity member</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attrition

Attrition rates for the study were acceptable at all time periods. Of the 342 participants, 291 (85.1%) returned for the 3-month follow-up, and 264 (77.2%) returned for the 7-month follow-up. Sixty-nine percent (N=237) of the participants attended all three phases of the study. Chi square analyses indicated that the control and experimental groups did not have significantly different attrition rates.

Chi-square analyses were conducted to examine whether participants who failed to return for each follow-up differed demographically from those who attended each follow-up session. Among members of the control group, men who failed to return for the three-month follow-up session did not differ significantly from those who attended the session, in terms of demographic characteristics. In addition, control group men who failed to attend the seven-month follow-up session were demographically comparable to those who attended the session.

Among members of the experimental group, there were several demographic differences between participants who returned for follow-up sessions and those who did not return. At the three-month follow-up, age was significantly related to attrition, \( \chi^2 (4, N=165) = 10.57, p < .05 \). Specifically, only 60% of men over age 21 returned for the 3-month follow-up, compared to 79.2% of the 18-year-olds, 81.7% of the 19-year-olds, 100% of the 20-year-olds, and 80% of the 21-year-old participants. At the seven-month follow-up, both fraternity membership, \( \chi^2 (1, N=165) = 6.45, p < .05 \), and family income, \( \chi^2 (6, N=165) = 15.83, p < .05 \) were significantly related to attrition. Fewer fraternity members (62.5%) than men who
were not fraternity members (84.4%) returned for the 7-month follow-up. Participants with lower family incomes were also less likely to return for the 7-month follow-up. Specifically, while 83.5% of participants who reported annual family incomes above $25,000 attended the follow-up, compared to 28.6% of participants who reported family incomes less than $25,000.

Chi-square analyses were also conducted to examine whether participants who failed to return for each follow-up differed from those who attended each follow-up session in terms of perpetration history. Among participants in the control group, perpetration history was not related to attrition at either follow-up session. Similarly, among experimental group participants, perpetration history was not related to attrition at the 3-month follow-up, $X^2 (2, N=164) = .26, p > .05$. However, among participants in the experimental group, perpetration history was significantly related to attrition at the 7-month follow-up $X^2 (2, N=164) = 9.95, p < .01$, such that men who reported engaging in behavior that met the definition of rape after the age of 14 but prior to the beginning of the study were less likely to return for the 7-month follow-up than men who reported no history of perpetration or men with a history of moderate perpetration. While 80.6% of men with no perpetration history and 90.3% of men with a history of moderate perpetration attended the 7-month follow-up session, only 25% of men with a history of rape attended the session.

Among men in the experimental group, attrition was assessed as a function of consumer satisfaction, as measured by the program evaluation questionnaire administered at post-test. T-tests were conducted to determine whether men who
failed to return for follow-ups reported being less satisfied with the sexual prevention workshop than those who attended the follow-up sessions. There were no significant differences in post-test program evaluation ratings between men who attended the three-month follow-up ($M = 66.33$) and men who failed to return for the three-month follow-up ($M = 68.15$), $t(163) = .94, p > .05$. In addition, there were no significant differences in program evaluation ratings between men who attended the seven-month follow-up ($M = 66.91$) and men who failed to return for the seven-month follow-up ($M = 65.35$), $t(163) = .86, p > .05$.

**Measures**

*Demographic Questionnaire*

This is a 17-item questionnaire used to collect relevant personal information regarding participant demographic characteristics such as age, ethnicity/race, and religious background, as well as information about participant characteristics related to social, dating, and sexual behaviors such as alcohol use, dating status, sexual orientation, and previous participation in sexual assault education. (see Appendix B1).

*Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale – Short Form (IRMA-SF)*

The short form of the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (Payne, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999) is a 20-item questionnaire designed to assess general rape myth acceptance. Each item is rated on a 7-point scale from 1 ("not at all agree") to 7 ("very much agree"). Scores are obtained by summing the ratings for 17 of the 20
The scale yields scores ranging from 17 to 119, with higher scores indicating greater endorsement of rape-supportive attitudes.

The short form of the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance scale is highly correlated to the full scale (r = .97), and has high internal consistency (alpha = .87). Good concurrent validity has also been demonstrated; correlations with the Sex Role Stereotyping Scale (Burt, 1980), Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale (Burt, 1980), Hostility Towards Women Scale (Burt, 1980), and Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence Scale (Burt, 1980) range from .47 to .74 (Payne et al., 1999).

For the purposes of this study, participants completed the short form of the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale twice during each assessment period. First, participants responded in the usual manner, by indicating the degree to which they agreed with each statement. This provided a measure of attitudes about rape. Later during each session participants completed the measure again, responding as they thought the average male student at the university would respond. This provided a measure of participants’ perceptions of other men’s attitudes, and has been labeled IRMA-O. Although this procedure has never been used before with the IRMA, this procedure has been used with other scales (e.g. Drinking Habits Questionnaire; Cahalan, Cisin, & Crossley, 1969) to measure perceived social norms (Baer, Stacy, & Larimer, 1991). (see Appendix B2)

Hypergender Ideology Scale (HGIS)

The Hypergender Ideology Scale (Hamburger, Hogben, McGowen, & Dawson, 1996) was designed to replace the Hyperfemininity Scale (Murnen &
Byrne, 1991) and the Hypermasculinity Inventory (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984) with a combined measure of extreme, stereotypical gender roles for both men and women. The short form of the Hypergender Ideology Scale was used in this study. It contains 19 self-report items which are rated on a 6-point scale, from 1 (“strongly disagree”) to 6 (“strongly agree”). Scores are obtained by summing the scores for all of the items. The scale yields scores ranging from 19 to 114, with higher scores indicating more extreme endorsement of stereotypical gender roles. The short form of the HGIS has demonstrated high internal consistency ($alpha = .93$). It is also significantly correlated with the Hypermasculinity Inventory ($r = .55$) and the Hyperfemininity Inventory ($r = .56$) (Hamburger et al., 1996). (see Appendix B3)

**Sexual Experiences Survey (SES)**

The Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss & Oros, 1982) is designed to identify perpetrators of sexual assault through a series of 10 sexually explicit questions, in which the respondent assesses his past sexual behavior along a variety of dimensions since the age of 14. Respondents were asked to answer “Yes” or “No” to each item in a self-report format. Following each item, each respondent was asked to indicate the number of times he has engaged in the behavior. At the initial assessment, participants were asked to respond to each question based on their behavior since the age of 14. At each follow-up assessment, participants were asked to respond to each question based on their behavior during the follow-up period.

This measure is used to identify sexual assault perpetration based on behavioral definitions of assault. As such, it can be used even when the perpetrator
does not interpret his behavior as sexual assault. The Sexual Experiences Survey is the most frequently used of all similar measures assessing sexually aggressive behavior, and has demonstrated high internal consistency ($\alpha = .89$) and two-week test-retest reliability ($r = .93$) (Koss & Gidycz, 1985). Men’s responses to the Sexual Experiences Survey have also been found to be significantly correlated with responses given in an interview ($r = .61$) (Koss & Gidycz, 1985).

The Sexual Experiences Survey has been used to classify individuals into one of five categories reflecting the extent of their reported use of coercion or force. The five categories reflect increasingly severe sexually assaultive behavior, and have been defined as follows: (a) not sexually aggressive (no items endorsed), (b) sexually aggressive contact (items 1, 2, and 3): the use of continual arguments, authority, or physical force to coerce a woman into sex play, including fondling, kissing or petting, but not sexual intercourse, (c) attempted rape (items 4 and 5): the use of physical force, alcohol, or drugs to attempt sexual intercourse with a woman, but intercourse did not occur, (d) sexual coercion (items 6 and 7): the use of authority, or continual arguments and pressure to compel a woman into sexual intercourse, and (e) rape (items 8, 9, and 10): The use of alcohol, drugs, or physical force to coerce a woman into sexual intercourse, including anal and oral sex. Men are classified according to the most severe type of assaultive behavior endorsed. For the purposes of this study, men were classified into three categories: (a) no sexual aggression: no items endorsed, (b) moderate sexual aggression: endorsement of items categorized as “sexually aggressive contact,” “attempted rape” or “coercion,” and (c) severe
sexual aggression: endorsement of items categorized as “rape.” For some analyses, these three categories were collapsed into two categories due to the low number of participants in the “severe” category: (a) no sexual aggression, and (b) sexual aggression (moderate or severe sexual aggression). (see Appendix B4).

Reactions to Offensive Language and Behavior Scale (ROLB)

This is a 26-item self report scale that measures discomfort with and willingness to confront the inappropriate behavior of other men, as well as perceptions of other men’s discomfort with and willingness to confront these behaviors. This scale was adapted from questions used by Kilmartin (1999). Several items assess behavior on a 7-point scale from 1 (“always”) to 7 (“never”) (e.g. When I hear a sexist comment I indicate my displeasure); other items assess discomfort on a 7-point scale from 1 (“very comfortable”) to 7 (“very uncomfortable”) (e.g. You’re walking to class when your friend brags, “I hooked up the last four weekends). Participants were asked to rate each item twice, once referring to their own behavior and comfort level, and again referring to their perceptions of the behavior and comfort level of other male students. The scale yields four subscales based on the type of item and the referent: self-behavior (ROLB-S-B), self-comfort (ROLB-S-C), other-behavior (ROLB-O-B), and other-comfort (ROLB-O-C). Lower scores on the behavioral subscales indicate a greater willingness to intervene in situations where other men are behaving in ways that objectify women or are potentially sexually aggressive. Lower scores on the comfort subscales indicate higher levels of comfort in situations where other men talk about women in a degrading or objectifying
manner. The ROLB demonstrated good internal consistency on all four subscales: self-behavior \((\text{alpha} = .70 \text{ to } .81)\), self-comfort \((\text{alpha} = .89 \text{ to } .92)\), other-behavior \((\text{alpha} = .83 \text{ to } .85)\), and other-comfort \((\text{alpha} = .94-.96)\). (see Appendix B5)

Consent Scenarios

Two consent scenarios were used to assess perceptions of consenting sexual activity. These scenarios were adapted from those used in a previous study (Pinzone-Glover, Gidycz, & Jacobs, 1998). Specifically, two of the three sexually aggressive vignettes used by Pinzone-Glover, et al. (1998) were used in this study. The third scenario was excluded because it lacked sufficient ambiguity to produce variability in participant responses; participants in that study uniformly labeled the scenario as rape. The two scenarios selected for this study both met the legal criteria for rape, but they included several variables that increased their ambiguity (Johnson & Jackson, 1988), including varying levels of prior intimacy, perpetrator alcohol consumption, and victim resistance. In Scenario One, the less ambiguous vignette used in this study, the woman allowed the man to touch her breasts over her clothing, the man had consumed two alcoholic drinks, and the woman cried during the assault. In Scenario Two, the more ambiguous vignette used in this study, the couple had previously had sexual intercourse, there was no alcohol consumption, and the woman “turned cold” during the assault.

The participants were asked to read the scenarios, and then rate each scenario on a 10 point scale across three dimensions: degree of sexual aggression (definitely not rape to definitely rape), responsibility attributed to the man (no responsibility to
total responsibility), and responsibility attributed to the woman (no responsibility to
total responsibility). A total score was obtained for each scenario, with higher scores
indicating higher perceived aggression, more responsibility attributed to the man,
and less responsibility attributed to the woman. (see Appendix B6)

Knowledge Questionnaire

This is a 7-item measure developed for this study for the purpose of assessing
the degree to which experimental participants learned the information presented in
the prevention workshop. Respondents were asked to respond “true” or “false” to
statements about the definitions and prevalence of sexual assault. This measure was
administered to participants in the experimental group at the conclusion of the
prevention workshop. The measure was administered to both the control and
experimental groups at the 7-month follow-up. (see Appendix B7)

The outcome variables were grouped into four categories: attitudes, social
perceptions, understanding of consent, and self-reported behavior. Table 4
summarizes each grouping of outcome measures.
Table 4

Summary of Outcome Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale – Self (IRMA-S)</td>
<td>Measures endorsement of rape myths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypergender Ideology Scale (HGIS)</td>
<td>Measures endorsement of stereotypical gender roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactions to Offensive Language and Behavior – Self (ROLB-S)</td>
<td>Behavior scale (ROLB-S-B) measures willingness to intervene when other men engage in sexually inappropriate behavior. Comfort scale (ROLB-S-C) measures discomfort with sexist language and behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understanding of Consent</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent Scenarios</td>
<td>Measures the degree to which vignettes depicting sexually aggressive behavior are rated as coercive, and the degree to which responsibility is assigned to the man and the woman in each vignette.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Reported Sexually Aggressive Behavior</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Experiences Survey (SES)</td>
<td>Measures sexual assault perpetration, including sexually aggressive contact, attempted rape, sexual coercion, and rape.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intervention Materials

Sexual Assault Prevention Program for Men

The program used in this study was initially developed by Berkowitz (1994), and has been used extensively with first-year men at a small liberal arts college. The original program is facilitated by male peers, and allows for flexibility in the topics and scenarios presented by the facilitators. For the purposes of this study, the program was modified in consultation with Dr. Berkowitz, both to allow for the use of a facilitator with professional training, and to acquire a standardized program format that will lend itself more easily to evaluation. Although the content of the modified program remains very similar to the content in the original program, a detailed protocol was developed in order to standardize the program’s implementation. The protocol outlines facts and definitions to be presented to participants, hypothetical situations to be discussed, and specific discussion questions and issues to be raised by the presenter. Feedback from participants in the pilot study was also used to assist in modifying the prevention program’s content and format. On the basis of this feedback, the program protocol was streamlined to shorten the length of the program, and discussion questions were added to elicit specific suggestions about how to handle difficult social and sexual situations.

The modified version of the program was facilitated by a trained male graduate student with groups of 10 to 15 men. The program format is a combination of didactic presentation, group discussion, and a small group activity. The program begins with a warm-up exercise in which each group member answers the question,
“What is difficult about being a man at Ohio University?” The facilitator then defines sexual assault and provides information about the prevalence of sexual assault, and asks for reactions to this information. Following the presentation of factual information, the facilitator initiates a discussion of issues related to sexual communication and consent, and presents a vignette that highlights these issues. The facilitator also presents several vignettes illustrating risky sexual situations, and initiates discussion about risky situational factors (such as alcohol use), and how to handle these situations. Men’s responsibility to prevent sexual assault is emphasized, with a focus on how participants feel when other men use sexist language or behave coercively, the impact of men’s sexually aggressive behavior on other men, and how to intervene with inappropriate behavior on the part of other men. The program protocol is provided in Appendix C1.

Program Evaluation Form

At the conclusion of the program, participants were asked to evaluate the program using the Elaboration Likelihood Model Questionnaire (Heppner et al., 1995). This is a 12-item measure designed to evaluate consumer satisfaction, as well as to assess the extent to which participants engaged in central route processing (e.g. thought carefully about the program and evaluated its content in a positive light). Respondents rated each item on a 7-point scale, with higher scores indicating greater central route processing. This measure has been demonstrated to have internal consistency of .83 (Heppner et al., 1995). Scores on this measure are also positively correlated with attitude change (Heppner et al., 1995). Participants also rated three
additional items on a 7-point scale; these items assessed participant perceptions of
the group process and the degree to which they felt their perceptions of other men’s
opinions had changed. In addition, the Program Evaluation Form included three open
ended questions in which participants were asked to indicate what they liked most
and least about the program, and to provide any additional comments (see Appendix
C2).

*Process Evaluation Form*

This is a nine-item measure designed to provide an assessment of the group
dynamics during each program, as well as the quality of the group discussions. Each
item is rated on a 7-point scale, and space is provided for additional comments about
each question. This form was completed after each program by the facilitator. This
form was also completed by a trained live rater for 4 of the 15 workshops conducted.
(see Appendix C3)

*Protocol Consistency Checklist*

This is a 52-item checklist designed to assess the degree to which the
facilitator adhered to the program protocol. This checklist was completed by a
trained live rater for 4 of the 15 prevention workshops conducted. The rater was
asked to indicate for each item whether the facilitator adhered to a given task in the
program protocol (e.g. “Did the facilitator present the informational slides about race
and same sex relationships?”). The items included a variety of tasks, including the
presentation of slides and information, the presentation of vignettes, and the
introduction of specific discussion topics. Responses by the live rater indicated that
the facilitator completed 100% of the tasks on the consistency checklist during each session the rater attended. (see Appendix C4)

Procedure

Sessions took place in classrooms in the Department of Psychology. At the beginning of session one, participants were randomly assigned to either the experimental group or the control group. Experimental and control participants were then directed to go to separate rooms. Once participants reported to the appropriate room, male experimenters distributed and read the consent form (see Appendix D) and distributed the questionnaire packets.

Participants in the experimental group then completed all of the outcome measures: Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (IRMA), Hypergender Ideology Scale (HGIS), Sexual Experiences Survey (SES), Reactions to Offensive Language and Behavior Scale (ROLB), and Consent Scenarios. After completing the questionnaires, participants in the experimental group participated in a sexual assault prevention program facilitated by a male graduate student. A trained live rater attended 20% of the programs to assess the consistency with which the program protocol was followed. At the end of the program, participants asked to complete a program evaluation form, and were given a debriefing form (see Appendix E). At this time participants were informed that they would be contacted in three months to participate in a follow-up session. Total participation time for experimental group participants was approximately three hours for session one.
Participants in the control group completed all of the outcome measures: Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (IRMA), Hypergender Ideology Scale (HGIS), Drinking Habits Questionnaire, Sexual Experiences Survey (SES), Reactions to Offensive Language and Behavior Scale (ROLB), and Consent Scenarios at time one. They also completed the following additional measures: Drinking Habits Questionnaire (Cahalan, Cisin, & Crossley, 1969), Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979), Child Sexual Victimization Questionnaire (Finkelhor, 1979), California Personality Inventory - Socialization Scale (Gough, 1957; 1968), Alcohol Expectancies Regarding Sex, Aggression, and Sexual Vulnerability Questionnaire (Abbey, McAuslan, Ross, & Zawacki, 1999), Multidimensional Sexuality Questionnaire (Snell, Fisher, & Walters, 1993), Adversarial Heterosexual Beliefs Scale (Lonsway & Fitzgerald,1995). These additional measures were administered both to make participation times for both groups comparable and to provide data for another study evaluating a model of sexual assault perpetration; however, they were not used in the analyses for this study. After completing the questionnaires, participants in the control group were given a debriefing form (see Appendix E) and were informed that they would be contacted in three months to participate in a follow-up session. Total participation time for control group participants was approximately two hours for session one.

Approximately three months after session one, all participants were asked to return for a follow-up session. At the beginning of session two, the experimenters distributed consent form (see Appendix D) and the questionnaire packets.
Participants were asked to obtain their subject numbers using the Subject Number Calculation Form. They then completed all of the outcome measures. After completing the questionnaires, participants were given a debriefing form (see Appendix E) and were informed that they would be contacted in four months to participate in another follow-up session. They also received $20 for their participation. Total participation time for all participants was approximately one hour for session two.

Approximately seven months after session one, all participants were asked to return for another follow-up session. At the beginning of session three, the experimenter distributed the consent form (see Appendix D) and the questionnaire packets. Participants were asked to obtain their subject numbers using the Subject Number Calculation Form. They then completed all of the outcome measures. After completing the questionnaires, participants were given a debriefing form (see Appendix E) and $20 for their participation. Total participation time for all participants was approximately one hour for session two. After completing the study, participants in the control group were offered the opportunity to attend the sexual assault prevention workshop. None of the members of the control group expressed interest in attending the workshop.
Results

*Intervention Variables*

*Program Evaluation Form*

Descriptive analyses were performed on the individual items of the program evaluation form, which was completed by participants in the experimental group immediately following the prevention workshop. Overall, the men indicated that they were actively engaged during the workshop and that they thought the workshop was valuable. In particular, they indicated that they thought the workshop was well organized and that the information presented was accurate and of high quality. They also indicated that they had the opportunity to voice their own opinions about the topics presented during the workshop. They were less likely to indicate that the presentation held their attention, that group members participated equally in group discussions, and that their perceptions of other men’s attitudes had changed. Table 5 presents the means for each item. The mean score on the Elaboration Likelihood Model Questionnaire (ELMQ), comprised by the first 12 items of the program evaluation form, was 54.97 (SD = 8.39) out of a possible score of 72. This indicates that program participants reported a high level of cognitive processing during the workshop, and suggests that conditions were favorable for attitude change.
Table 5

Mean Ratings for Program Evaluation Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean (N = 165)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program topic was important to me personally</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivated to listen to the presentation</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation held my attention</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information presented was difficult to understand</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was not distracted during the presentation</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough time to think about the topic</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter made good points about the topic</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tried hard to evaluate the information provided</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Found presentation organized and easy to follow</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to concentrate on the presentation</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information presented was logical and accurate</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of presenter’s information</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to voice opinions in the group</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All group members participated equally in discussions</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinions about other men’s attitudes have changed</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Higher numbers indicate more favorable ratings of the workshop.
Analyses were conducted to assess whether differences in ELMQ scores were associated with any of the demographic variables, or pretest variables related to dating and social behaviors; none of these variables were significantly related to scores on the ELMQ. Analyses were also conducted to assess whether perpetration history was associated with differences in ELMQ scores. An ANOVA conducted on the ELMQ indicated that there were no significant differences between experimental group participants as a function of perpetration history, $F(2, 161) = .02, p > .05$. This suggests that participants with a history moderate and severe sexual assault perpetration were as engaged in, and responded as positively to, the prevention workshop as participants with no perpetration history.

Finally, analyses were conducted to assess whether differences in ELMQ scores were associated with changes in attitude at both the 3-month and 7-month follow-ups. Change scores were calculated for each variable such that positive change scores indicated attitude change in the expected direction. Then correlations were calculated between scores on the ELMQ and attitude change for each variable at both follow-up periods. On the IRMA, there was no relationship between the ELMQ and attitude change at the 3-month follow-up. At the 7-month follow-up, higher scores on the ELMQ were associated with attitude change on the IRMA in the desired direction. However, on the HGIS, ROLB-B, and ROLB-C, higher scores on the ELMQ were negatively correlated with attitude change at the 3-month follow-up. At the 7-month follow-up, there was no relationship between ELMQ scores and
attitude change for any of the three variables. Table 6 summarizes the correlations between ELMQ scores and attitude change.
Table 6

*Correlations Between the ELMQ and Attitude Change*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-month</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-month</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-month</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-month</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLB-B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-month</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-month</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLB-C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-month</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-month</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, two-tailed.
Process Evaluation Form

Descriptive analyses were performed on the individual items of the process evaluation form, which was completed by the program facilitator immediately following each of the 15 prevention workshops conducted. This form was also completed by a trained live rater who attended four of the workshops. Ratings on the process evaluation form indicated that overall, the group process was favorable, and that no notable factors detracted from the workshop. In particular, in their responses to the Likert-type items, the facilitator and the live rater indicated that there were no unusual circumstances that negatively influenced the group process, that participants seemed to be comfortable discussing their feelings and opinions, and that group participation was not limited to a few dominant members. They also indicated that, in general, the participants appeared to accept the major ideas presented in the workshop. Table 7 presents the means for each item.
Table 7

*Mean Ratings for Process Evaluation Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean (N = 15)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did everyone participate and talk?</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did one or two individuals dominate the discussion?</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were cliques detrimental to the program?</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were all viewpoints represented?</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were participants comfortable with sharing thoughts?</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did any circumstances detract from the program?</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much resistance to main points of the program?</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Higher scores indicate more favorable ratings of the group process.
In response the open-ended questions on the process evaluation form, the facilitator and the live rater identified several ideas that program participants had difficulty accepting. The facilitator reported that, in six of the workshops, group members had difficulty accepting the idea that an incident can be defined as sexual assault even if the victim does not actively resist. Less frequently, the facilitator and live rater reported encountering resistance to information about the frequency of false accusations (3 workshops), the initiator’s responsibility for obtaining consent for sexual activity when both people are drunk (2 workshops), and the role of sexual objectification in interpersonal violence (2 workshops). Additionally, in two workshops, group members indicated that they would not want to confront sexist language and behavior. In two workshops, the facilitator reported that there was no notable resistance to any of the major ideas presented. Responses to the open-ended questions indicated that the workshop facilitator handled challenging and inappropriate responses by asking for group feedback, and reframing responses in a more acceptable way if possible.

Knowledge Questionnaire

Men in the experimental group obtained a mean score of 6.36 (SD = .71) out of a possible seven on the knowledge questionnaire, which was administered to the experimental group immediately following the prevention workshop for the purpose of assessing the degree to which experimental participants learned the information presented in the workshop. The knowledge questionnaire was administered to both the control and experimental groups at the 7-month follow-up. At the 7-month
follow-up, men in the experimental group obtained a mean score of 5.78 ($SD = 1.08$), while men in the control group obtained a mean score of 5.3 ($SD = 1.2$). Men in the experimental group answered significantly more questions correctly at post-test than they did at the 7-month follow-up, $t(124) = 5.41, p < .001$. Men in the experimental group answered significantly more questions correctly than men in the control group at the 7-month follow-up, $t(253) = 3.33, p < .01$.

*Social Perceptions*

Analyses were performed to assess whether participants’ pretest perceptions of the attitudes of other men differed from their self reported attitudes at pretest, as predicted by social norms theory. T-tests were conducted between each social perception variable and its self-report counterpart: IRMA-Self and IRMA-Other; ROLB-Behavior-Self and ROLB-Behavior-Other; ROLB-Comfort-Self and ROLB-Comfort-Other. There were significant differences between social perceptions and self-reported attitudes on the IRMA, $t(340) = 15.32, p < .001$, ROLB-Behavior, $t(334) = 11.79, p < .001$, and ROLB-Comfort $t(315) = 4.98, p < .001$. For each variable, participants perceived the attitudes of others as being more rape supportive than their own behaviors. Table 8 presents the mean scores for each variable as a function of whether participants used themselves or other men as a reference point.
Table 8

*Mean Attitude Scores as a Function of Reference Point*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRMA&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>40.29</td>
<td>12.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.06</td>
<td>19.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLB-Behavior&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>20.74</td>
<td>5.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.90</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLB-Comfort&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>24.05</td>
<td>10.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.66</td>
<td>10.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Higher scores indicate more rape supportive attitudes.

<sup>b</sup>Higher scores indicate less rape supportive attitudes.
Frequency of Sexual Aggression

The frequency of sexual aggression over the course of the study was measured using the Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss & Oros, 1982). At pretest, 27.4% of the participants reported history of sexually aggressive behavior. Of those who reported a history of perpetration, 45.2% had engaged in attempted rape or sexual coercion, and 9.7% had engaged in behavior that met the criteria for rape. At the 3-month follow-up, 14% of the men reported that they had engaged in sexually aggressive behavior between the pretest and the 3-month follow-up. Of these men, 25% had engaged in attempted rape or sexual coercion, and 7.5% reported behavior that met the criteria for rape, while the remaining men had engaged in sexually aggressive contact. At the 7-month follow-up, 13.9% of the men reported perpetration between the 3-month follow-up and the 7-month follow-up. Of these men, 30.6% had engaged in attempted rape or sexual coercion, and 13.9% reported behavior that met the criteria for rape. Table 9 summarizes the frequency of sexual aggression for both the control and experimental groups during the course of the study.
Table 9

*Frequency of Sexual Assault Peretration at Each Time Period*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>History of Perpetration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually Aggressive Contact</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Rape</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Coercion</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perpetration at 3-month Follow-up</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually Aggressive Contact</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Rape</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Coercion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perpetration at 7-month Follow-up</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually Aggressive Contact</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Rape</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Coercion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Percentage of participants within control group. <sup>b</sup>Percentage of participants within experimental group.
Comparison of Control and Experimental Groups at Pretest

The control and experimental groups were compared on all of the variables to determine whether there were any pretest differences between the two groups. Chi square analyses were performed on all of the categorical variables, and t-tests were performed on all of the continuous variables.

Categorical Variables

Chi square analyses conducted on the demographic variables indicated that there were no significant demographic differences between the control and experimental groups. The two groups did not differ significantly in age, marital status, year in school, living arrangements, fraternity membership, ethnic group, religion, or family income at pretest. Similarly, no differences were found between the two groups when Chi square analyses were conducted on pretest variables related to dating and social behaviors and sexual assault awareness. The two groups did not differ significantly in dating status, sexual orientation, frequency or amount of alcohol use, personal acquaintance with a rape victim, past attendance at a sexual assault awareness program, opinions about the extent to which sexual assault is a problem at Ohio University, or pornography use.

Chi square analyses conducted on the Sexual Experiences Survey indicated that the control and experimental groups differed significantly in their history of sexual assault perpetration, $\chi^2 (2, N = 339) = 6.11, p < .05$, such that men in the control group were more likely to have a history of sexually aggressive behavior. In the control group, 66.9% of the men reported no history of sexually aggressive
behavior, 30.3% reported a history of sexually aggressive behavior in the moderate range, and 2.9% reported a history of sexually aggressive behavior in the severe range. In the experimental group, 78.7% of the men reported no history of sexually aggressive behavior, 18.9% reported a history of moderate sexually aggressive behavior, and 2.4% reported a history of severe sexually aggressive behavior. In order to account for the potential effects of differential perpetration history rates on program outcomes, this variable was included in both the logistic regression and repeated measures ANOVA analyses.

Continuous Variables

T-tests conducted on the continuous outcome variables indicated that, in general, the control and experimental groups did not differ with respect to pretest attitudes, social perceptions, and perceptions about sexual consent. There were no significant differences between the two groups on the IRMA, the ROLB, or the consent scenarios. However, the control group scored significantly higher on the HGIS ($M = 53.12$) than the experimental group, ($M = 49.88$), $t(339) = 2.46, p < .05$, indicating that the control group had more traditional attitudes regarding gender roles at pretest.

Logistic Regression

Perpetration at 3-Month Follow-up

In order to assess whether participation in the prevention workshop influenced perpetration rates over the 3-month follow-up period, a binary logistic regression was conducted using perpetration at the 3-month follow-up (assault, no
assault) as the criterion variable. Group membership (control, experimental) and history of perpetration (none, moderate, severe) were included as predictor variables. Both predictors were entered into the model simultaneously, in order to assess the predictive value of each variable in the presence of the other predictor. Group membership was not predictive of perpetration over the 3-month follow-up period, \(Wald (1) = .62, p > .05\). History of perpetration significantly predicted perpetration at the 3-month follow-up, \(Wald (1) = 4.39, p < .05\). Table 10 summarizes the results for each predictor.
Table 10

Summary of Logistic Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Perpetration

Over the 3-month Follow-up Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>Wald</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetration History</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>4.39*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 285.
*p < .05
Perpetration at 7-Month Follow-up

In order to assess whether participation in the prevention workshop influenced perpetration rates over the 7-month follow-up period, a binary logistic regression was conducted using perpetration at the 7-month follow-up (assault, no assault) as the criterion variable. Group membership (control, experimental), history of perpetration (none, moderate, severe), and perpetration over the 3-month follow-up period (none, moderate, severe) were included as predictor variables. All three predictors were entered into the model simultaneously, in order to assess the predictive value of each variable in the presence of the other predictors. Neither group membership, Wald (1) = .47, p > .05, nor perpetration history, Wald (1) = .09, p > .05, predicted of perpetration over the 7-month follow-up period. Similarly, perpetration over the 3-month follow-up did not predict perpetration at the 7-month follow-up, although it was approaching significance, Wald (1) = 3.06, p = .08. Table 11 summarizes the results for each predictor.
Table 11

Summary of Logistic Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Perpetration

*Over the 7-month Follow-up Period*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>Wald</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetration History</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetration: 3-month Follow-up</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* N = 225.
Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance

Attitude Variables

In order to examine the effects of the prevention program on attitude change, 2 (Group: Control, Experimental) x 2 (Perpetration History: No, Yes) x 3 (Time: Pretest, 3-month follow-up, 7-month follow-up) repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted on each of the following attitude variables: Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale - Self (IRMA-S), Hypergender Ideology Scale (HGIS), Reactions to Offensive Language and Behavior – Self – Behavior (ROLB-S-B), and Reactions to Offensive Language and Behavior – Self – Comfort (ROLB-S-C). The assumption of sphericity, as measured by Mauchley’s test of sphericity, was violated on the ROLB-S-B and the HGIS, and the Greenhouse-Geisser epsilon was used to adjust the degrees of freedom for the analyses on these variables.

There were main effects for Perpetration History on both the HGIS, \( F(1, 229) = 6.08, p < .05 \), and the ROLB-S-C, \( F(1, 228) = 4.09, p < .05 \). Men with a history of sexually aggressive behavior endorsed more traditional views of gender roles on the HGIS (\( M = 53.70 \)) than men with no perpetration history (\( M = 49.96 \)), and less discomfort with sexist language and behavior (\( M = 21.64 \)) than men with no history of perpetration (\( M = 24.11 \)). There was a main effect for Time on the ROLB-S-B, \( F(1.2, 278) = 8.70, p < .01 \). At the pretest, participants indicated that they were more inclined to intervene with sexist or sexually aggressive behavior (\( M = 21.1 \)) than at either the 3-month (\( M = 23.98 \)) or the 7-month (\( M = 26.11 \)) follow-up. No other main effects for Group, Perpetration History, or Time were observed.
There were no significant Group x Time interactions for the IRMA-S, $F(2, 454) = 1.01, p > .05$, the HGIS, $F(1.8, 409) = .42, p > .05$, the ROLB-S-B, $F(1.2, 278) = 2.70, p > .05$, or the ROLB-S-C, $F(2, 454) = .09, p > .05$. This suggests that participants in the control and experimental group did not differ significantly in attitude changes over the 7-month follow-up period. Table 12 presents the means for each attitude variable as a function of Group and Time. In addition, there were no significant Group x Perpetration History x Time interactions for the IRMA-S, $F(2, 454) = 1.41, p > .05$, HGIS, $F(1.8, 409) = 2.25, p > .05$, ROLB-S-B, $F(1.2, 278) = 2.65, p > .05$, or ROLB-S-C, $F(2, 454) = .02, p > .05$. 


Table 12

*Mean Attitude Variable Scores as Function of Group and Time*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IRMA-S</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>40.63</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.37</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.16</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>40.74</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.31</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.78</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HGIS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>53.64</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.62</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.61</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>50.69</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.79</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.61</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROLB-S-B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>21.35</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.61</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.41</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>20.84</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.35</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.80</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROLB-S-C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>22.85</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.64</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.11</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental</strong></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.89</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Higher scores indicate more rape supportive attitudes.

Higher scores indicate less rape supportive attitudes.
Social Perception Variables

In order to examine the effects of the prevention program on social perceptions, 2 (Group: Control, Experimental) x 2 (Perpetration History: No, Yes) x 3 (Time: Pretest, 3-month follow-up, 7-month follow-up) repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted on each of the following social perception variables: Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale - Other (IRMA-O), Reactions to Offensive Language and Behavior – Other – Comfort (ROLB-O-C), and Reactions to Offensive Language and Behavior – Other – Behavior (ROLB-O-B). The assumption of sphericity, as measured by Mauchley’s test of sphericity, was violated for all three variables, and the Greenhouse-Geisser epsilon was used to adjust the degrees of freedom for these analyses.

There was a main effect for Time on the IRMA-O, $F(1,224) = 4.71, p < .05$. Pairwise comparisons indicated that at both the 3-month follow-up ($M = 54.16$) and the 7-month follow-up ($M = 54.81$) participants perceived other men as having less accepting attitudes toward rape than at pretest ($M = 57.72$). There was also a main effect for Perpetration History on the ROLB-O-C, $F(1,217) = 4.88, p < .05$, such that men with no perpetration history reported more discomfort with sexist language and behavior ($M = 22.42$) than men with a history of sexually aggressive behavior ($M = 19.84$). No other main effects for Group, Perpetration History, or Time were observed.

There were no significant Group x Time interactions for the IRMA-O, $F(1.9, 417) = 1.0, p > .05$, the ROLB-O-C, $F(1.94, 420) = 1.41, p > .05$, or the ROLB-O-B,
$F (1.9, 426) = 1.41, p > .05$. This suggests that the intervention did not lead to significant changes in social perceptions over the 7-month follow-up period. Table 13 presents the means for each social perception variable as a function of Group and Time. In addition, there were no significant Group x Perpetration History x Time interactions for the IRMA-O, $F (1.86, 417) = 1.3, p > .05$, the ROLB-O-C, $F (1.94, 420) = .39, p > .05$, or the ROLB-O-B, $F (1.9, 426) = .48, p > .05$. 
Table 13

*Mean Social Perception Variable Scores as a Function of Group and Time*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IRMA-O&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.17</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.34</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.49</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.26</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.98</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.12</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROLB-O-C&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.79</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.33</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.40</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.94</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.09</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.24</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROLB-O-B&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.48</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.44</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.72</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.52</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.25</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.16</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Higher scores indicate more rape supportive attitudes.

<sup>b</sup>Higher scores indicate less rape supportive attitudes.
Consent Variables

In order to examine the effects of the prevention program on judgments about consent, 2 (Group: Control, Experimental) x 2 (Perpetration History: No, Yes) x 3 (Time: Pretest, 3-month follow-up, 7-month follow-up) repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted on the total scores for both Scenario One and Scenario Two. The assumption of sphericity, as measured by Mauchley’s test of sphericity, was violated for both scenarios, and the Greenhouse-Geisser epsilon was used to adjust the degrees of freedom for these analyses. There was a significant main effect for time Scenario Two, \( F(1.93, 444) = 7.65, p < .001 \). At both the 3-month follow-up (\( M = 18.72 \)) and the 7-month follow-up (\( M = 19.45 \)), participants rated the scenario as more aggressive than at the pretest (\( M = 17.86 \)). No other main effects for Time, Group, or Perpetration History were observed.

There was a significant Group x Time interaction for Scenario One, \( F(1.85, 418) = 3.94, p < .05 \). Post-tests were conducted using Fischer’s Least Significant Difference to examine differences between each pair of means. Post-tests indicated that men in the control group demonstrated a decline in their ratings of sexual aggression between the pretest and the 3-month follow-up. Their ratings of Scenario One increased significantly between the 3-month follow-up and the 7-month follow-up, but their 7-month ratings were still significantly lower than their pretest ratings. Men in the experimental group demonstrated no change in their ratings of Scenario One between the pretest and the 3-month follow-up, but at the 7-month follow-up, they rated the scenario as significantly less aggressive than at the 3-month follow-up.
In addition, their ratings of Scenario One at the 7-month follow-up were not significantly different than their pretest ratings. Post tests also indicated that, at pretest, men in the control group rated Scenario One as significantly more aggressive than men in the experimental group; however, at the 3-month follow-up, men in the experimental group gave the scenario higher ratings than men in the control group. There were no significant differences between the two groups at the 7-month follow-up. Figure 1 illustrates the Group x Time interaction.

There was no significant Group x Time interaction for Scenario Two, $F(1.93, 444) = .79, p > .05$. There was also no significant Group x Perpetration History x Time interaction for either consent scenario. Table 14 presents the means for each consent scenario as a function of Group and Time.
Figure 1. Group x Time interaction for Consent Scenario One. Higher scores indicate higher ratings of aggression, more responsibility assigned to the man, and less responsibility assigned to the woman. N = 230.
Table 14

Mean Consent Variable Scores as a Function of Group and Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenario One</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.86</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.02</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.86</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.10</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.38</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.38</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenario Two</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.66</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.36</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.72</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.08</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-month</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.72</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Higher scores indicate higher ratings of sexual aggression.
Discussion

*Intervention Variables*

Several measures were included to assess the quality with which the prevention workshop was implemented. Analyses of these measures indicated that there were no notable circumstances that obstructed the implementation of the workshop. The facilitator presented the workshop in a consistent manner, adhered to the workshop protocol, and fostered an atmosphere in which group members were able to voice their opinions without defensiveness.

The men in the experimental group gave the workshop high ratings on the program evaluation form, which included the Elaboration Likelihood Model Questionnaire (ELMQ). The responses indicated that the participants were actively involved in thinking about the information presented in the program, and that they found the program content to be valuable, accurate, and personally relevant. This suggests that the participants engaged in a high level of central route processing, which has been associated with lasting attitude change in the persuasion literature (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). Although there were no group differences in attitude change over the course of the study, scores on the ELMQ were associated with attitude change within the experimental group. As expected, higher levels of central route processing were associated with decreases in rape myth acceptance at the 7-month follow-up. However, contrary to expectation, at the 3-month follow-up higher levels of central route processing were associated with increases in traditional gender
role beliefs, increased comfort with sexist language and behavior, and decreased willingness to intervene with inappropriate behavior.

It is possible that some of the group discussions included in the workshop may have unintentionally contributed to these findings. Group discussions are particularly likely to foster central route processing because their interactive nature increases personal relevance and cognitive engagement. Facilitator responses on the process evaluation form indicate that during some of the workshops, participants stated that they did not believe that sexist language and behavior contribute to sexual assault, that they were not offended by this behavior, and that they felt uncomfortable intervening with this type of behavior. It is possible that participants who engaged in more central route processing were more influenced by those opinions than by the information presented by the facilitator. This, combined with a relative lack of facilitator input during the group discussions may explain, in part, the relationship between central route processing and attitude change away from the desired direction.

Although facilitator responses on the process evaluation form indicated that, in general, participants were accepting of the major ideas presented in the workshop, the facilitator also noted that there were several instances in which there was resistance to the ideas presented. In some of the workshops, participants disagreed with the information presented about obtaining consent when alcohol is involved, the frequency of false accusations, and the significance of sexist language and behavior. One of the major goals of the workshop was to change social perceptions by
exposing a more accurate, healthier social norm with respect to rape-supportive attitudes and behaviors. It appears that this did not happen during the course of this study. It is possible that this did not happen because the true norm was not uncovered during the workshops. It is also possible that the views expressed during the workshops did represent accurate norms, but that this norm was not significantly different than the participants’ perceptions.

Scores on the knowledge measure provide some limited evidence that the workshop resulted in increased knowledge of basic facts about sexual assault. At post-test, men in the experimental group demonstrated high scores on the knowledge measures. At the seven-month follow-up, their knowledge had decreased significantly, but was still greater than the knowledge of control group participants. Because the knowledge measure was not administered to the control group at pretest, few conclusions can be drawn about the extent to which the workshop resulted in increased knowledge, and comparisons cannot be made between the two groups. In addition, knowledge scores for both groups were high, indicating that the measure has little utility for discriminating between different levels of knowledge. This measure was initially included in the study as a manipulation check to ensure that workshop participants had attended to the program content. However, these findings suggest that it may be useful to include a more extensive measure of knowledge as an outcome measure in future research.
Outcome Variables

It was hypothesized that men in the experimental group would be less likely to engage in sexually aggressive behavior over the follow-up period. Binary logistic regressions were conducted using a two category measure of perpetration over each follow-up period (assault, no assault) as the dependent variable. These analyses indicated that group membership was not predictive of perpetration at either follow-up. Perpetration was collapsed into two categories for these analyses due to the low base-rates for each specific type of perpetration. As a result, differences in the frequency of behavior meeting the criteria of rape, which was of particular interest, could not be assessed with inferential analyses. However, an examination of the frequency data did not reveal group differences in the perpetration of rape during the follow-up periods.

It was hypothesized that men in the experimental group, relative to men in the control group, would demonstrate greater reductions in rape supportive attitudes. Repeated measures analyses of variance were conducted to examine the effects of group membership and perpetration history on rape supportive attitudes over the follow-up periods. These analyses indicated that there were no significant differences between the control and experimental groups over time for any of the attitude variables, which measured endorsement of rape myths, traditional attitudes about gender roles, and reactions to observing other men behaving inappropriately. In addition, there were no significant perpetration history and group membership interactions over time. These findings differ from the findings of several other male
prevention program evaluation studies, in which men attending a prevention program demonstrated reductions in rape myth acceptance relative to a control group (e.g. Foubert & Marriot, 1997). Although reductions in rape myth acceptance have been the most consistent finding in previous research, reductions in other rape-supportive attitudes, such as acceptance of interpersonal violence, (Shewe & O’Donohue, 1996) have occasionally been demonstrated.

One factor that may have contributed to this finding is the length of the follow-up periods. The first follow-up period was approximately three months, while the second follow-up was approximately seven months. For a majority of previous studies, attitude change was demonstrated at post-test assessments or after follow-up periods shorter than three months. Furthermore, attitude changes typically rebounded to pretest levels after longer follow-up periods. Only one study has reported attitude changes that persisted for longer than three months, and the statistical methods used limit the interpretation of the findings (Foubert, 2000). Thus, it is possible that the same attitude change and rebound occurred for the participants in this study, but were not detected due to the length of the follow-up periods. Although the inclusion of a post-test assessment or a shorter follow-up period in this study may have identified brief changes in rape-supportive attitudes, the implications of such a finding would be limited.

Participant scores on the pretest measure of rape myth acceptance also may have been a factor contributing to the absence of attitude change on this measure. The average pretest score was low compared to the range of possible scores. In
addition, the highest individual score fell significantly below the possible high score, while the lowest individual score was the lowest score possible. This suggests that, in general, the participants did not report high levels of rape myth acceptance prior to the study. Therefore, it is possible that a floor effect may have limited the extent to which these attitudes could be altered by participating in the prevention workshop.

It was hypothesized that men in the experimental group, relative to men in the control group, would demonstrate greater changes in their perceptions of the attitudes of other men, such that their perceptions would become more accurate. As expected, pretest scores indicated that for all of the social perception measures, participants did have inaccurate perceptions of other men’s attitudes, such that they perceived others as having more rape supportive attitudes than they actually did. Repeated measures analyses of variance were conducted to examine the effects of group membership and perpetration history on social perceptions over the follow-up periods. The analyses indicated that there were no significant differences between the control and experimental groups over time for any of the social perception variables. There were also no significant perpetration history and group membership interactions over time, with respect to social perceptions. These findings are corroborated by the data from the program evaluation form. At posttest, experimental participants did not give high ratings on the item asking if their opinions of other men’s attitudes had changed.

It is possible that the nature of the group discussions contributed to the lack of change in social perceptions. Although facilitator ratings indicated that in general,
participants were receptive to the workshop content, there was evidence that rape-supportive attitudes were voiced by some group members. Therefore, it is possible that when these opinions were expressed during discussions, participants used these comments to confirm that their initial perceptions were correct.

Group composition is another factor that may have limited the impact of the prevention workshop on social perceptions. Because the men in this study were introductory psychology students and were randomly assigned to the control and intervention groups, men who participated in the workshop together were not members of the same immediate social group. Although occasionally two or three men in a given workshop were friends, by and large, the workshop members did not know each other. Berkowitz (personal communication, 2001) has noted that social norms components of the prevention workshop would likely be most relevant for groups of men who know each other. Ideally, the workshop discussions would engender more accurate (less rape-supportive) perceptions of the attitudes held by members of the peer group, and the group dynamic in future social situations would be informed by these more accurate perceptions. Thus, peer groups participating in the workshop together might conform their collective behavior to the healthier attitudes revealed during the workshop. In groups of unacquainted men, changes in social perceptions might not be generalized to men outside of the group.

It was hypothesized that men in the experimental group, relative to men in the control group, would demonstrate greater improvements in their ability to accurately label sexually aggressive scenarios as rape. Repeated measures analyses
of variance were conducted to examine the effects of group membership and perpetration history on perceptions of consent over the follow-up periods. These analyses revealed a significant group by time interaction for one of the two scenarios. Specifically, the control group gave the scenario higher ratings (more aggression) at pretest. At the 3-month follow-up, the experimental group gave the scenario higher ratings than the control group; this resulted from a decline in control group ratings while the experimental group remained the same. At the 7-month follow-up, there were no differences between the two groups. The control group ratings increased between the 3-month and 7-month follow-ups, but were still lower than their pretest ratings. Experimental group ratings decreased between the 3-month and 7-month follow-ups, but were not significantly different than their pretest ratings. In short, the experimental group did not display the deterioration demonstrated by the control group at the 3-month follow-up. However, they did deteriorate between the 3-month and 7-month follow-ups, although their decline was less severe than that of the control group.

This is a promising finding, suggesting that the prevention workshop may have made an impact on men’s perceptions of consent. In personal communication, the workshop facilitator indicated that the participants seemed most interested in the discussions about consent. Participants expressed that they perceived of a great deal of ambiguity in what constitutes consent. According to the facilitator, they were very interested in obtaining a clear set of guidelines that would decrease the size of “the gray area.”
Although this is a promising finding, it should be interpreted with caution. In particular, while men in the experimental group did not demonstrate the same declines as the control group, they also did not demonstrate improvements. Because this finding is based on a three-item measure, the results are not as substantive as they would be if they were based on a more extensive measure of consent perceptions. In addition, a significant group by time interaction was found for only one of the two consent scenarios. Both groups demonstrated improvements over time on the other scenario. Finally, it is important to note that the observed differences in perceptions of consent were not accompanied by differences in perpetration rates.

Limitations

Attrition

Although attrition rates were acceptable across the course of the study, several variables were found to be associated with attrition, limiting the extent to which the results of the study can be generalized. There were no differences in attrition rates between the control and experimental groups. In addition, neither demographic variables nor perpetration history were related to attrition among members of the control group. However, among members of the experimental group, several variables were related to attrition. At the 3-month follow-up, age was related to attrition, such that men over the age of 21 were less likely to attend the follow-up session. At the 7-month follow-up, fraternity members and men with the lowest family incomes were less likely to attend. In addition, experimental group men with a history of behavior that met the legal criteria for rape were less likely to attend the
follow-up. These findings are methodologically problematic because past investigations have shown both fraternity membership and a history of perpetration to be significantly correlated with subsequent perpetration (Lackie & de Man, 1997; Loh, 2000).

The differential attrition rates for the experimental group are of particular concern because they suggest that some groups of men may have had unfavorable responses to the prevention workshop. It is possible that men in these groups, particularly those with a history of rape, felt defensive in response to the content of the workshop, and failed to attend the follow-up sessions in order to avoid the feelings elicited by the workshop. There were no differences in program evaluation ratings between men who withdrew from the study and men who attended the follow-up sessions. In addition, program evaluation ratings did not differ as a function of perpetration history. However, the possibility that the workshop content was related to differential attrition rates must be considered, particularly because no such differences were found in the control group.

*Base Rates*

The base rates for sexually aggressive behavior were low throughout the course of the study, and particularly during the follow-up periods. Although a substantial proportion of the participants engaged in sexually aggressive behavior at each time period, the base rates within the four categories of perpetration were very low. Therefore it is difficult to establish the reliability of the data on the frequency of each type of perpetration, and it was not possible to conduct inferential analyses to
distinguish between different types of perpetration. Although grouping all perpetrators together for comparison with non-perpetrators has some utility, perpetrators are not a homogenous group. In particular, it is likely that men who commit rape are different than other perpetrators, and that their responses to rape education programming would be different. One way to minimize the limitations posed by low base rates would be to conduct multisite studies with large sample sizes. However, extremely large samples would be necessary to obtain a substantial number of each type of perpetrator.

Measures

The experimental group did not demonstrate changes in rape-supportive attitudes relative to the control group. As mentioned previously, this may have been in part due to low scores on the measure of rape myth acceptance. The measure used to assess this construct is the most up-to-date measure available, and was created to replace an outdated measure of rape myth acceptance. However, the low scores obtained by men in this sample may have created a floor effect. These low scores may have reflected an attempt by the participants to answer in a socially desirable manner. It is also possible that some of the items on the measure are outdated, as Berkowitz (personal communication, 2000) has suggested. In addition, although the relationship between rape myth acceptance and perpetration has been well established in the literature, in a study conducted using the control group from this sample, rape myth acceptance was not related to perpetration at any time period. It is possible that the presence of rape myths has declined substantially as a result of
widespread rape education efforts. However, it is also possible that rape myths still exist in a more implicit, covert form, and that more subtle measures need to be developed in order to detect them.

There was some limited evidence that the prevention workshop used in this study had an impact on judgments about consent. Judgments about consent were measured by having participants read sexually aggressive scenarios and rate each scenario on three dimensions. Due to the length of the scenarios and time limitations, only two scenarios were used, resulting in a total of six items used to measure perceptions of consent. As a result, these findings are less substantial than they would be if they were based on a more comprehensive measure. Thus, the development of a reliable and valid measure of consent judgments would be very useful for researchers wishing to assess understanding of the parameters of consent, and their potential relationship to perpetration rates.

**Implications**

In general, although the workshop received high program evaluation ratings and the group process was generally positive, there was little evidence to support the effectiveness of the prevention workshop. Men in the experimental group were just as likely as men in the control group to engage in sexually aggressive behavior over the course of the study. In addition, the experimental group did not demonstrate improvements in rape supportive attitudes or social perceptions. There was some evidence that the workshop may have had a short-term positive impact on judgments about consent, but methodological concerns limit the interpretation of this finding.
Despite the lack of substantive support for the effectiveness of the workshop, the findings from this study raise several issues that can be used to inform future studies evaluating prevention programming for men.

The lack of findings with respect to social perceptions suggests that it would be beneficial to use peer groups as participants in future research evaluating this program, and other programs that focus on social norms. Because a major focus of this program was on changing inaccurate social perceptions and encouraging men to be proactive in responding to sexually aggressive behavior, implementing the program with men who already know each other is more likely to increase the salience of social norms messages. For example, the program could be implemented with men who live on the same dormitory floor, or members of athletic teams. It would be particularly interesting to evaluate this program with fraternity groups, given the association between fraternity membership and sexual aggression (e.g. Humphrey & Kahn, 2000; Loh et al., 2003).

The findings from this study also reconfirm the need to assess a broad spectrum of outcomes. In the past, researchers have largely relied on assessing rape supportive attitudes as their principle measures of outcome, because of the well-established relationship between these attitudes and a history of perpetration. However, changes in rape supportive attitudes cannot be equated with behavior change. In a study conducted using the control group data from this sample, pretest attitudes did not predict perpetration over the follow-up. Therefore, while assessing attitude change remains important, it is insufficient to use attitude measures as the
only outcome variables. In this study, judgments about consent and knowledge of rape facts emerged as potentially important dimensions to assess in evaluation studies. The development of reliable and valid scales with which to measure these constructs would be beneficial. Most importantly, because the ultimate goal of prevention programming is to decrease sexually aggressive behavior, it is particularly important to assess perpetration rates. Although changes on other dimensions related to perpetration are valuable, and may contribute to social change, prevention programs cannot legitimately be declared successful if they do not reduce the frequency of sexually aggressive behavior.

Perhaps most importantly, the lack of evidence supporting the effectiveness of this workshop is consistent with other studies evaluating male-targeted prevention programs. This suggests that brief, one-session interventions cannot be expected to produce lasting, substantial outcomes. Theorists and researchers agree that sexual assault perpetration is influenced by many variables throughout the lifespan, at both societal and individual levels (e.g. Berkowitz, 1992; Hall & Barongan, 1997). Hall and Barongan (1997) emphasize the importance of gender role socialization factors. They suggest that effective prevention efforts will require interventions that provide children and adolescents with repeated exposure to gender role alternatives in a variety of settings, as well as broader changes at the societal level.

Although prevention programs for college men are not sufficient to eliminate sexual assault, the development and evaluation of high quality programming remains important. Developmentally, identity and intimacy issues are particularly relevant for
college age men; thus, college is an appropriate time to implement educational programs that support the development of flexible gender roles and healthy sexual relationships. One way to increase the impact of such programs is to structure interventions so that they include multiple exposures to information over time. In a study evaluating a mixed-sex rape education program, students who had been exposed to more than one educational program made more accurate judgments about a sexually aggressive vignette and endorsed fewer rape myths (Lonsway & Kothari, 2000). Continued research on the variables related to perpetration is also crucial. The quality of preventive interventions for men will continue to improve as researchers learn more about the causal pathways to sexual assault.


Murnen, S. K., Wright, C., & Kaluzny, G. (2002). If “boys will be boys,” then girls will be victims? A meta-analytic review of the research that relates masculine ideology to sexual aggression. *Sex Roles, 46*, 359-375.


Appendix A

Subject Number Calculation Form

Please write down the last 4 digits
of your social security number:       _____  _____ _____ _____

Record the month and day of your birthdate.
Add this 4 digit figure to your SS # above.
If the month or day is only 1 digit, please put a ‘0’
in the first space. For example, if you were born on
January 1, you should record it as ‘01/01’:

+_____  _____ / _____ ____
 M  M  D  D

________________________________

=       _____ _____ _____ _____ _____

Add the number of letters in your mother's FULL
FIRST name. Do not use nicknames. For example, if
your mother's first name is Christine, but she goes by
the nickname Chris, you should record it as ‘09’, the
number of letters in CHRISTINE.:

+ _____ _____

________________________________

= _____ _____ _____ _____ _____

Please put this sheet back in the manila envelope provided. Fill out all
questionnaires on the scantron sheets.

If you have any questions, please ask the experimenter.
Appendix B1
Demographics Questionnaire

1. What is your age? (Choose one)
   A. 18
   B. 19
   C. 20
   D. 21
   E. Over 21

2. What is your marital status? (Choose one)
   A. Single, never married
   B. Married
   C. Separated
   D. Divorced

3. What class are you in? (Choose one)
   A. Freshman
   B. Sophomore
   C. Junior
   D. Senior
   E. Graduate student

4. Where do you currently live?
   A. College dormitory or residence hall
   B. Fraternity or sorority house
   C. Other University/college housing
   D. Off-campus house or apartment
   E. Parent/Guardian's home
   F. Other

5. Are you a member of a social fraternity?
   A. yes
   B. no

6. What is your race or ethnic background? (Choose one)
   A. Caucasian, Non-Latino
   B. African-American
   C. Latino
   D. Asian or Pacific Islander
   E. American Indian or Alaska Native
   F. Other
7. In what religion were you raised? (Choose one)
   A. Catholic
   B. Protestant
   C. Jewish
   D. Muslim
   E. Non-denominational
   F. Other
   G. None

8. What is your best guess of your family’s income last year? (Choose one)
   A. $15,000 or less
   B. $15,001 - $25,000
   C. $25,001 - $35,000
   D. $35,001 - $50,000
   E. $50,000 - $75,000
   F. $75,000 - $100,000
   G. Over $100,000

9. What is your current dating status? (Choose one)
   A. I do not date.
   B. I date casually.
   C. I am involved in a long-term monogamous relationship (6 months or more)
   D. I am engaged
   E. I am married

10. What best describes your sexual orientation? (Choose one)
    A. Heterosexual
    B. Homosexual
    C. Bisexual

11. How often do you drink alcohol?
    A. I never drink or have not drunk in the past year
    B. I drink less than once a month, but at least once in the past year
    C. I drink 1-3 times a month
    D. I drink 1-2 times a week
    E. I drink more than twice a week

12. On a typical drinking occasion, how much do you usually drink?
    A. None
    B. Usually no more than 3 cans of beer (or 2 glasses of wine or 2 distilled spirits)
C. Usually no more than 4 cans of beer (or 3 glasses of wine or 3 distilled spirits)
D. Usually no more than 5 or 6 cans of beer (or 4 glasses of wine or 4 distilled spirits)
E. Usually more than 6 cans of beer (or 5 or more glasses of wine or distilled spirits)

13. In the last three months, how often did you drink to the point of intoxication or drunkenness: That is, feeling dizzy, feeling ill, passing out, or feeling out of control? (Estimate if you are not sure)
   A. I never drank to the point of being drunk
   B. 1-3 times in the past three months
   C. 4-5 times in the past three months
   D. 6-10 times in the past three months
   E. 11-15 times in the past three months
   F. 16-20 times in the past three months
   G. 21-25 times in the past three months
   H. more than 25 times in the past three months

14. Do you know someone who has been raped?
   A. Yes
   B. No

15. Have you ever attended a sexual assault awareness program/workshop?
   A. Yes
   B. No

16. To what extent do you think that sexual assault is a problem at Ohio University?
   A. not at all
   B. a little
   C. somewhat
   D. quite a bit
   E. very much

17. How often do you view pornographic materials (magazines, movies, etc)?
   A. at least once a day
   B. at least once a week
   C. at least once a month
   D. at least once last year
   E. once or more, but not in the past year
   F. never
Appendix B2

**Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all agree</td>
<td>Very Much agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
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 that are raped.
11. If the rapist doesn't have a weapon, you can't really 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 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 ambiguous.
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.
# Appendix B3

**Hypergender Ideology Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A strongly disagree</th>
<th>B somewhat disagree</th>
<th>C slightly disagree</th>
<th>D slightly agree</th>
<th>E somewhat agree</th>
<th>F strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>A true man knows how to command others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The only thing a lesbian needs is a good, stiff cock.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Men should be ready to take any risk, if the payoff is large enough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>No wife is obliged to provide sex for anybody, even her husband.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Women should break dates with female friends when guys ask them out.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Men have to expect that most women will be something of a prick-tease.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>A real man can get any woman to have sex with him.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Women instinctively try to manipulate men.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Get a woman drunk, high, or hot and she’ll let you do whatever you want.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Men should be in charge during sex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>It’s okay for a man to be a little forceful to get sex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Women don’t mind a little force in sex sometimes because they know it means they must be attractive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Homosexuals can be just as good at parenting as heterosexuals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Gays and lesbians are generally just like everybody else.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Pickups should expect to put out.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>If men pay for a date, they deserve something in return.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Effeminate men deserve to be ridiculed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Any man who is a man needs to have sex regularly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I believe some women lead happy lives without having male partners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B4
Sexual Experiences Survey (Male Version)

The following questions are about your sexual experiences from age 14 on to age 17 (INCLUDE ANY EXPERIENCES PRIOR TO YOUR 18th BIRTHDAY).

Have you ever had any of these experiences from age 14 to age 17?

1. Have you ever had sex play with a woman (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) when she didn’t want to because you overwhelmed her by your continual arguments and pressure? (From age 14 to 17)
   A. No
   B. Yes

2. About how many times did it happen (from age 14 to 17)?
   A. 0
   B. 1
   C. 2
   D. 3
   E. 4
   F. 5 or more

3. Have you had sex play with a woman (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) when she didn’t want to because you used your authority (boss, teacher, camp counselor, supervisor) to make her? (From age 14 to 17)
   A. No
   B. Yes

4. About how many times did it happen (from age 14 to 17)?
   A. 0
   B. 1
   C. 2
   D. 3
   E. 4
   F. 5 or more

5. Have you had sex play with a woman (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) when she didn’t want to because you threatened or used some degree of physical force (twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.) to make her? (From age 14 to 17)
   A. No
   B. Yes
6. About how many times did it happen (from age 14 to 17)?
   A. 0
   B. 1
   C. 2
   D. 3
   E. 4
   F. 5 or more

The following questions are about sexual intercourse. By sexual intercourse we mean penetration of a woman’s vagina, no matter how slight, by a man’s penis. Ejaculation is not required. Whenever you see the words sexual intercourse, please use this definition.

7. Have you attempted sexual intercourse with a woman (get on top of her and insert your penis) when she didn’t want to by threatening or using some degree of force (twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.) but intercourse did not occur? (From age 14 to 17)
   A. No
   B. Yes

8. About how many times did it happen (from age 14 to 17)?
   A. 0
   B. 1
   C. 2
   D. 3
   E. 4
   F. 5 or more

9. Have you attempted sexual intercourse with a woman (get on top of her and insert your penis) by giving her alcohol or drugs, but intercourse did not occur? (From age 14 to 17)
   A. No
   B. Yes

10. About how many times did it happen (from age 14 to 17)?
    A. 0
    B. 1
    C. 2
    D. 3
    E. 4
    F. 5 or more
11. Have you had sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn’t want to by overwhelming her with your continual arguments and pressure? (From age 14 to 17)
   A. No
   B. Yes

12. About how many times did it happen (from age 14 to 17)?
   A. 0
   B. 1
   C. 2
   D. 3
   E. 4
   F. 5 or more

13. Have you had sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn’t want to because you used your position of authority (boss, teacher, counselor, supervisor)? (From age 14 to 17)
   A. No
   B. Yes

14. About how many times did it happen (from age 14 to 17)?
   A. 0
   B. 1
   C. 2
   D. 3
   E. 4
   F. 5 or more

15. Have you had sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn’t want to because you gave her alcohol or drugs? (From age 14 to 17)
   A. No
   B. Yes

16. About how many times did it happen (from age 14 to 17)?
   A. 0
   B. 1
   C. 2
   D. 3
   E. 4
   F. 5 or more
17. Have you had sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn’t want to because you threatened to use some degree of physical force (twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.) to make her? (From age 14 to 17)
   A. No
   B. Yes

18. About how many times did it happen (from age 14 to 17)?
   A. 0
   B. 1
   C. 2
   D. 3
   E. 4
   F. 5 or more

19. Have you had sexual acts (anal or oral intercourse or penetration by objects other than the penis) with a woman when she didn’t want to by using threats or some degree of physical force (twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.)? (From age 14 to 17)
   A. No
   B. Yes

20. About how many times did it happen (from age 14 to 17)?
   A. 0
   B. 1
   C. 2
   D. 3
   E. 4
   F. 5 or more
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Reactions to Offensive Language and Behavior Scale

DIRECTIONS: Based on the scale below, indicate how often YOU engage in the behavior listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I hear a sexist comment I indicate my displeasure.
2. When I see a man hitting on a woman and she appears not to want it, I intervene (e.g., by asking if everything is okay, distracting him by starting a conversation, or asking the guy to leave her alone).
3. When I witness a situation in which it looks like a woman will end up being taken advantage of, I intervene (e.g., by asking if everything is okay, distracting him by starting a conversation, or asking the guy to leave her alone).
4. When I hear a group of men using language that is derogatory toward women (e.g. whore, bitch) I indicate my displeasure.
5. When I see a man hitting on a woman who appears to be extremely intoxicated, I intervene (e.g., by asking if everything is okay, distracting him by starting a conversation, or asking the guy to leave her alone).

DIRECTIONS: For each of the following situations, estimate YOUR degree of comfort using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncomfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. While talking with a friend about a woman he likes, he says, “I took her out for dinner and a movie and we didn’t even hook up.”
2. Your roommate says to you, “Michelle is such a bitch, she wouldn’t even tell me what I missed in class this morning.”
3. You are getting ready to go on a date when your roommate walks in with a bottle of tequila. He says to you, “If you give her a couple shots of this, she’ll loosen up.”
4. You ask a male friend about a woman in one of your classes. He says, “She’s hot, but she’s a slut.”

5. You’re walking to class when your friend brags, “I hooked up the last four weekends.”

6. You walk into your room and your roommates are watching porn.

7. Your friend is telling you about relationship problems he’s having with his girlfriend. He says that, “If she wasn’t so good in bed, I would have dumped her a long time ago.”

8. You’re outside and your friend tells you, “She wants me” just after a pretty woman walks by.

**DIRECTIONS:** Based on the scale below, indicate how often you believe the [AVERAGE MALE STUDENT] engages in the behavior listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. When he hears a sexist comment indicates his displeasure.
2. When he sees a man hitting on a woman and she appears not to want it, he intervenes (e.g., by asking if everything is okay, distracting him by starting a conversation, or asking the guy to leave her alone).
3. When he witnesses a situation in which it looks like a woman will end up being taken advantage of, he intervenes (e.g., by asking if everything is okay, distracting him by starting a conversation, or asking the guy to leave her alone).
4. When he hears a group of men using language that is derogatory toward women (e.g. whore, bitch) he indicates his displeasure.
5. When he sees a man hitting on a woman who appears to be extremely intoxicated, he intervenes (e.g., by asking if everything is okay, distracting him by starting a conversation, or asking the guy to leave her alone).
DIRECTIONS: For each of the following situations, estimate the degree of comfort that you think the AVERAGE MALE STUDENT feels using the following scale:

A B C D E F G
Very Unsure Very Comfortable

1. While talking with a friend about a woman he likes, his friend says, “I took her out for dinner and a movie and we didn’t even hook up.”

2. His roommate says to him, “Michelle is such a bitch, she wouldn’t even tell me what I missed in class this morning.”

3. He is getting ready to go on a date when his roommate walks in with a bottle of tequila. His roommate says to him, “If you give her a couple shots of this, she’ll loosen up.”

4. He asks a male friend about a woman in one of his classes. His friend says, “She’s hot, but she’s a slut.”

5. He’s walking to class when his friend brags, “I hooked up the last four weekends.”

6. He walks into his room and his roommates are watching porn.

7. His friend is telling him about relationship problems he’s having with his girlfriend. His friend says that, “If she wasn’t so good in bed, I would have dumped her a long time ago.”

8. He’s outside and his friend tells him, “She wants me” just after a pretty woman walks by.
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Consent Scenarios

DIRECTIONS: Please read the following scenarios and respond to the following questions using the scales provided. There are no right or wrong answers. Please choose only one option for each item and fill in the corresponding circle on the scantron sheet provided. DO NOT WRITE DIRECTLY ON THIS SURVEY.

Scenario A

Gina and Mike had met in their philosophy class. They were both medium in build; Gina was 19 and Mike was 21 years old. They were attracted to each other immediately and would try to sit near each other in class. Comparing class notes and studying together had become common events. Mike had even asked Gina out to dinner a number of times. They often spent most of the dinner talking and enjoyed each other’s company. It seemed they shared so many interests. Gina was especially flattered by Mike’s attention and interest. She liked the way he kissed her goodnight. This had promise.

On Thursday, their philosophy professor grouped students together to work on an assignment that was due the following Monday. To their pleasant surprise, Gina and Mike had been paired up. Since Gina owned a computer, they decided to work on the project at her apartment. Besides, it would be much quieter there on a Friday night than in his dorm. When Gina offered to make him dinner before they started working, Mike eagerly accepted the invitation. Mike didn’t have much experience with women, but according to his friends things were going well.

Gina’s efforts to impress Mike with her cooking succeeded. And Mike had certainly won a few “brownie points” by bringing her flowers. Mike drank 2 margaritas with dinner and they decided to relax for awhile before starting their assignment. It wasn’t long before their talking turned to kissing. Mike slowly moved his hand along her neck and shoulder until it was resting on Gina’s breast. This surprised Gina, but it also felt good. They both were enjoying being in each other’s arms. He continued to caress her and tried to slide his hand under her sweater. When Gina pulled back, Mike asked her what was wrong. He seemed confused, even hurt, and Gina answered that it seemed to be moving a bit fast. “No problem, I’ll slow down,” Mike said. For a while, he kept his hands outside of her sweater. He again tried to touch her under her top. “But Mike”, Gina said. “Shh, just relax Gina. It’ll be all right.” Gina was a little scared, this wasn’t going as she had planned. She tried to reason with him and was ready to cry. Before she knew it, Mike had pushed up her skirt. Her thoughts were swimming as he proceeded to have sex with her.
For the scenario you just read, please answer the following questions on the scantron sheet:

1. How would you rate this experience?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   definitely  definitely
   not rape    rape

2. How much responsibility would you assign to the woman in this scenario for the incident occurring between the couple?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   no          total
   responsibility responsibility

3. How much responsibility would you assign to the man in this scenario for the incident occurring between the couple?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   no          total
   responsibility responsibility

Scenario B

Rich and Ellen were two college students, both pre-law. Ellen was 21, almost 5-feet 5-inches tall, and weighed 118 pounds. Rich was 22, 175 pounds and 5-feet 11-inches in height. They had gotten to know each other well over the years and shared many of the same classes. They began dating a few months ago and, building on a good friendship, had gotten serious quickly. They were always together it seemed; and when they weren’t together, they were talking on the phone. It was wonderful. Neither of them was surprised when their intimacy recently led to sex. Ellen hadn’t been sure about it at first, but Rich’s slow and methodical advances had felt so good. He had told her they could stop, but she didn’t want to. She was filled with pleasure and willingly made love with him. Later, however, she began to feel guilty about what happened. She explained to Rich that pre-marital sex was prohibited by her religion. Ellen had honestly enjoyed their experience, but her religion was too important to her to go against it again. Rich said that he understood as he was somewhat religious himself. Ellen was relieved. They continued being intimate, but stopped short of intercourse.

Rich reminded Ellen of a dance in her dorm Friday night and asked if she’d like to go. She agreed. After they had been at the dance for 2 hours, Rich suggested they go to Ellen’s room so they could talk where it wouldn’t be noisy. It sounded like a great idea to Ellen. They walked to her room holding hands. Sitting on her
bed, they began to talk. They kissed and then laid next to each other as they continued “making out”. Rich placed his hand on Ellen’s breast and started caressing it. She didn’t resist as he touched her under tank top, either. In fact, she responded by touching him back. Rich took off his shirt; Ellen liked looking at his muscles. After removing his shirt, he helped her remove her tank top. They enjoyed the feel of each other’s bare skin. Rich continued to kiss and caress Ellen. She had her hand directly on his crotch, massaging him softly. Rich was feeling more excited and asked Ellen to remove her jeans. She felt he understood her religious beliefs, so it wasn’t a problem. Rich then removed his pants. As he moved his hand under her panties, Ellen thought about having sex with him. However, she realized that she couldn’t. Rich told her he wanted to make love to her. “But Rich……” He interrupted her, “How can you get me worked up like this. It’s not fair to just cut me off. I know you’re enjoying it.” She felt guilty, but she knew she couldn’t do this. It didn’t matter, Rich had started to put his penis inside of her. She didn’t move or respond; she just turned cold. Rich was startled by loud knocking at the door. Ellen used this surprise to move away from him. She felt so guilty.

For the scenario you just read, please answer the following questions on the scantron sheet:

4. How would you rate this experience?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
definitely         definitely
   not rape         rape

5. How much responsibility would you assign to the **woman** in this scenario for the incident occurring between the couple?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   no                      total
   responsibility         responsibility

6. How much responsibility would you assign to the **man** in this scenario for the incident occurring between the couple?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   no                      total
   responsibility         responsibility
Appendix B7

Knowledge Questionnaire

Directions: Please indicate your response to the following items by circling “true” or “false.” You may write on this form.

1. Heavy alcohol use is associated with acquaintance rape.
   A. True
   B. False

2. One of every four college women have had experiences that met the definition for rape or attempted rape.
   A. True
   B. False

3. It is not considered rape if a woman is unconscious.
   A. True
   B. False

4. Very few men feel uncomfortable when other men talk explicitly about their sexual relationships.
   A. True
   B. False

5. About 14% of college men have engaged in behavior that met the definition of sexual assault or sexual coercion.
   A. True
   B. False

6. Women are more likely to be assaulted by a stranger than by someone they know.
   A. True
   B. False

7. If a woman does not actively resist, then it is not rape.
   A. True
   B. False
Appendix C1

SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION PROGRAM FOR MEN

I. Random Assignment of Participants

As participants enter the room, give them an index card and tell them to go directly to the room. Example: please go directly to Porter 107.

Facil. - Allow participants to determine their room and leave if necessary.

Asst. - Collect cards from those who enter each room.

II. Informed Consent and Subject Number

Asst. - As participants enter the room hand out the packets with the informed consent on top.

Please read over and sign the informed consent form.

Facil. - Wait until everyone has signed the informed consent before speaking.

Hello everyone, thanks for coming. My name is _________ and this is __________. Keep in mind that this is a three-part study. Your participation today will take about 3 hours, and you will receive 3 experimental credits for your participation tonight. The second part of the study will be in 3 months, and the third part of the study will be in six months. Each time you come back for the follow-up sessions, you will spend about one hour filling out questionnaires, and you will be paid $20 each time.

Does anyone have any questions?

Please open the packets. The first thing in the packet is a sheet you will use to figure your own subject number. This subject number will be the only way you will identify yourself on our surveys, and your subject number will never be matched with your name. This is done so that you may feel free to answer all questions as honestly as possible, and to ensure complete confidentiality. You will calculate this number each time you come back to fill out surveys, which will allow us to match your surveys each time you come in. Please double check your calculations to be sure that they are correct, to ensure that you are able to participate in each part of the study.

Facil. – Put up the overhead and guide participants through the formula. When everyone is finished, continue...
Does everyone feel comfortable that they have correctly figured their subject numbers?

OK. You now should be looking at a set of surveys and scantron sheets. Each survey has a scantron sheet attached to it. Please take a moment to write your subject number on the Identification line of all of the scantron sheets, and fill in the bubbles.

*Facil. - Give participants a moment to fill in their subjects numbers.*

You will be filling in scantron 1 with the answers to survey 1, and scantron 2 with the answers to survey 2, and so on. When you’ve finished filling out the surveys on the appropriate scantron sheets, please put the materials back into the envelope. Then please sit quietly until everyone is finished. Please take a moment now to write your subject number one more time on the front of the envelope itself.

*Facil. - Give participants a moment.*

Are there any questions? It will take approximately 45 minutes to complete these questionnaires, and then you will participate in a two-hour educational program. It is now (state time), you will be done no later than (state time they will be finished.)

*Facil. - When you notice that everyone is done, ask “Does anyone need more time?”*

Please keep your packets and envelopes on the desk in front of you.

**III. Program Warm-Up**

Hello, I’m _________. The purpose of the workshop today is to talk about our responsibility to ourselves, to our fellow classmates, and to Ohio University to prevent sexual assault. We want to strive to make Ohio University a place where all students feel safe. Before we talk more about what we are going to be doing today, we’d like to start with a brief warm-up.

Why don’t we start by each answering the question, “what’s difficult about being a man at OU?”

*Facil. - After the warm-up, thank participants for making some good comments, and briefly summarize comments and issues raised.*
IV. Introduction

Now, we would like to let you know a little bit about us and why we decided to become facilitators for this workshop....(proceed)

And, I want to review what our purposes are today. First, we want to educate students about the problem of acquaintance rape on this and other campuses. We also want to discuss what we can do as men to understand the causes of rape and prevent it from occurring, and to reduce the likelihood of sexual assault charges being brought against individual male students. We also hope to provide you with information that will help you to develop healthy dating relationships.

The workshop will be about two hours long and during that time, we really want to have some good discussion and we really want to hear what you have to say. Please avoid coming and going during the workshop, and please be an active participant not only by voicing your own thoughts but also by listening closely to what others have to say. Most importantly, remember that what participants have to say should stay in this room.

V. Definitions and Facts

Sexual activity is a choice. Many people choose not to be sexually active and we all must decide how sexually active we want to be. In surveys conducted on college campuses, approximately 1/3 of men and women reported that they had not been sexually active within the last year (i.e. had intercourse.)

Facil. – Ask for reactions to this information. Are you surprised? In the discussion, focus on the fact that sometimes we have misperceptions of other men’s sexual activity.

Now, we’d like to start off by showing you some definitions, facts and figures.

Asst. - Dim lights.

Asst. - Show SLIDE 1.
Facil. - Read SLIDE 1: SEXUAL HARASSMENT - abuse, harassment or mistreatment of a person based on their gender. Examples include cat calls, obscene phone calls, uncomplimentary graffiti, etc.

Asst. - Show SLIDE 2.
Facil. - Read SLIDE 2: SEXUAL ASSAULT - any form of sexual contact resulting from use of physical force or threats of force, and/or without consent, including rape. In most states, a person is unable to consent if: they are under age 17, are mentally incapacitated, or physically helpless.
There are many social myths about sexual assault that make defining unwanted sexual experiences difficult.

Asst. - Show SLIDE 3.
Facil. - Read SLIDE 3. Sexual contact is still sexual coercion or sexual assault if:
• objects or fingers are used for penetration
• alcohol or drugs are given secretly, forcefully, or deceptively to impair the person’s judgement, control, or resistance
Asst. - Show SLIDE 4.
Facil. - Read SLIDE 4.
• the person is unconcious
• the person has not explicitly consented, verbally or non-verbally (if the person is passive and doesn’t object, it can still be sexual assault)

Asst. - Show SLIDE 5.
Facil. - Read SLIDE 5: RAPE - any form of penetration (penal, genital, or oral) into any part of the body without consent, intercourse without consent. (In most states, rape requires penetration.)

Asst. - Show SLIDE 6.
Facil. - Read SLIDE 6: ACQUAINTANCE RAPE - any instance rape in which the victim and perpetrator are previously known to each other.

Now, here are some facts you may not be aware of.

Asst. - Show SLIDE 7 and SLIDE 8.
Facil. - Read SLIDE 7 and SLIDE 8: In a representative national sample of over 6,000 college students from 32 institutions (Koss et al., 1987), 54% of the women reported being victims of coerced or unwanted sexual contact since age 14, and 28% of the women reported experiencing an assault which met the legal definition of rape or attempted rape (forced penis-vagina penetration.) 84% of the women knew the man who raped them, and 57% of the rapes happened on dates. Over 25% of the men admitted obtaining sexual contact through some form of sexual aggression or coercion.

Asst. - Show SLIDE 9.
Facil. - Read SLIDE 9: In a recent study conducted with students here at Ohio University, 14% of the men reported that they had engaged in behavior that met the criteria for sexual aggression in the past, and of those men, 9.5% admitted to engaging in sexually aggressive behavior over one academic quarter.
Facil. – ask participants how they think these men’s behavior affects other men.
Asst. - Show SLIDE 10.
Facil. - Read SLIDE 10: National statistics suggest that 30-50% all women and 10-15% of all men will experience rape in their lifetime (Note: the majority of these rapes will be acquaintance rapes.)

Asst. - Show SLIDE 11.
Facil. - Read SLIDE 11: The majority of all rapes reported to police occur between people of the same race.

Rape can occur in same-sex relationships.

Asst. - Show SLIDE 12.
Facil. - Read SLIDE 12: One third of students on one campus stated that they have engaged in unintended sexual activity at least once in the last year after consuming alcohol.

In conclusion, we know that acquaintance rape is extremely common and can take place between people of any gender or sexual orientation. It usually occurs under the influence of alcohol with women as victims and men as the perpetrator, between individuals of the same race.

Facil. and Asst. – Ask for any reactions, comments, or clarification of any of the statistics and definitions.

VI. Sexual Communication and Consent
Can someone be raped and their perpetrator not know it was rape?

Facil. and Asst. - Encourage participants to consider and discuss this possibility.

If a man does rape someone without knowing that he did, he will feel falsely accused, even if he is being accurately accused.

Facil. and Asst. – Ask for reactions and comments. Discuss men’s fears of being falsely accused. Emphasize that when men feel falsely accused, it may be because they are unaware that what they did was in fact rape. Ask how they might respond if a friend was accused of rape, but said he was being falsely accused. How could they be supportive but still encourage the friend to take responsibility for his actions?

Let’s talk some more about how a man can be sexually aggressive without realizing that this is what he is doing. A lot of times in sexual situations, it may not be clear to the man what the woman wants. When this happens, the man may misinterpret or make assumptions about how she feels. Consider this scenario:
A man is with a woman he has known for about a week. They went out to dinner, and then back to the man’s apartment to watch a movie. The man leans over to kiss her, and they kiss for a few minutes. As things progress, they begin to undress each other. She seems to be enjoying herself, but then she says, “Maybe this isn’t such a good idea.”

Facil. and Asst. – After presenting the scenario, draw out audience responses, and discuss reactions. Ask them to consider the following questions:
- Was the situation realistic?
- What are the possible ways of interpreting her behavior?
- How can men handle situations in which they are not sure of the woman’s feelings?
- What if he went ahead and had intercourse anyway? Would it be rape?
- What if she didn’t say anything and he went ahead and had intercourse anyway? Emphasize that sexual assault is not only due to miscommunication, but also is a result of coercion and it is a violation of trust. When men are busy thinking about how to “get what they want,” with out considering the other person’s wishes, there is a greater chance that miscommunication will occur.

Now, to help us focus on what we as men can do to avoid miscommunication and minimize our risk of perpetrating sexual assault, let’s consider what consent means.

Asst. - Show SLIDE 13.
Facil. - Read SLIDE 13:
A. Both parties are fully conscious.
B. Both parties are equally free to act.
C. Both parties have positively and clearly communicated their intent.
D. Both parties are positive and sincere in their desires.

If you are with a woman who seems to be uncomfortable with doing something or says no, but finally says yes, should you assume that you have her consent? Should that be considered “positively” desiring the behavior?

Facil.- Encourage discussion, and emphasize that it can still be sexual assault if the person does not verbally consent, even if the person is passive and does not object.

Does it make a difference whether or not she is intoxicated?

What role do you think alcohol plays in consent? Do drunk people meet the “fully conscious” aspect of consent?

Drugs and alcohol are important factors that increase the likelihood that a sexual assault will occur.
Asst. - Show SLIDE 14. 
Facil. - Read SLIDE 14: In a national survey of college students, it was found that about 75% of the men and at least 55% of the women involved in an acquaintance rape had been drinking alcohol or taking drugs just before the incident.

Asst. - Show SLIDE 15. 
Facil. - Read SLIDE 15: When women drink or use drugs, they may:
- experience impaired awareness and judgement
- be less able to physically resist

Asst. - Show SLIDE 16. 
Facil. - Read SLIDE 16: When men drink or use drugs, they may:
- experience impaired judgement and impulse control
- become more emotionally volatile
- tend to think women who are drinking want sex or are “fair game”
- misinterpret or misjudge the other person’s intent

VII. Introduce Scenarios

Now, I would like to present some other scenarios to see what you think of them:

Facil. and Asst. - After presenting each scenario, draw out audience responses and discuss concerns, reactions, etc. Facilitate discussion by using examples and calling on participants for reactions, impressions and concerns, while avoiding giving the “right” answers. Ask participants to address the questions that follow each scenario.

1. You’re at a party. You see a student asking a woman to come up to his room. He is telling her that he wants to watch a movie with her. She says no a number of times, but finally says yes. What do you tell him as he walks past you on the stairs?

- Was the situation realistic? Do you think this happens at OU?
- What risks or potential problems are there with what is happening?
- What kinds of coercive or opportunistic behavior have you seen other men engage in?
- How can we encourage men to take action to stop rape and confront each other?
- How are we as men affected when other men take sexual advantage of someone?
Discuss how this behavior hurts men who don’t engage in these behaviors.
2. A few students are sitting around a room talking about what happened over the weekend. Some are bragging about their sexual exploits, and one is describing what happened in detail. You are bothered by the conversation, but not sure what to say. What do you do?

- Was the situation realistic?
- What risks or potential problems are there with what is happening?
- Do you think situations like this bother most other men?
- Do situations like this bother you? How do you handle them?

IX. Small Group Practice

Let’s talk some more about how we can step in and let other guys know when they’re out of line. Studies show that a majority of men feel uncomfortable with the way men talk about women in all male groups. A lot of times, they don’t say anything, because they assume that they are in the minority. I’d like to have you break into small groups to discuss these issues. During this time, discuss with your group possible ways to confront other men about the way they talk about women, or about their behavior with women that indicates they may be sexually coercive. As you talk, jot your ideas down on the worksheet, and we’ll discuss them with the whole group.

Asst. – Distribute pencils and worksheets.
Facil. – Identify a leader for each group. Ask this person to facilitate discussion and write responses on the worksheet. Break participants into groups of 3 or 4 participants each. Allow a few minutes for discussion, then ask for their ideas. Facilitate discussion and try to elicit a variety of reactions and concerns. Emphasize that there are many possible ways that men can intervene. Ask participants to be specific about what they would say, and encourage them to “practice” how they would intervene. You might say “Show me how you would do it?” or “How would you say it?” Emphasize that a majority of men feel uncomfortable in these situations, but usually don’t say anything because they assume they are in the minority. Emphasize the ways that all men are hurt by this kind of behavior. Empathize with concerns about the difficulty of speaking up, while also discussing the importance of doing so.
IX. Concluding the Workshop

Facil. - Summarize primary issues raised in the discussion and repeat and reinforce some good comments made during the workshop.

Before we go, I want to summarize the major points we discussed tonight. We discussed how men can engage in behavior that is sexually aggressive without realizing it, and came up with some ideas for making sure you are clear about what your partner wants. We also discussed the impact sexual assault has on all men, and talked about how we as men can speak up when other men do something inappropriate.

Facil: Incorporate the ideas men came up with during the program, and thank them for their valuable input.

OK. The last thing we’d like to have you do before you go is to complete a short program evaluation. Please complete the program evaluation directly on the form provided.

When you are done, please put your evaluation in the envelope, and bring it up to us. We will contact you in about 3 months to come back for the second part of the study. During the second part of the study, you will spend about one hour completing questionnaires, and you will be paid $20. The third part of the study will take place in about 6 months, and will also involve about one hour of filling out forms and payment of $20. Because this is an ongoing study, we would appreciate that you not discuss the study or the procedures with other students.

Facil. – Thank participants for their participation and contributions to the discussion.

Asst. - Hand out program evaluation. After participants complete the evaluation, have them bring up their envelopes. Stamp their experiment cards and hand out debriefing forms.
1. How does it affect other men when a man uses coercive behavior?

2. What factors make it difficult to intervene in situations where someone is doing something that degrades women or may lead to a woman being sexually assaulted?

3. Can you think of anything men could say or do in response to other men’s actions?
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Program Evaluation

Directions: Please respond to the following questions by circling the number that corresponds to your response.

1. How important was the topic of this program to you personally?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6
not important
at all
very important

2. How motivated were you to listen to the presentation?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6
not motivated
at all
very motivated

3. What the presenters said about this topic held my attention.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6
strongly agree
disagree

4. How difficult to understand was the information presented?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6
too simple
just right
too difficult

5. During the presentation, I was distracted from thinking about the topic.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6
strongly agree
disagree
6. There was enough time in the presentation to think about the topic.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6
strongly agree strongly disagree

7. The presenter made good points about the topic.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6
strongly agree strongly disagree

8. To what extent did you try hard to evaluate the information provided?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6
did not try at all tried to a great extent

9. To what extent did you find the presentation well organized and easy to follow?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6
not at all organized and easy to follow very organized and easy to follow

10. To what extent did you find it difficult to concentrate on the presentation?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6
not at all difficult very difficult

11. In your estimation, how logical and accurate was the information presented?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6
not at all logical and accurate very logical and accurate
12. How would you rate the quality of the presenter’s information?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>very poor</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Did you feel like you had the opportunity to voice your opinions in the group?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no opportunity to voice opinions</td>
<td>at lot of opportunity to voice opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Did you feel like everyone in the group participated equally in the discussions, or did a few people dominate the discussions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a few people dominated</td>
<td>everyone participated equally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. To what extent have your opinions of what other men think changed after attending the program today?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>a great deal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Did the presenter provide definitions of sexual assault on slides?

A. Yes
B. No

17. Did the presenter provide information about the frequency of sexual assault on slides?

A. Yes
B. No

18. Did the presenter provide a definition of consent?

A. Yes
B. No
19. Did the presenter read scenarios and facilitate discussions of the scenarios?
   A. Yes
   B. No

20. Did the presenter break the group into smaller groups to complete a worksheet?
   A. Yes
   B. No

21. What did you like most about the program?

22. What did you like least about the program?

23. Additional comments or suggestions?
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Process Evaluation Form

Completed by: _________________
Date of Program: _______________

1. To what extent did everyone participate and talk?
   A   B   C   D   E   F   G
   not at all
   a great deal

   Comments:

2. Did any one or two individuals dominate the discussion?
   A   B   C   D   E   F   G
   not at all
   a great deal

   Comments:

3. Were there friends or cliques who interacted with each other in a way that helped or was detrimental to the program?
   A   B   C   D   E   F   G
   no effect on program
   big effect on program

   Comments:
4. To what extent were all viewpoints represented?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>a great deal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

5. To what extent did the men seem comfortable sharing their true thoughts and feelings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>a great deal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

6. Was there anything that detracted from the program? (e.g. environmental conditions, attitudes of participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>a great deal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

7. How much resistance or acceptance was there to the main points of the program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no resistance at all</td>
<td>a great deal of resistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
8. What program content did attendees have a difficult time accepting?

Comments:

9. How were challenging or inappropriate responses handled by the facilitator?

Comments:
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Protocol Consistency Checklist

Directions: Check “yes” or “no” for each of the following items.

I. Program Warm-Up

1. Did the facilitator introduce himself? Yes No
2. Did the facilitator introduce the topic of the program?
3. Did the facilitator present the warm-up exercise?
4. Did the facilitator summarize comments made during the warm-up?

II. Introduction

1. Did the facilitator talk about why he decided to become a facilitator?
2. Did the facilitator outline the purposes of the program?
3. Did the facilitator encourage discussion and listening to one another?
4. Did the facilitator explain confidentiality issues?

III. Definitions and Facts

1. Did the facilitator present information about sexual activity on college campuses?
2. Did the facilitator ask for reactions to this information?
3. Did the facilitator present the definitional slides for sexual assault?
4. Did the facilitator present the statistics slides on the prevalence of sexual assault victimization and perpetration?
5. Did the facilitator present informational slides about race and same sex relationships?
6. Did the facilitator ask for reactions and comments about the information presented?
IV. Sexual Communication and Consent

1. Did the facilitator ask participants to discuss whether someone could think he had consent when he didn’t?
2. Did the facilitator lead a discussion about the fear of false accusation?
3. Did the facilitator present the consent scenario and initiate discussion?
4. Did the facilitator alter the scenario to increase it’s ambiguity?
5. Did the facilitator ask participants for ideas about how to handle these situations?
6. Did the facilitator emphasize the importance of considering the other person’s wishes, to avoid misperceiving intent?
7. Did the facilitator present the definitional slides on consent and initiate discussion?
8. Did the facilitator present slides on the role of alcohol/drugs in assault?
9. Did the facilitator use a questioning discussion style (rather than lecture)?
10. Did the facilitator allow for a free exchange of ideas?

V. Introduce Scenarios

1. Did the facilitator present each scenario?
2. Did the facilitator initiate discussion of the scenarios?
3. Did the facilitator ask participants to identify risks?
4. Did the facilitator ask participants to relate scenarios to real situations?
5. Did the facilitator initiate discussion about how sexual assault affects men?
6. Did the facilitator solicit ideas about how to handle the scenarios?
7. Did the facilitator use a questioning discussion style?
8. Did the facilitator allow for a free exchange of ideas?
**VI. Small Group Practice**
1. Did the facilitator present information about men’s discomfort with the way men talk about women in all male groups?
2. Did the facilitator introduce the small group activity?
3. Did the facilitator distribute the worksheet?
4. Did the facilitator break participants into groups of 3 or 4?
5. Did the facilitator identify a leader for each group?
6. Did the facilitator initiate discussion about the worksheet?
7. Did the facilitator solicit ideas about how to confront inappropriate behavior?
8. Did the facilitator present additional suggestions for intervening with other men?

**VII. Concluding the Workshop**
1. Did the facilitator ask for final comments of suggestions?
2. Did the facilitator summarize the topics addressed?
3. Did the facilitator incorporate into the summary comments made by the participants?
4. Did the facilitator have participants complete the evaluation?
5. Did the facilitator thank participants for their contributions?

**VIII. General Atmosphere**
1. Did the facilitator maintain eye contact throughout the program?
2. Did the facilitator maintain a friendly demeanor?
3. Did the facilitator respond to questions?
4. Did the facilitator maintain control of the discussions?
5. Did the facilitator address inappropriate responses in a diplomatic and helpful way?
6. Did the facilitator encourage participation?
7. Did the facilitator reinforce participation?
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Human Subjects Consent Form Control Group (Time 1)

Title of Research:  Men’s Dating Experiences
Principal Investigators:  Tracy R. Lobo and Catherine Loh
Department:  Psychology

I.  Federal and university regulations require us to obtain signed consent for participation in research involving human participants.  After reading the statement in II below, please indicate your consent by signing this form.

II.  Statement of Procedure:
Research has shown that people have different perceptions of the world based on their knowledge, attitudes, and experiences.  This project is evaluating how knowledge, attitudes, and experiences are related, and how they differ over time.  These results will aid in our understanding of social and worldly issues, and will promote future research as well.

Many questionnaires will be used to assess knowledge and attitudes on a variety of issues, including society, social policies, and sexual behaviors.  Additionally, some questionnaires address personal characteristics and past experiences.  Some of the surveys are sexually explicit in nature.  Please consider before participation whether you may be embarrassed, offended, or upset by the sensitive content of such materials.  Participation is voluntary and may be discontinued at any time without penalty.

If you choose to participate, you will be asked to fill out questionnaires on three separate occasions, once today, once during Session II in approximately three months, and again at Session III, approximately six months from today.  In addition to filling out questionnaires, your participation today will involve a two-hour educational program which provides information on dating relationships between men and women.  Further, group discussions about dating experiences will be facilitated during the program.  Program discussions will center around definitions of consensual sex, techniques for handling difficult sexual situations, and ways you and your dating partners can avoid sexual miscommunication.  Your participation will take approximately five hours; three hours for Session I, and one hour each for Sessions II and III.  You will receive three experimental credit points toward your psychology class at the end of Session I.  You will be contacted to participate in Sessions II and III at a later date.  You will receive $20 for your participation at the end of Session II, and $20 for your participation at the end of Session III.

All answers are confidential.  You will receive a Subject Number Calculation Form on which you will be asked to calculate your subject number.  The information requested on the form is not available to the researchers and thus, the resulting...
number can in no way be used to identify you. You will be asked to calculate this number at all three sessions.

The primary risk associated with this study is discomfort in answering questions about personal or private information. In addition, there is the possibility that other participants could disclose the comments you make during the workshop. However, participants will be provided with guidelines about keeping the information disclosed in the workshop confidential. In addition, your participation is entirely voluntary, and you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or negative consequences.

As a research participant, you will be exposed to psychological research and may gain insight into your own adjustment and life experiences. A benefit of participation in the educational workshop is that you will increase your knowledge and awareness of issues related to sexual assault. In addition, you will receive 1 credit for each hour or partial hour of participation in session 1.

I agree that known risks to me have been explained to my satisfaction and I understand that no compensation is available from Ohio University and its employees for any injury resulting from my participation in this research. If you have any questions or concerns, the experimenter will be available for one half hour at the end of each session. In addition, you may feel free to call Tracy Lobo at 594-0042 or Catherine Loh at 593-3364.

I certify that I have read and understand the statement of procedure and agree to participate as a subject in the specific research described therein. My participation in this research is given voluntarily. I understand that I may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of any benefits to which I may otherwise be entitled. I certify that I am at least 18 years of age.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Carol Blum, Associate Vice President for Research, Ohio University, (740) 593-0370.

Signature: ___________________________ Print: ___________________________

Date: ____________
Ohio University

Human Subjects Consent Form Control Group (Time 1)

Title of Research: Men’s Dating Experiences
Principal Investigators: Tracy R. Lobo and Catherine Loh
Department: Psychology

I. Federal and university regulations require us to obtain signed consent for participation in research involving human participants. After reading the statement in II below, please indicate your consent by signing this form.

II. Statement of Procedure:
Research has shown that people have different perceptions of the world based on their knowledge, attitudes, and experiences. This project is evaluating how knowledge, attitudes, and experiences are related, and how they differ over time. These results will aid in our understanding of social and worldly issues, and will promote future research as well.

Many questionnaires will be used to assess knowledge and attitudes on a variety of issues, including society, social policies, and sexual behaviors. Additionally, some questionnaires address personal characteristics and past experiences. Some of the surveys are sexually explicit in nature. Please consider before participation whether you may be embarrassed, offended, or upset by the sensitive content of such materials. Participation is voluntary and may be discontinued at any time without penalty.

If you choose to participate, you will be asked to fill out questionnaires on three separate occasions, once today, once during Session II in approximately three months, and again at Session III, approximately six months from today. Your participation will take approximately five hours; two and one-half hours for Session I, and one hour each for sessions II and III. You will receive three experimental credit points toward your psychology class at the end of Session I. You will be contacted to participate in Sessions II and III at a later date. You will receive $20 for your participation at the end of Session II, and $20 for your participation at the end of Session III.

All answers are confidential. You will receive a Subject Number Calculation Form on which you will be asked to calculate your subject number. The information requested on the form is not available to the researchers and thus, the resulting number can in no way be used to identify you. You will be asked to calculate this number at all three sessions.

The primary risk associated with this study is discomfort in answering questions about personal or private information. However, your participation is entirely voluntary, and you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or negative consequences.
As a research participant, you will be exposed to psychological research and may gain insight into your own adjustment and life experiences. In addition, you will receive 1 credit for each hour or partial hour of participation in session 1.

I agree that known risks to me have been explained to my satisfaction and I understand that no compensation is available from Ohio University and its employees for any injury resulting from my participation in this research. If you have any questions or concerns, the experimenter will be available for one half hour at the end of each session. In addition, you may feel free to call Tracy Lobo at 594-0042 or Catherine Loh at 593-3364.

I certify that I have read and understand the statement of procedure and agree to participate as a subject in the specific research described therein. My participation in this research is given voluntarily. I understand that I may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of any benefits to which I may otherwise be entitled. I certify that I am at least 18 years of age.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Carol Blum, Associate Vice President for Research, Ohio University, (740) 593-0370.

Signature: ____________________________  Print: ____________________________

Date: __________
Ohio University
Human Subjects Consent Form (Time 2)

Title of Research:  Men’s Dating Experiences
Principal Investigators:  Tracy R. Lobo and Catherine Loh
Department:  Psychology

I. Federal and university regulations require us to obtain signed consent for participation in research involving human participants. After reading the statement in II below, please indicate your consent by signing this form.

II. Statement of Procedure:
Research has shown that people have different perceptions of the world based on their knowledge, attitudes, and experiences. This project is evaluating how knowledge, attitudes, and experiences are related, and how they differ over time. These results will aid in our understanding of social and worldly issues, and will promote future research as well.

Many questionnaires will be used to assess knowledge and attitudes on a variety of issues, including society, social policies, and sexual behaviors. Additionally, some questionnaires address personal characteristics and past experiences. Please consider before participation whether you may be embarrassed, offended, or upset by the sensitive content of such materials. Participation is voluntary and may be discontinued at any time without penalty.

Your participation during Session II today will take approximately one hour. You will be asked to complete a set of questionnaires. You will receive $20 after your participation in Session II. You will be contacted at a later date for Session III, which will occur approximately three months from today.

All answers are confidential. You will receive a Subject Number Calculation Form on which you will be asked to calculate your subject number. The information requested on the form is not available to the researchers and thus, the resulting number can in no way be used to identify you. Please be advised that no provision has been made to compensate for any injury sustained during participation in this study. If you have any questions or concerns, the experimenter will be available for one half hour at the end of each session. In addition, you may feel free to call Tracy Lobo at 594-0042 or Catherine Loh at 593-3364.

The primary risk associated with this study is discomfort in answering questions about personal or private information. However, your participation is entirely voluntary, and you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or negative consequences.

As a research participant, you will be exposed to psychological research and may gain insight into your own adjustment and life experiences. In addition, you will receive $20 for your participation in session 2.

I agree that known risks to me have been explained to my satisfaction and I understand that no compensation is available from Ohio University and its
employees for any injury resulting from my participation in this research. If you have any questions or concerns, the experimenter will be available for one half hour at the end of each session. In addition, you may feel free to call Tracy Lobo at 594-0042 or Catherine Loh at 593-3364.

I certify that I have read and understand the statement of procedure and agree to participate as a subject in the specific research described therein. My participation in this research is given voluntarily. I understand that I may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of any benefits to which I may otherwise be entitled. I certify that I am at least 18 years of age.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Carol Blum, Associate Vice President for Research, Ohio University, (740) 593-0370.

Signature: ___________________________       Print: ___________________________

Date: ____________
Ohio University
Human Subjects Consent Form (Time 3)

Title of Research: Men’s Dating Experiences
Principal Investigators: Tracy R. Lobo and Catherine Loh
Department: Psychology

I. Federal and university regulations require us to obtain signed consent for participation in research involving human participants. After reading the statement in II below, please indicate your consent by signing this form.

II. Statement of Procedure:
Research has shown that people have different perceptions of the world based on their knowledge, attitudes, and experiences. This project is evaluating how knowledge, attitudes, and experiences are related, and how they differ over time. These results will aid in our understanding of social and worldly issues, and will promote future research as well.

Many questionnaires will be used to assess knowledge and attitudes on a variety of issues, including society, social policies, and sexual behaviors. Additionally, some questionnaires address personal characteristics and past experiences. Please consider before participation whether you may be embarrassed, offended, or upset by the sensitive content of such materials. Participation is voluntary and may be discontinued at any time without penalty.

Your participation during Session III today will take approximately one hour. You will be asked to complete a set of questionnaires. You will receive $20 after your participation in Session III.

All answers are confidential. You will receive a Subject Number Calculation Form on which you will be asked to calculate your subject number. The information requested on the form is not available to the researchers and thus, the resulting number can in no way be used to identify you. Please be advised that no provision has been made to compensate for any injury sustained during participation in this study. If you have any questions or concerns, the experimenter will be available for one half hour at the end of each session. In addition, you may feel free to call Tracy Lobo at 594-0042 or Catherine Loh at 593-3364.

The primary risk associated with this study is discomfort in answering questions about personal or private information. However, your participation is entirely voluntary, and you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or negative consequences.

As a research participant, you will be exposed to psychological research and may gain insight into your own adjustment and life experiences. In addition, you will receive $20 for your participation in session 3.

I agree that known risks to me have been explained to my satisfaction and I understand that no compensation is available from Ohio University and its employees for any injury resulting from my participation in this research. If you
have any questions or concerns, the experimenter will be available for one half hour at the end of each session. In addition, you may feel free to call Tracy Lobo at 594-0042 or Catherine Loh at 593-3364.

I certify that I have read and understand the statement of procedure and agree to participate as a subject in the specific research described therein. My participation in this research is given voluntarily. I understand that I may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of any benefits to which I may otherwise be entitled. I certify that I am at least 18 years of age.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Carol Blum, Associate Vice President for Research, Ohio University, (740) 593-0370.

Signature: ____________________________  Print: ____________________________

Date: __________
Appendix E  
DEBRIEFING FORM – Experimental Group (Time 1)

Thank you for your participation in this research project. This study was designed to investigate how knowledge, attitudes and experiences regarding men and women, gender roles, social policies, and unwanted sexual experiences are related. In addition, the educational program was designed to increase knowledge and awareness of these issues. The information provided by the questionnaires will help psychology researchers and clinicians learn more about the relationship between these different constructs. In doing so, psychologists will better be able to use such questionnaires in researching a variety of social- and gender-related issues, including sexual assault, in a reliable manner.

As a reminder, all of your questionnaire responses will remain strictly confidential. If you have any further questions regarding the nature of this study, or would like to request details of the results of the study, please feel free to contact one of the following:

Graduate Researchers:  Tracy R. Lobo  
Porter Hall - Office 311-G  594-0042
Catherine Loh  
Porter Hall - Office 44-M  593-3364

Faculty Researcher:  Christine A. Gidycz  
Porter Hall - Room 231  593-1092

In addition, if you are concerned about the study materials used or questions asked and wish to speak with a professional, or if you would like more information or reading material on this topic, please contact one of the following resources:

Ohio University Counseling and Psychological Services:  593-1616

Tri-County Mental Health Services:  592-3091

Careline (24-hr Hotline):  593-3344
Thank you for your participation in this research project. This study was designed to investigate how knowledge, attitudes and experiences regarding men and women, gender roles, social policies, and unwanted sexual experiences are related. The information provided by these questionnaires will help psychology researchers and clinicians learn more about the relationship between these different constructs. In doing so, psychologists will better be able to use such questionnaires in researching a variety of social- and gender-related issues, including sexual assault, in a reliable manner.

As a reminder, all of your questionnaire responses will remain strictly confidential. If you have any further questions regarding the nature of this study, or would like to request details of the results of the study, please feel free to contact one of the following:

Graduate Researchers:       Tracy R. Lobo       Catherine Loh
                           Porter Hall - Office 311-G  Porter Hall - Office 44-M
                           594-0042                      593-3364

Faculty Researcher:        Christine A. Gidycz
                           Porter Hall - Room 231
                           593-1092

In addition, if you are concerned about the study materials used or questions asked and wish to speak with a professional, or if you would like more information or reading material on this topic, please contact one of the following resources:

Ohio University Counseling and Psychological Services:  593-1616

Tri-County Mental Health Services:  592-3091

Careline (24-hr Hotline):  593-3344
DEBRIEFING FORM (Time 2)

Thank you for your participation in this research project. This study was designed to investigate how knowledge, attitudes and experiences regarding men and women, gender roles, social policies, and unwanted sexual experiences are related. The information provided by these questionnaires will help psychology researchers and clinicians learn more about the relationship between these different constructs. In doing so, psychologists will better be able to use such questionnaires in researching a variety of social- and gender-related issues, including sexual assault, in a reliable manner.

As a reminder, all of your questionnaire responses will remain strictly confidential. If you have any further questions regarding the nature of this study, or would like to request details of the results of the study, please feel free to contact one of the following:

Graduate Researchers:  Tracy R. Lobo  Catherine Loh
Porter Hall - Office 311-G  Porter Hall - Office 44-M
594-0042  593-3364

Faculty Researcher:  Christine A. Gidycz
Porter Hall - Room 231
593-1092

In addition, if you are concerned about the study materials used or questions asked and wish to speak with a professional, or if you would like more information or reading material on this topic, please contact one of the following resources:

Ohio University Counseling and Psychological Services:  593-1616

Tri-County Mental Health Services:  592-3091

Careline (24-hr Hotline):  593-3344
DEBRIEFING FORM (Time 3)

Thank you for your participation in this research project. This study was designed to investigate how knowledge, attitudes and experiences regarding men and women, gender roles, social policies, and unwanted sexual experiences are related. The information provided by these questionnaires will help psychology researchers and clinicians learn more about the relationship between these different constructs. In doing so, psychologists will better be able to use such questionnaires in researching a variety of social- and gender-related issues, including sexual assault, in a reliable manner.

Some of the participants in this study attended an educational program in addition to completing questionnaires. These two groups will be compared to determine whether they differ in attitudes and behaviors.

As a reminder, all of your questionnaire responses will remain strictly confidential. If you have any further questions regarding the nature of this study, or would like to request details of the results of the study, please feel free to contact one of the following:

Graduate Researchers: Tracy R. Lobo Catherine Loh
Porter Hall - Office 311-G Porter Hall - Office 44-M
594-0042 593-3364

Faculty Researcher: Christine A. Gidycz
Porter Hall - Room 231
593-1092

In addition, if you are concerned about the study materials used or questions asked and wish to speak with a professional, or if you would like more information or reading material on this topic, please contact one of the following resources:

Ohio University Counseling and Psychological Services: 593-1616

Tri-County Mental Health Services: 592-3091

Careline (24-hr Hotline): 593-3344