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ABSTRACT

Past research on the effectiveness of acquaintance rape prevention programs focused on changes in reported attitudes under the assumption that changed attitudes lead to changed behavior. However, this research was limited by the use of measures susceptible to social desirability effects and the lack of a theoretical foundation for attitude change.

The current study used the Elaboration Likelihood Model (J. T. Petty & R. E. Cacioppo, 1986) as a theoretical foundation to guide the implementation of an innovative rape prevention program and the evaluation of attitude change. This experimental program used an interactive and non-confrontational format to propose a behavioral system that encouraged men to seek unambiguous sexual consent. This program was evaluated in comparison to a traditional rape prevention program that focused on rape statistics, rape myths, and consequences to victims using a didactic and more confrontational format. In addition, the current study investigated the relationship of hypermasculinity with a range of rape-supportive attitudes and intentions, as well as the differential effectiveness of the programs with low and high hypermasculine men.

Participants were 128 fraternity men who were randomly assigned to the two conditions. Results indicated that hypermasculinity was positively correlated with rape myth acceptance and the intention to engage in sexually coercive behavior. Hypermasculinity was negatively correlated with cognitive elaboration and intention to confront friends and family members who make sexist or rape supportive comments.

The two rape prevention programs did not differ from each other in terms of cognitive elaboration. However, results indicated that participants in the traditional program were less
supportive of rape myths than participants in the interactive program. Implications of these findings for prevention efforts and future research were discussed.
INTRODUCTION

Sexual assault continues to be a serious problem in the United States, as reflected by the high prevalence rates reported in the literature. Although prevalence estimates vary fairly dramatically depending on the definition of sexual assault that is used, studies using the most conservative of definitions indicate that 10% to 15% of women will be sexually assaulted within their lifetime (e.g., Koss & Oro, 1982). Furthermore, this rate has been consistent for nearly two decades (Tjaden & Thonnes, 1998).

Interestingly, the majority of rape victims fall between the ages of 16 to 25 (Schultz, Scherman, & Marshall, 2000), and 45% of rape perpetrators are under age 25 (Dallager & Rosen, 1993). Researchers also found that fraternities on many campuses may be rape supportive environments due, in part, to excessive alcohol use and rigid definitions of masculinity (Martin & Hummer, 1989). Therefore, college students comprise a high risk group for both perpetrating a sexual assault or being victimized by a sexual assault, making them a prime target for interventions.

Initially, universities sought to ensure student safety by increasing the lighting on campus, trimming bushes away from campus walkways, and offering self-defense courses to women. Although these efforts may have reduced the number of assaults committed by strangers (stranger rapes), they had little impact on the incidence of the most frequent type of sexual assault on campus, acquaintance rape, which typically occurs indoors (Koss, 1988).

With this recognition, universities began to develop and offer psychoeducational programming on rape prevention to potential perpetrators. Early rape prevention programs were largely atheoretical, and program content was based primarily upon the researcher’s intuition. Many programs consisted of didactic presentations that provided information on
the prevalence of rape and attempted to change participants' rape supportive attitudes. Also known as rape myths, these attitudes were defined as false but pervasive beliefs that enable sexually aggressive men to justify their actions (Lonsway, 1996). For example, a common rape myth posits that women who dress provocatively deserve to be raped (Burt, 1980).

Because the correlation between sexual aggression and rape supportive attitudes was well supported in the literature (Lonsway, 1996), it was assumed that changing rape myths would lead to changes in rates of sexual aggression.

Outcome research on the early prevention programs was scarce. However, within the last decade, researchers focused increasing attention on program evaluation. Because many of these programs were intended to change attitudes, researchers typically assessed program effectiveness by comparing pre- and post-scores on attitudinal measures, such as the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (RMAS) (Burt, 1980). Research conducted in this manner demonstrated a significant decrease in endorsement of rape myths after the presentation of intervention programs (Dallager & Rosen, 1993; Foubert & Marriott, 1997; Harrison, Downs, & Williams, 1991; Lonsway et al., 1998; Pinzone-Glover, Gidycz, & Jacobs, 1998; Schultz et al., 2000).

The accumulating results of program evaluations provided some support for several potentially effective components of rape prevention programs. First, interactive programs appeared to be more effective than didactic programs in terms of involving participants (Borden, 1988; Lonsway, 1996). Second, all male environments enabled the participants to more honestly express and examine rape supportive beliefs (Berkowitz, 1992). Third, some studies indicated that non-confrontational approaches were effective in terms of reducing the defensiveness commonly experienced by male participants in such programs (Ring &
Kilmartin, 1992). Fourth, researchers emphasized the importance of exploring attitude and attitude change from a theoretical framework.

Although program evaluations indicated that some rape prevention programs were successful, there were significant methodological and conceptual problems in the design and implementation of many of the studies. First, many studies relied on transparent instruments, such as the RMAS, which are based on self-reported attitudes that can be easily influenced by social desirability (Lonsway, 1996). In the course of the prevention programs, participants learned that certain attitudes are considered rape myths. On the subsequent attitudinal measure, these participants may have endorsed the socially "correct" response. Thus, researchers may have mistaken socially desirable responses for attitude change. Second, many interventions were conducted with volunteers. The type of individuals who are likely to volunteer for such programs may differ in significant ways from the men who chose not to participate (Lonsway, 1996). For example, volunteers may be less likely to engage in sexually assaultive behavior. Finally, many of the programs failed to articulate the theoretical framework believed to underlie attitude change. In effect, many of these programs assumed that measuring pretest and posttest scores was sufficient evidence for attitudinal change.

One theoretical foundation that seems particularly relevant for rape prevention programs is The Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM) (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). The ELM is a dual-route theory of persuasion drawn from the social psychology literature. The model posits that attitude change occurs through one of two routes: central or peripheral. Central route processing is characterized by a critical evaluation and elaboration of the core aspects of a persuasive message. Central route processing occurs when an individual is motivated to
attend to a message, believes a message is personally relevant, and has the cognitive faculties to understand a message. By contrast, peripheral route processing is characterized by a reliance on superficial cues, such as the expertness or attractiveness of the presenter. Peripheral route processing occurs when an individual’s motivation, sense of personal relevance, and ability to understand a message is low. If peripheral cues are strong enough (i.e., if the presenter is particularly trustworthy), an individual may switch from peripheral route processing to central route processing. Persuasion that occurs through the peripheral route is less desirable than persuasion that occurs through the central route because attitudes changed through the peripheral route are more transitory, more susceptible to counter persuasion attempts, and less predictive of behavior than attitudes changed through central route processing (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). In the context of rape prevention programming, then, programs should strive to maximize the likelihood that participants will engage in central route processing.

As noted in the preceding discussion of the ELM, attitude changes are most beneficial if they are the result of central route processing rather than peripheral route processing. Several studies demonstrated that acquaintance rape prevention programs that were designed to increase motivation and personal relevance resulted in a greater likelihood of engaging in central route processing (Gilbert, Heesacker, & Gannon, 1991; Heppner, Humphrey, Hillenbrand-Gunn, & DeBord, 1995). In one of the studies, researchers concluded that central route processing contributed to participants’ willingness to listen to a phone call soliciting support for a women’s safety project (Gilbert et al., 1991).

A review of the literature revealed that minimal research has been conducted on personality traits of participants to determine whether this has an impact on program
effectiveness. One particularly relevant personality trait is hypermasculinity (Mosher & Sirkin. 1984). Hypermasculine men were characterized as “noncurious”, “nonreflective”, and uninterested in “synthesizing ideas or logical thought” (Mosher & Sirkin. 1984. p. 162). Based upon this characterization, it is not difficult to see why such men might be unlikely or unwilling to engage in central route processing of a rape prevention message. Further evidence for the relevance of hypermasculinity comes from research which demonstrated that high hypermasculinity is correlated with sexually aggressive behavior (Mosher & Anderson. 1986). lower empathy (Gold, Fultz, Burke, Prisco. & Willett. 1992; Norris, George. Davis. Martell. Leonesio. 1999; Vass & Gold. 1995). and increased anger (Gold et al.. 1992; Vass & Gold. 1995).

The current study assessed hypermasculinity and predicted that hypermasculinity scores would correlate positively with measures of rape supportive attitudes and intention to engage in sexually coercive behavior. Based upon the characteristics described above, the study also predicted that hypermasculine men would be less motivated to critically evaluate the messages in the rape prevention programs. Thus, it was expected that hypermasculinity scores would correlate negatively with cognitive elaboration.

More importantly, the current study was designed to compare the Believable Yes (Zilber & Mann. 2000). a theoretically based intervention. against a traditional intervention that was based upon a didactic program designed by Heppner et al. (1995). The Believable Yes was presumed to lead to increased central route processing because it incorporated several program strengths that have been identified in the literature. Specifically, the Believable Yes adopted a non-confrontational approach. increased personal relevance among participants. and balanced the didactic presentation of information with interactive segments.
Because of these features, it was predicted that the Believable Yes Program would be more effective than the traditional program with hypermasculine men. but that both programs would be effective with low hypermasculine men.
LITERATURE REVIEW

This section begins with a review of estimated prevalence rates of sexual assault and a discussion of the difficulty of defining sexual assault. Three possible explanations for sexual assault are provided and a theoretical framework for the development and evaluation of new programs is described. The section then focuses on a review of extant literature on programs designed to address one or more of these explanations. Methodological and conceptual problems faced by researchers are then discussed. Finally, the effect of personality characteristics on the effectiveness of intervention programs is explored, and an experiment is proposed to test the effectiveness of a new rape prevention program compared with a traditional program.

Sexual Assault: Prevalence Rates and Definitional Issues

Prevalence Rates

There is substantial variability in the prevalence rates of sexual assault reported in the literature. Conservative definitions of sexual assault suggest that 10% of women will be sexually assaulted within the span of their life. More inclusive definitions suggest that as many as 25% of women will be sexually assaulted in their lifetime (Koss, 1993). The National Violence Against Women Survey noted a prevalence rate of 15% for completed rape of women since age 15 (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998), a rate that has been confirmed by other recent research (Brener, McMahon, Warren, & Douglas, 1999).

The majority of rape victims fall between the ages of 16 and 25 (Schultz et al., 2000). In addition, 45% of rape perpetrators are below the age of 25 (Dallager & Rosen, 1993). In many cases, these assaults are perpetrated by an acquaintance (Koss, 1988).
demographics of the at-risk population emphasize the relevance of rape prevention efforts for the college student population.

**Definitional Issues**

The variability in the prevalence rates is due, in part, to the fact that researchers are not relying on a standardized definition for sexual assault. The following section will address two of the definitional issues: the nature of the act and the nature of the relationship between the perpetrator and the victim.

The first definitional issue deals with the wide range of actions that are included in sexual assault. Conservative definitions of sexual assault have focused on the act of penetration as a fundamental aspect of sexual assault. In an early study, for example, Koss and Oro (1982) defined sexual assault as anal, oral or vaginal penetration that occurs without the consent of the women. In this definition, an assault occurs through force, threat of force, or the use of alcohol to incapacitate the victim. In contrast, Berkowitz (1992) defined sexual assault as a continuum with rape representing one endpoint and sexual coercion, such as pleading and verbal manipulation, representing the opposite endpoint. Such discrepant definitions result in highly variable prevalence estimates reported by researchers. As a result, there has been a backlash against this research and critics have charged that the seriousness of rape has been exaggerated by inflated and, therefore, unreliable prevalence rates (Rozee & Koss, 2001).

A second definitional issue involves the relationship between the perpetrator and the victim. Sexual assault has traditionally been equated with stranger rape: a violent sexual assault committed by a man who seeks out women who are unknown to him. These rapes commonly include the use of force, the display or use of a weapon, and injury to the victim.
However, many sexual assaults do not meet this definitional criterion. Acquaintance rape has been defined as a sexual assault in which the perpetrator and the victim have had some form of prior contact, from kissing to an action as innocuous as a conversation (Koss. 1988). This type of rape is more likely than stranger rape to take place indoors and is unlikely to involve a weapon or serious injury to the victim (Koss. 1988).

The Issue of Consent

The absence of consent is implicit in the definition of both stranger rape and acquaintance rape. In the context of sexual assault, consent is typically defined as a voluntary agreement to a request or a proposition that is fully comprehended (Lim & Roloff. 1999). In stranger rape, it seems obvious that consent has not been obtained. However, the issue of consent becomes much more complex in acquaintance rape because victims of this type of assault have often engaged in some form of voluntary contact with the perpetrator. This brings up important questions. At what point does the contact between acquaintances become an assault? When does consent need to be sought and how should it be communicated? Are there certain conditions that invalidate consent? Who holds the responsibility for ensuring valid consent?

Antioch College (1993) addressed some of these issues in a controversial document. This document delineated a behavioral code to which male and female students were expected to adhere. In this code, men were required to seek unambiguous verbal consent for each progressive level of intimacy, from kissing to fondling to penetration. Both request and consent were required to be specific to the behavior and both must occur before beginning the behavior in question. “May I touch you?” would not satisfy the code because the request does not specify where the receiver will be touched. Finally, the consent must be willingly
enacted and can be withdrawn at any time. Based on these guidelines, a useable definition of sexual consent was proposed: “the act of willingly and verbally agreeing to engage in specific sexual contact or conduct” (Antioch College. 1993. p. 1).

Antioch's guidelines were important in several respects. First, the initiator and the partner were both expected to share in the responsibility of the sexual encounter. Thus, it was not simply the responsibility of the female partner to refuse an unwanted advance: it was also the responsibility of the male partner to ensure that he had voluntary consent for his behavior. Second, consent must be verbally expressed. Finally, a verbal agreement was considered a necessary but not sufficient condition for consent (i.e., coercion could not be used to obtain consent) (Lim & Roloff. 1999). These guidelines were designed to address the questions posed earlier and were expected to ensure safe sexual relationships between partners. However, there is no published research addressing whether students abide by the code or whether this results in a decrease in sexual assaults.

**Explanations of Acquaintance Rape**

Given the complexity inherent in defining rape, it is not surprising that the explanations for the occurrence of rape are equally complex and varied. These explanations are critically important for they guide the implementation and design of prevention programs. Although there are many theories on the etiology of sexually aggressive behavior, the following discussion focuses on Berkowitz’s (1992) integrated model of sexual assault and then focuses on three aspects of the model that are particularly relevant to the current discussion: inadequate communication between men and women, personality style of the perpetrator, and attitudes of the perpetrator.
Berkowitz's Model

Berkowitz's (1992) model is a multivariate approach to explain sexual assault. "All components of the model need not be present for a sexual assault to occur [but] there is evidence that their presence can be used to predict the likelihood of sexual assault" (Berkowitz, 1992, p. 176). The components of the model include perpetrator characteristics, victim characteristics, situational variables, and miscommunication between partners. Perpetrator characteristics include rape supportive attitudes, which are thought to define conditions in which a perpetrator might engage in sexually aggressive behavior, and the personality style of the perpetrator, which may increase the likelihood that he will act on his attitudes. Situational variables include alcohol or drug use, the nature of the perpetrator-victim relationship and the location of the date (i.e., whether the date ended in the man's home). These situational variables may trigger the behavioral expression of attitudes. Finally, misperception and miscommunication may contribute to a misunderstanding between partners in terms of what behavior is acceptable. The following discussion will focus on three aspects of Berkowitz's model: miscommunication, hypermasculine personality style, and rape supportive attitudes of perpetrators. Because the current study is focused on prevention programs aimed at men, victim characteristics were not explored.

Communication and Sexual Assault

Lack of adequate communication between men and women may be central in acquaintance rape because, as discussed previously, rape is an act that occurs in the absence of consent. Thus, it is important to consider how men and women request and indicate consent.
The Miscommunication Hypothesis posits that a percentage of sexual assaults are the result of misunderstandings between the male and the female partner. In a recent article, McCaw and Senn (1998) identified three forms of this hypothesis that have been discussed in the literature: women are reluctant to say no to unwanted sexual advances, men believe that women use "no" as a token gesture, and men have a tendency to overestimate women’s interest in sex.

Some women have difficulty in refusing unwanted sexual advances from men. For example, a woman might fear that a refusal will make the man angry, even when no force or threat of force has been used. Other women may lack the assertiveness necessary to say no.

If the woman does say no, it may be interpreted by the man as token resistance. Token resistance refers to the belief held by many men that women refuse sexual advances when they want to say yes. This belief is based on the assumption women might not want to appear promiscuous, might feel embarrassed or constrained due to moral beliefs, and might want the man to work harder to obtain sex (Abbey, 1991). In one study, 51% of men sampled asserted that women routinely use token resistance and a woman must refuse a man’s sexual advances two to three times before the man believes that she is earnest in her refusal (Mills & Granoff, 1992).

Token resistance has important implications for sexual assault programming. Osman and Davis (1997) presented a group of 200 male undergraduate students with a date rape scenario, manipulating both the strength of the woman’s refusal and the number of cues of sexual availability. Cues of sexual availability included the woman wearing provocative clothing, drinking alcohol, and going to the man’s apartment after the date. Dependent variables included a thought listing form and Osman’s Perceptions of Date Rape Scale
Results revealed a negative correlation between belief in token resistance and accurate perceptions of date rape. When cues of sexual availability were present, male participants performed even more poorly in terms of accurately identifying a rape scenario. The authors suggest that token resistance may have provided certain men with the means to rationalize sexual aggression (i.e., I was merely giving her what she really wanted).

In general, some literature supports the notion that men misinterpret sexual signals from women. From a sociological perspective, men are theorized to have a sexualized view of the world; they are more likely to impute sexual meaning to behaviors and stimuli that have no such connotation. Abbey (1991) found that men were more likely than women to perceive others as seductive and were more likely to indicate sexual attraction toward members of the opposite sex. When the behaviors were ambiguous or subtle, men had a greater propensity to interpret behaviors as indicative of sexual interest (Abbey, 1991; Berkowitz, 1992). Factors such as friendliness, seductiveness of clothing and the attractiveness of the woman have been hypothesized to contribute to misperception (Berkowitz, 1992). For example, necking could be interpreted as evidence of interest in sexual intercourse, even though the woman had no desire to move to a deeper level of intimacy (Lim & Roloff, 1999). If men misperceive a woman’s level of sexual interest, this creates a situation conducive to miscommunication and, theoretically, to sexual assault.

However, some studies challenged the idea that sexual assault results from miscommunication. For example, McCaw and Senn (1998) found congruence between male and female participants’ understanding of what constitutes a sexually coercive behavior. Male and female participants were asked to list what they considered to be coercion within the context of a sexual interaction. Men and women identified several common coercive
behaviors, such as invasion of physical space, removal of clothing, use of alcohol, ignoring no verbal pressure or arguing, and repeated physical advances after a refusal. Men did not ignore or dismiss refusals and did not overestimate the women's interest in sex. Thus, the results did not support the miscommunication hypothesis and the authors concluded that sexual assault stemming from actual miscommunication may be a rare occurrence. Hickman and Muehlenhard (1999) echoed this finding, stating that "it is unlikely that miscommunication about consent is a major contributing factor to acquaintance rape. It is more likely that sexually aggressive men selectively ignore or reinterpret what women say to fit what they want to hear, using miscommunication as an excuse for rape" (p 270).

Given the research described above, a verbal expression of consent is desirable because it is most likely to eliminate the ambiguity that can arise from non-verbal signals (Lim & Roloff, 1999). However, a review of the literature revealed that verbally expressing consent in a sexual situation was rare. Research has shown that both men and women typically indicated consent by either making no response or by cooperating with the behavior (Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999; McCaw & Senn, 1998). This can be problematic if the woman was cooperating because she was confused, frightened, or embarrassed. Research indicates that it is equally rare for sexual contact to be initiated through a verbal request. Men typically indicated interest in sexual contact with a physical advance, which, if not resisted, resulted in an escalation to more intimate physical behaviors. This indirect communication enables the man to gain sexual access and to avoid explicit rejection (Cupach & Metts as cited in Lonsway, 1996) but does not foster an environment conducive to verbal consent.
Although Antioch's policy was criticized as an exaggeration of political correctness, it brought the importance of sexual consent to the forefront of the rape prevention debate. If a certain percentage of sexual assaults resulted from miscommunication or misperception of signals, then taking the ambiguity out of the communication process should reduce the incidence of acquaintance rape. If sexually coercive men selectively interpret cues to maximize the possibility of obtaining sex, then emphasizing the importance of unambiguous verbal consent will make it more difficult for perpetrators to rationalize their actions.

**Hypermasculine Personality Style**

As evident in the preceding discussion, miscommunication alone cannot be expected to explain the incidence of sexual aggression. Berkowitz's (1992) model posits that personality characteristics of the perpetrator can increase the possibility that attitudes will translate into behavior. One of the most salient personality characteristics associated with sexual aggression is hypermasculinity, or the macho personality constellation. This masculine ideology has been conceptualized as a three-part construct that includes "calloused sexual attitudes towards women, a conception of violence as manly, and a view of danger as exciting" (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984, p. 151). Calloused sexual attitudes refers to the conceptualization of sexual intercourse as a means to establish masculine dominance without regard to the female's experience of the event. The hypermasculine man has been characterized as an individual who "does not want to understand many areas of knowledge and does not value synthesizing ideas or logical thought" and is "impulsive, unreflective, noncurious . . . and willing to hurt another individual to fulfill personal desires" (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984, p. 162). Researchers have also indicated that hypermasculine men may

In 1986, Mosher and Anderson studied the correlation between the macho personality constellation and sexually aggressive behavior and found that men with more calloused sex attitudes were more likely to engage in sexually assaultive behavior. Such men used a variety of coercive behaviors to obtain sex from partners, including the use of drugs or alcohol, verbal manipulation, anger expression, angry rejection, and the threat or use of force. In addition, "the more macho men, in comparison to the less macho men, experienced less disgust, anger, fear, distress, shame, contempt, and guilt as they imagined themselves violently raping a women" (p. 90). It is not difficult to see how such characteristics could contribute to an inability or unwillingness to examine persuasive messages arguing that rape is unacceptable. The importance of an individual's willingness to examine a persuasive message will be addressed in subsequent sections.

Because Berkowitz's model posits that an interaction between personality characteristics and situational variables may explain sexual aggression, it is important to examine how hypermasculine men react to situational cues in sexual situations. For example, how do hypermasculine men respond to cues of distress? Gold et al. (1992) assessed emotional states of 107 college males before and after viewing three videotaped segments: a smiling baby, a crying baby, and a quiet baby. Participants then completed the Hypermasculinity Inventory, the Sexual Experience Survey, and the Emotional Reaction Questionnaire, a self-report measure that assesses six emotional states: anger, empathy, excitement, distress, sadness, and happiness. Results demonstrated that hypermasculine men responded to the stimulus of a crying baby with less empathy and more anger than low
hypermasculine men. The researchers suggested that hypermasculine men responded to distress by enacting masculine scripts, which place a higher value on anger and a lower value on empathy. This reaction was identified as a prerequisite of aggressive behavior. Research has also demonstrated that hypermasculine men react to negative messages about their masculinity and sexual prowess with less empathy and greater anger than low hypermasculine men (Vass & Gold, 1995).

In the context of sexual assault, it may be that hypermasculine men either ignore or angrily attempt to suppress a victim’s distress. What situational factors might exacerbate this tendency? Norris et al. (1999) examined the possible interaction between situational determinants, such as alcohol consumption, and hypermasculinity on empathic responses. Participants were randomly divided into one of three beverage consumption conditions: water, alcohol, and a placebo condition in which participants were led to believe that they were consuming alcohol. After consuming the beverage, participants read a 3-page narrative in which a male character and a female character interacted sexually. Two elements of this narrative were manipulated: beverage consumed in the story and female’s expression of emotion (i.e., distress vs. pleasure). Participants then completed several measures designed to assess empathy and likelihood that they would behave in a similar manner. Results indicated that alcohol consumption interacted with hypermasculinity to magnify the individual’s intrinsic tendency to experience empathy. Hypermasculine men were less likely to experience empathy after consuming alcohol when compared to low hypermasculine men. This study has important implications for the fraternity population, in which excessive alcohol consumption is a normative behavior.
Given the risk that hypermasculine men represent, it seems reasonable to ask whether programming can have an impact on this group’s attitudes or behavior. Research on reducing the incidence of aggression in batterers has implications for this question. Batterer programs are educational and counseling interventions for men who have physically assaulted their intimate partners (Gondolf, 1997). Although there is wide variability in program design, many programs have relied on behavioral strategies, such as skill building and anger management, and cognitive strategies, such as challenging rationalizations and changing attitudes. Gondolf (2000) noted that the latter strategy has been assumed by researchers to produce more lasting behavioral change. Outcome research in this area has revealed an impressive cessation of violent incidents among 60% to 80% of individuals who complete the programs (Gondolf, 1997). Change has been demonstrated through self-report questionnaires (Gondolf, 2000), semi-structured interviews (Russell, 1995), and objective measures, such as arrest records (Gondolf, 2000). However, it should be noted that these programs experience significant dropout rates: 40 to 60% of participants quit before the conclusion of the program. Unfortunately, these participants “appear to be the men most likely to have committed more severe domestic violence and more likely to reoffend” (Gondolf, 1997, p. 89). Thus, it appears that batterer education programs are effective for a certain percentage of men, but may not have a positive impact on some of the more severe offenders.

**Attitudes**

Yet another part of Berkowitz’s (1992) model is the role of the attitudes of the perpetrator. Social psychological research has explored the relationship between attitudes and behavior in an attempt to determine whether a causal relationship exists. This research
has often focused on the relationship between attitudes and health behavior. For example, one study examined participants' propensity to use a condom for the sake of reducing risk for sexually transmitted diseases (Helweg-Larsen & Howell, 2000). It should be noted that the assessment of attitudes is a difficult task, especially when the attitudes being assessed are vulnerable to social desirability effects. In the context of sexual assault, researchers have used similar methods to explore how the existence of rape supportive attitudes may provide insight into the etiology of rape.

These rape supportive attitudes are often called rape myths. In 1980, Burt first conceptualized rape myths as pervasive but generally false beliefs that enable individuals to rationalize incidents of sexual assault. Since that time, the concept has been used by researchers with little attention being given to definitional consistency. In an effort to address some methodological problems arising from this practice, Lonsway et al. (1998) offered a revised, more specific definition: “Attitudes and beliefs that are generally false but are widely and persistently held, and that serve to deny and justify male sexual aggression against women” (p. 134).

For example, one rape myth posits that women either invite or deserve sexual aggression by dressing seductively or engaging in flirtatious behavior. Another common myth is that women enjoy the experience of rape. This myth was exemplified in an interview with a 19 year old man named Joe, who discussed feelings of anger and retribution towards women. He stated, “There has to be some point in every rape where the woman relaxes and enjoys it. I’m not saying that ladies want to be raped because they enjoy it, but there has to be some point where they enjoy it, because it’s enjoyable. Sex is enjoyable.” (Beneke, 1982, p. 54). Despite his discussion of his own anger and its relation to his own propensity to rape.
Joe’s comment suggests that he is ignoring the distinction between a sexual act and a violent act. Researchers have commented on this phenomenon, noting that "normal and coercive sexual encounters become so fused in the masculine mystique that it becomes possible to see rape as not only normal but even desired by the victim" (Box, 1983, p. 147).

Another myth is that a woman will falsely report a rape in order to seek revenge or to protect her reputation. Although there are documented cases of women falsely accusing men of rape, evidence suggests that such incidents are the exception rather than the rule. In fact, research indicates that women are much more likely to endure rape and the psychological and physical consequences without reporting the crime to the police, leading researchers to conclude that rape may be the most underreported crime in the United States (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994). Given the traumatic and lengthy process involved in prosecuting a rapist, it is not difficult to see why many women are reluctant to undergo this process. Indeed, in a mock jury situation, individuals who endorse rape myths were more likely to have a narrow definition of a rape, less likely to convict a defendant, and less likely to recommend a severe sentence than are individuals who do not endorse rape myths (Burt, 1991).

The Elaboration Likelihood Model of Attitude Change

If rape supportive attitudes are, in fact, contributing to the incidence of sexual assault, then a theoretical framework for understanding attitudes and attitude change would seem to be a logical foundation for prevention efforts. Researchers in social psychology have focused a great deal of attention on the development of theories to explain human behavior and many of these theories have examined the role of attitudes. The Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM) (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981) is one of the most prominent theories.
The ELM is a theory of persuasion that delineates the elements of persuasive attempts that are associated with lasting attitude change. The model has been the focus of a substantial amount of laboratory research (e.g., Petty & Cacioppo, 1986; Petty, Wegener, & Fabrigar, 1997) as well as applied research in counseling psychology (e.g., Heesacker, Connor, & Prichard, 1995). A brief summary of the model is provided here (refer to Petty & Wegener (1999) for a more thorough discussion of the model).

The ELM postulates that, in the absence of competing needs or desires, individuals have a fundamental desire to acquire and hold correct attitudes. The model acknowledges that correctness is inherently subjective and affected by the quality and objectivity of evidence. The desire to be correct is moderated by the ability and motivation of the individual to assess persuasive messages. The ELM has been called "a dual-route but multiprocess theory" (Petty & Wegener, 1999), indicating that there are two routes to persuasion (central route processing and peripheral route processing) but that the variables in the model contribute to persuasion in multiple ways. Postulate three of the model indicates that "variables can affect the amount and direction of attitude change by (a) serving as persuasive arguments, (b) serving as peripheral cues, and/or (c) affecting the extent or direction of issue and argument elaboration" (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981, p. 48). The two routes differ in terms of the amount of cognitive effort that is expended in assessing a persuasive message. Although the terminology of the model suggests a dichotomous conceptualization (i.e., central route processing vs. peripheral route processing), the ELM conceptualizes attitude change on a continuum with the two routes representing the endpoints.
Central route processing is characterized by a critical examination of the core elements and concepts of an argument. That is, central route processing is characterized by a high level of cognitive effort and a high likelihood of cognitive elaboration. This route is enabled when an individual believes that the material presented is personally relevant and understandable. To the extent that these conditions are met, the model indicates that an individual will assess the core content of the message by engaging in issue-relevant thinking and elaboration. For example, a fraternity member attending a rape prevention intervention might primarily engage in central route processing if he had a sister who had been sexually assaulted in the past because this personal experience might increase his motivation to concentrate on the content of the intervention. His motivation might be even stronger if he had personally suffered a sexual assault. Provided that his motivation is sufficiently strong and he has the mental faculties to understand the message, he will focus on the core content of the message. If the arguments presented are strong, his attitude will change in the direction of those arguments. If his attitudes towards rape do change, the new attitudes are more likely to be enduring and predictive of later behavior, compared to attitudes changed through peripheral route processing.

By contrast, peripheral route processing is characterized by a focus on cues of a persuasive message, such as the trustworthiness and attractiveness of the source or the number of arguments presented. Peripheral route processing requires less cognitive effort (or elaboration) when compared with central route processing. Attitude change through the peripheral route occurs because the presenter is attractive or there are a large number of arguments presented. Petty and Cacioppo (1986) noted that peripheral route processing is problematic because attitude change that occurs through this route is transitory, more
susceptible to counter persuasion attempts and not as predictive of behavior when compared to attitude change based on central route processing: “In peripheral processing individuals are more likely to adopt a strategy in which they attempt to derive a “reasonable” attitude based on existing schemata and superficial analyses of the veracity of the recommendation” (Petty & Cacioppo. 1986, p 13).

However, if these peripheral cues are strong (i.e., if the presenter is extremely trustworthy) then the individual may shift to assessing the validity of the arguments (i.e., central route processing). In the prior example, if the fraternity member lacked experiences that would increase his motivation or sense of personal relevance, he may primarily engage in peripheral route processing, focusing on characteristics of the presenter, such as education, gender, or attractiveness. If the presenter were a woman, he might believe that the information being presented is politically motivated and this may serve to simply reinforce existing schema about women and rape. As a result, his attitudes may not change. However, if the presenter were a respected fraternity member, the individual might be more willing to attend to the core elements of the message (i.e., engage primarily in central route processing). If the messages were strongly articulated critiques of rape supportive behavior, then the processing may result in lasting attitude change.

Programs intending to effect attitude change should necessarily focus on maximizing the probability that participants will engage in central route processing. In addition, they should focus on those peripheral cues that will maximize the possibility that men with low motivation (i.e., those relying on peripheral cues) will switch to a critical examination of the argument (i.e., central route processing).
Cognitive Elaboration. As evident in the preceding discussion, the amount of issue relevant thinking, especially thinking that elaborates on the persuasive message, is a defining aspect of central route processing. This construct is commonly called cognitive elaboration. Researchers have used the construct as a framework to examine ethical decision making (e.g., Street et al., 2001) and to examine client change within the therapeutic context (e.g., Barone & Hutchings, 1993). Cognitive elaboration has also been used frequently by the advertising industry to measure the effectiveness of an advertisement (e.g., Reichert et al., 2001). Researchers have typically assessed cognitive elaboration through a simple thought listing form (Helweg-Larsen & Howell, 2000). Other researchers have devised measures to indirectly assess cognitive elaboration by evaluating the prerequisites of central route processing, such as personal relevance and motivation. The Elaboration Likelihood Model Questionnaire (ELMQ) is one such measure (Heppner et al., 1995). One of the intents of this study was to apply the ELM to the design, implementation, and evaluation of rape prevention programming.

Intervention Programs and Their Outcomes

Universities’ initial response to the problem of sexual assault was to ensure that there were adequate victim advocacy programs and counseling services (Schultz et al., 2000). University officials also sought to make it more difficult for rapists to gain access to women by increasing the lighting on campus and keeping hedges trimmed away from walkways. However, these measures addressed only stranger rape and they did not have a significant impact on acquaintance rape. In addition, these efforts did not address the underlying causes and contributing factors of either stranger or acquaintance rape.
In recent years, researchers and university officials focused increased attention on the development and implementation of acquaintance rape prevention programs. Lonsway (1996) asserted that education has the potential to change rape supportive attitudes (i.e., rape myths) and that this change in attitude may, in turn, result in decreased sexual aggression and increased empathy for women. The call to focus on challenging rape myths was echoed by subsequent research exploring the relationship between rape myth acceptance and sexually coercive behavior in adolescent males (Lanier, 2001). Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1994) argued that it was critical to assess whether prevention programs could change these culturally-held attitudes and decrease the frequency of rape.

A review of existing acquaintance rape prevention programs is presented below. The majority of these programs sought to change attitudes and misconceptions about rape that are held by many men under the assumption that a change in attitudes would translate to a change in behavior. As discussed in subsequent sections, however, a change in reported attitudes does not necessarily indicate that actual attitudes have undergone lasting change.

**Elements of Effective Prevention Programs**

For many years, programs were developed that were intended to challenge rape supportive ideology but, until the last ten years, there has been a dearth of research examining the efficacy of these programs. Recently, researchers have identified several important aspects of prevention programs relevant to attitude change.

The early prevention programs were lecture presentations in which men received information on the prevalence and consequences of sexual assault and the widely held misconceptions about rape. Borden (1988) concluded that such programs were ineffective in modifying men’s attitudes and called for a more dynamic, interactive approach: this call was
subsequently echoed by other researchers (e.g., Lonsway, 1996). The interactive approach was consistent with research on active learning, which demonstrated that presentations requiring active participation enhanced the probability that participants would process the material at a deeper level (e.g., Mathie et al., 1993). Based on this reasoning, an interactive approach may be an effective way to increase the probability that participants will engage in central route processing.

The composition of the groups was another important factor in the efficacy of intervention programs. All male environments have been hypothesized to increase the possibility that men will honestly express attitudes and beliefs that place them at risk for assaultive behavior (Berkowitz, 1992). Although co-ed groups may allow for greater development of empathy for women, they may also combine women survivors with male perpetrators and these populations may be too disparate for one program format to be effective (Lonsway, 1996). The gender of the facilitators may also be a relevant factor. Male facilitators may be perceived as more reliable and less interested in enforcing a personal ideology, and this may increase the investment of the participants. However, it could also be argued that the presence of a female facilitator may enable the program to challenge rape supportive attitudes in a manner that concurrently challenges stereotypes of feminism. This possibility has yet to be explored in the literature.

The tone of the programs was another important factor in effective programs. Participants may expect to be subjected to feminist propaganda that promotes the view that all men are potential rapists, so it is not difficult to see how this would increase defensiveness and mitigate the impact of the program. However, challenging rape supportive attitudes does not necessitate personal confrontation, either between facilitators and participants or among
participants (Lonsway, 1996). Several researchers noted that a confrontational approach significantly decreased the effectiveness of prevention programs or led to a boomerang effect in which participants became more likely to endorse rape supportive statements (Fisher, 1986; Winkel, 1984; see Heppner et al., 1995 for a review). Thus, programs that have been advertised or promoted in non-threatening ways may have a better chance of positively impacting rape supportive attitudes.

Researchers have also emphasized the importance of program participants taking an active role in translating attitude change to environments outside the program by confronting those peers whose statements or behavior is indicative of rape supportive ideology (Berkowitz, 1992). It should be emphasized that this refers to confronting the behavior rather than adopting a confrontational tone. Modeling by peers may be more effective than the efforts of program facilitators to impact environments in which rape supportive statements are pervasive and unchallenged.

**Program Outcomes**

Outcome evaluations of acquaintance rape prevention programs have often focused on immediate changes in self-reported rape supportive attitudes. Burt's (1980) Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (RMAS) has been the most widely used instrument with which program success has been measured. This instrument is comprised of 19 items scored on a Likert scale, with higher scores reflecting stronger adherence to rape myths. The initial reliability of this instrument was adequate, with a Cronbach’s $\alpha = .85$ (Burt, 1980). Much of the outcome research in this area has used change scores on measures like the RMAS as demonstration of a significant change in participants’ attitudes; however, as discussed in later
sections. there are considerable problems with the use of this instrument in the context of prevention programs.

Foubert and Marriot (1997) conducted a study in which they assessed change in rape supportive attitudes in participants attending a sexual assault peer education intervention. The program was provided to fraternity pledge classes and advertised as “How to Help a Sexual Assault Survivor” (p. 261): such advertising was designed to reduce defensiveness and increase personal relevance among participants. Participants in a control condition did not receive any programming. Adherence to rape myths was assessed by the RMAS, which was administered prior to the intervention, immediately after the program, and at a two month follow-up. Endorsement of rape myths in the control condition was only assessed at the two month follow-up. At the immediate posttest, there was a significant decline in acceptance of rape myths in the treatment condition compared with pretest scores ($d = 1.08$). However, a significant decrement in rape supportive attitudes in the control group was observed at the two month follow-up ($d = 0.37$). It is noteworthy that the difference between the treatment group and the control group was not significant at the two month follow-up. The authors concluded that “there may be a benefit in simply administering [the RMAS] to individuals as a consciousness-raising measure” (p. 265).

Another example of program evaluation that examines lasting attitudes change can be found in Lonsway et al. (1998). The authors compared participants in the Campus Acquaintance Rape Education (CARE) program to participants in a human sexuality course. The CARE program was described as a semester-long practicum course designed to prepare students to act as facilitators of rape prevention programs. Dependent measures included the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale, the Adversarial Heterosexual Beliefs Scale, and the
Attitudes Towards Feminism Scale. Participants in the CARE program reported more attitude change than did participants in the Human Sexuality course: They were less likely to accept rape myths ($d = 0.34$) and verbalized more support for the feminist movement ($d = 0.20$). Commendably, this study included a two year follow-up with both groups. As hypothesized, the positive effects of the intervention on scores on the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale were still present at the two year assessment point ($d = 0.17$), supporting the assumption that time intensive interventions are more likely to result in lasting attitude change than are brief intervention programs. However, the groups did not differ on the Adversarial Heterosexual Beliefs Scale and the Attitudes Towards Feminism Scale at the two year assessment point.

Lonsway (1996) noted that many researchers have ignored the serious issue of demand characteristics. In an attempt to address the impact of demand characteristics, Pinzone-Glover et al. (1998) conducted a study in which they compared participants in an acquaintance rape prevention program to a control group of participants in a program focusing on sexually transmitted diseases. The acquaintance rape prevention program consisted of a presentation of prevalence rates and statistics about rape, discussion of a worksheet focused on rape myths and facts, and case examples of rape scenarios. The experimenters used several techniques to reduce the impact of demand characteristics, including the use of distractor tasks and the use of multiple experimenters. The dependent variables included scores on the RMAS, the Rape Empathy Scale (RES), and the Attitudes Towards Women Scale. In comparison to the control group, male participants in the acquaintance rape prevention program were able to provide more accurate definitions of rape and demonstrated more empathy for women as measured by the RES than did male
participants in the control group. Results on the RMAS, however, were not significant. The authors concluded that the acquaintance rape prevention program had the potential to reduce the propensity of participants to engage in sexually aggressive behavior. Although there were positive aspects of this study, this conclusion is problematic for reasons discussed in subsequent sections.

Little research has examined the impact of attitude change programs on actual behavior. In a recent article, Schultz et al. (2000) designed a study that actually assessed the connection between change in attitude and change in behavior. In this study, participants attended the Campus Rape Prevention program, a co-ed interactive drama program designed to increase awareness of risk factors for rape and provide students with information about current prevention and intervention efforts. Participants then completed the RMAS and the College Date Rape Attitude and Behavior Survey, which assessed behavioral intent (Lanier & Elliott, 1997). Results indicated that the participants in the treatment program were significantly less likely to endorse rape myths than a control group. This was consistent with prior research confirming that programs can change reported attitudes. However, participants in the treatment group did not display any difference on the behavioral intent measure (e.g., “when I hear a sexist comment, I will indicate my displeasure”, p. 197). Schultz et al. were not able to account for the incongruity between reported attitudes and behavioral intent, other than noting that the actual behavior of participants may be different than their verbalized intent. An equally likely explanation may be that there was no real attitude change, a possibility if the measures used to assess attitude change were inadequate (e.g., highly susceptible to social desirability). Schultz et al. did not discuss the possibility that participants’ evaluation of rape myths on a transparent instrument may have been
different than their actual beliefs about those myths. It is also possible that behavioral intent measures are more effective as indicators of attitudes rather than transparent measures. If so, then the results of this study are, at best, inconclusive with respect to actual attitude change.

**Intervention Programs Based on the ELM**

In recognition of the need for theoretically grounded work, a growing number of researchers have utilized the ELM as a theoretical foundation for designing and implementing prevention programs. The following discussion focuses on two of these programs.

In one of the first studies to use the ELM, Gilbert et al. (1991) noted that the theory was effective in designing the study’s program and, more importantly, in understanding the manner by which reported attitudes were changed. Seventy-five undergraduate psychology students from two universities were randomly assigned to either a 60 minute psychoeducational intervention on sexually aggressive attitudes or a no-treatment control condition. Attitude change was assessed by a composite of four attitude scales: the RMAS, the Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence Scale, the Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale, and the Sex Role Stereotyping Scale. In addition, several items were constructed to assess the components of central route processing: motivation, ability, and thought favorability (e.g., “To what extent did you feel motivated to think carefully about the arguments and information presented in the speech”, p. 201). Results indicated that reported attitude change was greater in the treatment group than in the control group \( (d = 0.25) \). Several of the central route processing components were significantly correlated with attitude change, including motivation to think carefully about arguments, sufficient ability to understand program material, and amount of effort expended in evaluating the logic and accuracy of arguments.
The authors concluded that this provided evidence that some central route processing was taking place.

One month after involvement in the intervention, participants were contacted by phone in the context of an unrelated project and a women's safety project was discussed. The treatment group was more willing to listen to the call and more willing to make favorable comments about the project than was the control group. However, there was no difference in terms of willingness to volunteer time for the project. The researchers concluded that these results provided evidence that the attitudes were still changed one month after the intervention. Although the researchers asserted that results could not be accounted for by demand characteristics, it should be noted that the outcome measures used to assess lasting attitude change could be affected by social desirability. For example, it seems likely that participants in the treatment condition were sensitized to the fact that some of the statements on the attitudinal measures were myths. In addition, the willingness to volunteer time is a more stringent measure of program impact. The fact that this was not significant also argues for caution when concluding that attitude change was evident at the one month follow-up. The authors recommended that future research focus on maximizing central route processing because attitudes changed by this route are more enduring, more resistant to later persuasion attempts, and more predictive of future behavior (Gilbert et al., 1991).

This recommendation was echoed in a study conducted by Heppner et al. (1995), who administered two interventions to a group of 258 male and female students enrolled in an introductory psychology class. The treatment intervention was an "interactional drama" in which participants viewed mock interactions between a male and female actor, asked
questions of the actors, and then rewrote the scripts. Prevalence information on rape was also presented. The control intervention consisted of a) information including prevalence, consequences and definitions, b) presentation of the video “Campus Rape”, and c) time for discussion. The researchers used multiple outcome measures and a control group to improve methodological sophistication. The measures included the RMAS, several behavioral indicators, and two instruments intended to explore the extent to which participants engaged in central route processing: the Elaboration Likelihood Model Questionnaire (ELMQ) and a thought listing exercise. Recall that the ELMQ is a 12 item scale designed to assess ability, motivation, and personal relevance among participants (Heppner et al., 1995). Thought listing was intended to provide a quantifiable indication of the amount of issue-relevant thinking and cognitive elaboration resulting from the intervention.

Results indicated that participants in the treatment condition engaged in greater central route processing as measured by scores on the ELMQ than participants in the didactic-video condition ($d = 0.81$). Participants in the treatment intervention displayed higher scores on the behavioral indicator assessing amount of time spent talking about the intervention than did participants in the didactic-video intervention ($d = 0.29$). In addition, participants in the treatment intervention also verbalized a greater willingness to volunteer with rape prevention programs on campus than did participants in the didactic-video intervention ($d = 0.31$). The authors stated that this provided further evidence for the basic assertion of the ELM: attitudes changed through central route processing are more likely to be linked to behavioral change than are attitudes changed through the peripheral route. It is of note that the RMAS did not detect any differences between treatment groups in this study.
leading the authors to offer some criticisms of the instrument that will be discussed in a subsequent section.

**Methodological and Conceptual Problems with Existing Intervention Programs**

**Methodological Problems**

An evaluation of the research in the rape prevention area revealed methodological problems with many of the studies. The first methodological problem deals with the manner in which attitudinal change has been assessed. As Lonsway (1996) noted, "education explicitly targeting the misinformation of rape mythology is one of the most widely used techniques in rape education programs and is the strategy most commonly associated with desirable attitude change . . . however, it is not altogether clear how the rape myths presented in the intervention map onto those in the post-intervention assessment" (p. 246). In many of these programs, researchers challenged a series of commonly held beliefs about sexual assault and then, usually immediately after the program, asked the participants to rate the veracity of statements drawn from very similar material (e.g., Gidycz et al., 2001, Heppner et al., 1995, Pinzone-Glover et al., 1998). Therefore, it seems likely that researchers are mistaking social desirability for attitude change. Long-term follow-up measures of attitude change may not show permanent attitude change because participants are no longer motivated to complete attitudinal measures in a socially desirable manner; they may be reporting their actual attitudes. Social desirability is a serious impediment to internal validity of studies (Lonsway et al., 1998) and it is important to acknowledge that reported attitudes may not reflect actual attitudes or values. Given the assumption that participants' attitudes play an important role in behavior, if the prevention programs have failed to change attitudes, then little behavioral change should be expected.
As noted previously, the RMAS has been the most widely used measure of attitude change in rape research. Schultz et al. (2000) noted, "the RMAS was chosen as a measure of attitude change due to its broad usage and also the fact that targeting rape mythology is the strategy most often associated with desirable attitude change" (p. 197). This is not very reassuring from a theoretical standpoint. Obviously, continuity is to be desired and an established instrument is preferable to a new and untried one. However, if a ubiquitous instrument fails to accurately assess that which it purports to assess (i.e., attitude change), there is little point in using it.

This brings up the critically important issue of validity: The RMAS has been criticized for both its construct and criterion validity (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994; Pinzone-Glover et al., 1998). The scale was designed over twenty years ago and, as a result, several researchers have argued that it now fails to adequately represent the relevant issues in contemporary society. In addition, Heppner et al. (1995) criticized the RMAS, stating that "items such as 'women who go around braless or wearing short skirts and tight tops, they are just asking for trouble.' may be too blatant to pick up subtle and complex contemporary attitudes about rape. This, may in turn create a 'floor effect' with little room for variability" (p 515). Another problem is that the RMAS is highly transparent and vulnerable to socially desirable response sets: it seems probable that most men know that they are not supposed to state that a woman who flirts deserves to be raped.

A related problem is the fundamental assumption underlying the majority of these prevention efforts: An hour long program has the power to have a lasting impact on attitudes that have been shaped over the course of many years. Many college students are immersed in a culture that is implicitly, and sometimes explicitly, supportive of rape ideology. and the
impact of this environment may be far more powerful than are brief interventions (Heppner et al., 1995). For example, the culture of a fraternity that enables and reinforces sexually aggressive attitudes and behavior may be far more compelling and persistent than the most sophisticated prevention program. This may be a piece of the explanation for the boomerang effect: attitudes that temporarily shifted during the program revert to prior states under the pressure exerted by the rape-supportive culture surrounding the student (Heppner et al., 1995).

One obvious solution is to increase the duration of the programs, allowing for a deeper level of exploring, challenging and processing of rape supportive ideology (Schaeffer & Nelson, 1993). However, the feasibility of implementing semester-long programs remains questionable. This is a serious investment of time and an individual who ascribes to rape supportive ideology may be highly unlikely to voluntarily enroll in such a program. Mandating attendance at such programs may simply increase resistance to the point that attitude change is impossible.

Furthermore, it could be argued that the type of individual likely to volunteer for such a program needs it less than those who do not volunteer. This brings up yet another important problem in current research: the samples being used by researchers are not necessarily representative of the population of college students, much less the general population. Studies that depend on volunteers may contain samples that are comprised of low risk individuals who have a lower propensity to accept rape myths or adversarial sexual beliefs than do high-risk individuals (Lonsway, 1996; Schewe & O’Donohue, 1993). As noted previously, the sample used in the CARE program was composed of those students who voluntarily enrolled in a semester-long practicum class. It seems reasonable to suggest
that these individuals may have differed in systematic ways from those students who did not enroll in the class. Ideally, the target sample for such programming would be college students at a high risk for committing sexual assault. This limitation in the generalizability of these studies has been discussed in the literature (Lonsway, 1996).

Conceptual Problems

Although several studies have turned to the ELM as a guiding framework for their research, many of the studies reviewed failed to articulate or even identify the theoretical foundation believed to be underlying the attitude change. A statistically significant change from pre- to post-assessment was often considered to be sufficient justification for the study. There is a clear need to conduct more theoretically grounded work to ensure that actual attitude change is taking place rather than socially desirable reporting. Only when attitude change is confirmed can programs be designed to modify attitude change in such a way that the likelihood of behavior change is enhanced.

Summary

Based on the premises of the ELM, effective programs will be those that strive to maximize the amount of central route processing in participants. This can be accomplished by increasing the motivation and sense of personal relevance among participants. However, this is not an easy task. Why should men be concerned with the issue of sexual aggression, especially when many men responsible for such aggression simply choose not to define it as such? "Of particular importance is the question of how to identify and communicate the payoff for men in eliminating sexual violence. Specifically, why would men be motivated to give up the power over women that is gained via the incidence and threat of rape?" (Lonsway, 1996, p. 257). Other researchers have suggested that men are goal oriented to
obtain sex from partners (Osman & Davis, 1999) and this may be even more salient with hypermasculine men. Program designers must consider how to communicate the value of changing rape supportive attitudes and behaviors in this context.

The design and promotion of the program may enhance the motivation or sense of personal relevance among participants. As noted previously, programs perceived as confrontational and blaming are unlikely to do anything more than create defensiveness in male participants. Advertising the intervention as a workshop designed to train men on how they can be supportive and helpful to a survivor of sexual assault has the potential to circumvent this problem (Foubert & Marriott, 1997). Advertising the program in this manner may decrease defensiveness and increase the sense of personal responsibility among the men and, as a result, increase the possibility that lasting attitude change may occur. Similar findings have been reported in other studies using a non-threatening intervention description (Ring & Kilmartin, 1992). A program format that advocates active sexual consent seeking by men may also serve this purpose.

**Purpose of the Present Study**

The current study is designed to compare the impact of a theoretically based acquaintance rape intervention and a traditional program on multiple outcome measures with low and high hypermasculine men. The present study is important for several reasons. First, the study compared a new intervention, the Believable Yes (Zilber & Mann, 2000), to the Traditional Intervention based on that used by Heppner et al. (1995). The Believable Yes was novel because it incorporated several aspects of prevention programming that have been associated with central route processing. First, the Believable Yes was a highly interactive program that proposed a behavioral system of consent seeking based on the behavioral code
advocated by Antioch College (1993). The level of involvement on the part of program participants has been associated with reported attitude change (Lonsway, 1996) and, as a result, it was expected that the Believable Yes would result in greater cognitive elaboration compared with the Traditional Intervention. In addition, because this program proposed a pro-active system of behavior designed to remove ambiguity from the sexual encounter, men who followed through on recommendations of the program were expected to be less likely to overestimate women's interest in sex and less likely to ascribe to the existence of the token no. Thus, it was expected to address the risk of assaultive behavior explained by the Miscommunication Hypothesis. Second, the program was expected to enhance personal relevance (another core characteristic of central route processing) because men were required to imagine themselves within a sexual context while practicing gaining consent. Third, the design of the Believable Yes was based upon Drum and Lawler's (1988) guidelines for psychoeducational programming. These guidelines emphasized the importance of accommodating different learning styles of participants through a variety of learning activities. The Believable Yes accomplished this through a balance between didactic and interactive segments. Fourth, the program was designed to reduce defensiveness by adopting a non-confrontational approach in which the facilitators state that they assume that none of the men wish to harm women and use "we" throughout the program. For these reasons, it was expected that the Believable Yes would result in greater cognitive elaboration among participants when compared to the Traditional Intervention and that this elaboration would provide evidence of attitude change.

A second strength of this study is that it was grounded in a theory that has enjoyed increasing use in the field: the ELM. In order for conclusions about attitude change to be
considered credible, a theoretical framework for the design, implementation, and assessment of prevention programs must be established. In past research, measures such as the RMAS have been consistently employed to demonstrate attitude change, but rarely was the theory underlying the change identified. In addition, there are clear problems with a reliance on transparent instruments assessing socially desirable attitudes, especially when program content includes a component that consists of challenging such attitudes. The current study attempted to assess attitude change through a variety of measures that were grounded in attitude change research, such as thought listing and the ELMQ. In addition, the Traditional Intervention had a component that challenged rape myths explicitly while the Believable Yes did not. This allowed for an evaluation of whether reported attitudes could be affected by a program component that is explicitly focused on challenging rape myths.

Much previous research has been conducted with volunteers from introductory psychology classes. This study was strengthened by the fact that fraternity men were used as participants. Fraternity men were selected because fraternities have been identified as high risk environments for sexual assault (Boswell & Spade, 1996).

Another important question that has not yet received a significant amount of attention in the literature is the impact of participant personality characteristics on the effectiveness of intervention programs. Specifically, how does personality affect an individual's assessment of the persuasiveness of a message? What impact does this have on the individual's tendency to engage in central route processing and, ultimately, to translate a persuasive message into attitude change? As discussed in previous sections, hypermasculinity has been identified as a correlate of sexual aggression, increased anger, and reduced empathy. Hypermasculine men may respond negatively to certain types of programming (i.e., rape
prevention programming). This study explored the impact of hypermasculinity on rape myth acceptance, behavioral intent to support rape prevention efforts, and cognitive elaboration.

It is reasonable to expect that many hypermasculine individuals would lack the motivation required to engage in central route processing during a rape prevention program and would, therefore, base their assessment of the information on peripheral cues. However, it was expected that the strengths of the Believable Yes, including the non-confrontational approach and the interactive design, would foster cognitive elaboration in hypermasculine men. Based on this expectation for higher levels of cognitive elaboration, it was also expected that hypermasculine men in the Believable Yes would demonstrate lower acceptance of rape myths and greater intent to participate in rape prevention efforts than hypermasculine men in the Traditional Intervention.
METHOD

Participants

The participants for the study were drawn from a fraternity population at a large Midwestern state university. The sample consisted of 128 men from eight fraternities. The mean participation rate was 33% across fraternities. Data on participation rate from each fraternity revealed some variability between fraternities: 52% (Fraternity 1), 54% (Fraternity 2), 44% (Fraternity 3), 30% (Fraternity 4), 38% (Fraternity 5), 24% (Fraternity 6), 35% (Fraternity 7), and 28% (Fraternity 8). Of the participants, 40% were freshman, 27% were sophomores, 26% were juniors, and 7% were seniors. The age range of the sample was 18 to 23 years, with a mean age of 19.7. The sample was predominately Caucasian (96.1%), with a small percentage of Asian American (1.6%), Hispanic (1.6%), and African American (0.8%) participants. Data on dating history revealed that 41% of the sample was involved in a romantic relationship; the mean length of these relationships was 6 months. The mean number of dates the previous semester was 3.9.

Psychoeducational Rape Prevention Interventions

The Believable Yes. The Believable Yes was a 60 min interactive intervention that was based on Antioch College’s policy of sexual consent. Components of the intervention included definitions of consent and sexual contact, a brief review of statistics on rape, and an interactive portion. Using the bases in baseball as a metaphor for sexual intimacy, the program facilitated an examination of how participants currently obtain consent and encouraged them to seek unambiguous verbal consent for each progressive level of intimacy. The interactive segments of the intervention required participants to generate “lines” that they would use to obtain consent in a sexual situation.
The workshop operated from the premise that none of the participants have a desire to willingly or knowingly harm another person and the techniques proposed in the study are designed to ensure that no one is unintentionally hurt. This program was innovative in that a concrete behavioral system (i.e., seeking verbal consent) was proposed that was designed to address many of the issues in acquaintance rape, such as miscommunication and token resistance. This approach was also consistent with research demonstrating that non-confrontational programs result in lower defensiveness and greater receptivity to intervention messages among participants than do confrontational programs (Ring & Kilmartin, 1992). A copy of the manual used for facilitation is included as Appendix A.

Traditional Intervention. The format of the Traditional Intervention was closely based on the didactic-video intervention described by Heppner et al. (1995). The didactic portion of this intervention described prevalence rates and consequences of sexual assault, discussed and challenged cultural rape myths, and examined gender socialization. The video shown was “Campus Rape” (Rape Treatment Center, 1990). This video had several vignettes of rape survivors discussing the assault and the consequences. Finally, time was allotted for a brief question and answer session. These elements were included because they have been identified as those most commonly used in rape prevention (Heppner et al., 1995). A manual for facilitation is included as Appendix B.

Facilitators

The interventions were facilitated by two male doctoral students in counseling psychology. Both facilitators received 10 hours of training and were trained to deliver both programs. The training consisted of a review of relevant literature, a demonstration of each program and a period in which facilitators had the opportunity to role play the aspects of each
program. Training for the Traditional Intervention was provided by the author and training for the "Believable Yes" was conducted by Dr. Suzanne Zilber, the psychologist who designed the program. Both facilitators also completed the university required Institutional Review Board training.

**Instruments**

_Demographic Questionnaire_. The Demographic Questionnaire (see Appendix C) included 7 items: age, ethnicity, year in school, college major, and three questions dealing with dating history. The instrument was administered immediately prior to the intervention.

_Hypermasculinity Inventory_. The Hypermasculinity Inventory (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984) is a 30-item forced-choice questionnaire that assesses the three aspects of the macho personality constellation discussed in prior sections (e.g., danger, violence, and calloused sexual attitudes towards women) (see Appendix D). The scale was developed with a sample of 135 college students from predominately middle class families. The researchers used theoretical expectations and focus groups of men discussing violence to create a pool of items which were divided into the 3 aspects of the macho constellation. The 10 items with the highest item-total correlation from each subscale were combined into the 30-item inventory. The Chronbach α coefficient for the scale was .89. Evidence for validity of the instrument was indicated by significant correlations with self-reported substance abuse (r = .26), aggression after alcohol consumption (r = .65), and sexual force (r = .40). In the current study, internal consistency for the scale was α = .82. Scores on this instrument for participants in the Believable Yes (M = 9.74, SD = 5.28) and the Traditional Intervention (M = 8.59, SD = 5.01) closely approximated means that were reported by Gold et al. (1995) (M = 7.52, SD = 4.15) and Norris et al. (1999) (M = 10.31, SD = 5.98).
The Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (RMAS). The RMAS (Burt, 1980) is a 19 item instrument designed to assess the degree of rape myth endorsement (see Appendix E). Scores on this instrument can range from 19 to 133, with elevated scores representing greater acceptance of rape myths. Internal consistency was reported at $\alpha = .88$ (Burt, 1980) and $\alpha = .86$ (Foubert & Marriott, 1997). In the current study, internal consistency on the RMAS pretest and posttest was $\alpha = .86$. Previous research has demonstrated a correlation between scores on the RMAS and acceptance of interpersonal violence (Burt, 1980).

The Elaboration Likelihood Model Questionnaire (ELMQ). The ELMQ was constructed by Heppner et al. (1995) to detect the presence of those components integral to central route processing (see Appendix F). The scale is composed of 12 items scored on a 5 point Likert scale with high scores reflecting greater central route processing. Aspects of central processing that are measured include motivation to listen to the message, ability to understand the message, and presence of favorable thoughts about the message (Heppner et al., 1995). Internal consistency has been reported at $\alpha = .83$ (Heppner et al., 1995). In the current study, internal consistency was $\alpha = .72$.

Thought Listing. The thought listing exercise was administered immediately after the intervention programs. Subjects listed all thoughts that crossed their mind during the program. Similar forms have been used in research assessing the level of cognitive elaboration after a persuasive message (e.g., Helweg-Larsen & Howell, 2000; Heppner et al., 1995). Refer to Appendix G for instructions.

Behavioral Intent Inventory. The six behavioral intent items (see Appendix H) were based upon items used in similar research (e.g., Heppner et al., 1995). These items were designed to assess willingness to seek unambiguous sexual consent, to engage in sexually
coercive behavior, to confront friends and family members who make sexist or rape supportive comments, to serve as a facilitator of rape prevention programs, to volunteer hours for rape prevention efforts, and to support a tuition increase for rape prevention programming.

In addition, the values of these six behavioral intention items were summed to create a composite variable representing overall behavioral intention. Scores on intention to engage in coercive behavior and intention to volunteer hours for rape prevention efforts were reversed in the construction of this variable. Higher scores on this composite variable reflected intentions that were supportive of rape prevention efforts.

**Design and Procedure**

Recruitment for the study was conducted in three ways: a) a presentation of the study to fraternity presidents at their monthly meeting, b) a letter writing campaign directed to the fraternity officers (see Appendix I), and c) phone contacts with fraternity presidents. Participants at each fraternity house meeting were assigned a number and a random number generator divided the participants into two groups: the Traditional Intervention group and the Believable Yes group. These groups went to different areas of the fraternity. To ensure anonymity, no data were identified at the individual level. Prior to administration of the interventions, participants in each group completed the consent form (see Appendix J), the demographic questionnaire, the Hypermasculinity Inventory, the RMAS, and the Behavioral Intentions Inventory. Immediately after the intervention, participants completed the thought listing form, the RMAS, the ELMQ, and the Behavioral Intentions Inventory. Finally, participants were debriefed (see Appendix K).
The dependent variables included the extent of cognitive elaboration, measured by scores on the ELMQ and number of issue relevant thoughts, and change scores on the RMAS and Intentions inventory. After participation in the program, each fraternity received a letter outlining the details of the programs and verifying the fraternity's participation in the project.

The facilitators assigned to each intervention program were counterbalanced. For example, at the first fraternity, Facilitator A ran the Traditional Intervention and Facilitator B ran the sexual consent intervention. At the next fraternity, the facilitators ran the opposite intervention.

Thoughts listed by participants were coded by two raters on two dimensions: relevance and valence (see Appendix L). The raters showed 94% agreement in coding of relevance and 96% agreement in coding of valence, resulting in an overall agreement rating of 89%. These ratings were then averaged to provide a more reliable assessment of the thoughts and this average score was used in the analyses.

Hypotheses

The following six hypotheses were proposed:

1. Hypermasculinity will be inversely correlated with cognitive elaboration as assessed by 1) scores on the ELMQ and 2) the number of relevant, irrelevant, positive and negative thoughts listed by participants.

2. Hypermasculinity will be positively correlated with rape myth acceptance as assessed by scores on the RMAS pretest.

3. Hypermasculinity will be inversely correlated with five of the behavioral intention measures: likelihood of seeking unambiguous verbal consent, likelihood of confronting friends and relatives who make sexist or rape
supportive comments, willingness to serve as a facilitator of the program in the future, willingness to support a tuition increase to support rape prevention programming, and number of hours willing to volunteer for anti-rape causes. Hypermasculinity will be positively correlated with likelihood of engaging in sexually coercive behavior.

4. Hypermasculine men in the Believable Yes will exhibit greater cognitive elaboration than hypermasculine men in the Traditional Intervention, whereas no such difference is expected for men scoring low on this dimension. It is expected that the positive aspects of the Believable Yes (i.e., interactive program, behavioral component, and non-confrontational style) would be more likely to facilitate central route processing than the Traditional Intervention.

5. Hypermasculine men in the Believable Yes will endorse fewer rape myths than hypermasculine men in the Traditional Intervention, whereas no such difference is expected for low hypermasculine men. This result was expected because changes in rape myth endorsement was expected to be associated with the level of cognitive elaboration.

6. Hypermasculine men in the Believable Yes will score higher on the behavioral intentions than hypermasculine men in the Traditional Intervention, whereas no such difference is expected for low hypermasculine men. Again, it was expected that changes in behavioral intention would be associated with the level of cognitive elaboration.
RESULTS

The first set of hypotheses predicted a significant relationship of hypermasculinity with the measure of rape myth acceptance, the behavioral intent measures and cognitive elaboration. A visual examination of the scatterplots between hypermasculinity and the dependent measures was conducted to ensure that the relationship was linear, not curvilinear, and that bivariate outliers were not responsible for the relationship. Next, hypermasculinity was correlated with the RMAS and the intention measures, using pretest scores to prevent contamination from program effects. Given that cognitive elaboration can only be assessed after the presentation of a persuasive message, hypermasculinity was correlated with posttest scores on the ELMQ and the thought listing measure to assess this construct. Confidence intervals were computed to provide more accurate estimates of the magnitude of the relationship between the variables.

The second set of hypotheses predicted that hypermasculine men in the Believable Yes would demonstrate greater cognitive elaboration, less rape myth acceptance, and greater behavioral intent congruent with rape prevention than hypermasculine men in the Traditional Intervention, whereas no such difference would be detected for low hypermasculine men. Using hypermasculinity and pretest scores as covariates, a series of ANCOVAs was used to test this set of hypotheses. Results did not support the predicted interactions. However, there was a significant main effect for program type on rape myth acceptance and intention to engage in sexually coercive behavior. Finally, a series of ANCOVAs was used to test for the effect of fraternity and facilitator. A correlation matrix of all measures is included as Appendix M.
Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis one predicted that hypermasculinity would be positively correlated with rape myth acceptance, as measured by the RMAS. A visual examination of the scatterplot between hypermasculinity and scores on the RMAS pretest revealed that the relationship was not curvilinear and there were no bivariate outliers. A correlation analysis was conducted to examine the magnitude of the relationship between the variables. There was a significant correlation between hypermasculinity and RMAS pretest scores: $r(126) = .39, p < .01$. A 95 percent confidence interval around the squared correlation was constructed. (.05 < $p^2$ < .34). This interval suggested that differences in hypermasculinity explained from 5 to 34 percent of the variance in pretest scores on the RMAS.

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis two predicted that hypermasculinity would be inversely correlated with the behavioral intent measures. The visual examination of scatterplots between hypermasculinity and each of the behavioral intent measures revealed that the relationships between the variables were not curvilinear and there were no bivariate outliers. A series of correlations were conducted to examine differences between hypermasculine men on each of the pretest behavioral intention measures.

Hypermasculinity was significantly and inversely correlated with intention to confront friends or family members who make sexist or rape supportive comments. $r(126) = -.27, p < .01$. A 95 percent confidence interval around the squared correlation was constructed. (.01 < $p^2$ < .18). This interval indicated that differences in hypermasculinity explained between 1 and 18 percent of the variance in this intention measure.
Hypermasculinity was significantly and inversely correlated with intention to serve as a facilitator of a rape prevention program. $r(126) = -.22, p = .02$. A 95 percent confidence interval around the squared correlation did not contain 0, $(0 < p^2 \leq .14)$. This interval suggested that differences in hypermasculinity explained up to 14 percent of the variance in the dependent measure.

Hypermasculinity was significantly and inversely correlated with intention to support a tuition increase to support rape prevention programs. $r(126) = -.30, p < .01$. A 95 percent confidence interval around the squared correlation was constructed, $(.02 < p^2 \leq .20)$. The interval suggested that differences in hypermasculinity explained from 2 to 20 percent of the variance in the intention measure.

Hypermasculinity was significantly and positively correlated with intention to engage in coercive behavior. $r(126) = .19, p = .03$. A 95 percent confidence interval around the squared correlation was constructed, $(0 < p^2 \leq .12)$. The interval suggested that differences in hypermasculinity explained between 0 and 12 percent of the variance in the intention measure.

Finally, hypermasculinity was significant and inversely correlated with the composite behavioral intention measure. $r(124) = -.28, p < .01$. A 95 percent confidence interval around the squared correlation was constructed, $(.01 \leq p^2 \leq .18)$. This interval indicated that differences in hypermasculinity explained between 1 and 18 percent of the variance in this intention measure.

**Hypothesis 3**

Hypothesis three postulated that hypermasculine men would score significantly lower on cognitive elaboration as measured by scores on the ELMQ and the thought listing form.
A visual examination of the scatterplot between hypermasculinity and scores on the ELMQ revealed that the relationship between the variables was not curvilinear and there were no bivariate outliers. Hypermasculinity was significantly correlated with scores on the ELMQ; $r(121) = -.25$, $p < .01$. A 95 percent confidence interval around the squared correlation was constructed, $(.01 \leq \rho^2 \leq .17)$. This interval suggested that differences in hypermasculinity could explain from 1 to 17 percent of the variance in scores on the ELMQ.

In contrast, hypermasculinity was not significantly correlated with other dependent measures of cognitive elaboration: number of relevant thoughts listed, $r(122) = -.06$, $p = .55$. irrelevant thoughts listed, $r(122) = .11$, $p = .23$. positive thoughts listed, $r(122) = -.07$, $p = .47$. and negative thoughts listed, $r(122) = .02$, $p = .83$. Thus, the study provided limited evidence for this hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 4**

A one-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), with hypermasculinity as the covariate, was conducted to test the fourth hypothesis: that hypermasculine men in the Believable Yes would demonstrate greater cognitive elaboration than hypermasculine men in the Traditional Intervention, but that no such difference would be detected for low hypermasculine men. There was no main effect for program type on scores on the ELMQ, $F(1, 120) = 1.19$, $p = .28$. The effect of the covariate was significant, $F(1, 120) = 7.01$, $p < .01$. The interaction between program type and the covariate was not significant, $F(1, 119) = 0.02$, $p = .90$. See Table 1 for means and standard deviations of all measures.

Cognitive elaboration was also assessed by the thought listing exercise described in the methods section. A one-way ANCOVA was conducted to test for a difference in number of thoughts listed between the two programs. For number of relevant thoughts listed, there
Table 1: Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Traditional Intervention</th>
<th>Believable Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypermasculinity</td>
<td>0-24</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELMQ</td>
<td>26-57</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMAS Pretest</td>
<td>31-84</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>52.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMAS Posttest</td>
<td>23-80</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Thoughts</td>
<td>0-11</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant Thoughts</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Thoughts</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Thoughts</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Seek</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Confront</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Coerce</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Serve As</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Volunteer</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Support</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Intention Score</td>
<td>12-40</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 = high scores reflect higher levels of the variable*

was no main effect for program type. $F(1.121) = 0.75, p = .39$. The effect of the covariate was not significant. $F(1.121) = 0.26, p = .61$. The interaction between program type and the covariate was not significant. $F(1.120) = 2.41, p = .12$.

For number of irrelevant thoughts listed, there was no main effect of program type. $F(1.121) = 0.66, p = .42$. The main effect of the covariate was not significant. $F(1.121) = 1.22, p = .27$. The interaction between program type and the covariate was not significant. $F(1.120) = 1.47, p = .23$.

For number of positive thoughts listed, there was no main effect of program type. $F(1.121) = 2.28, p = .13$. The main effect of the covariate was not significant. $F(1.121) =
0.32. \( p = .57 \). The interaction between program type and the covariate was not significant. \( F(1, 120) = 3.7, p = .06 \).

For number of negative thoughts listed, there was no main effect of program type. \( F(1, 121) = 2.64, p = .11 \). The main effect of the covariate was not significant. \( F(1, 121) < 0.01, p = .96 \). The interaction between program type and the covariate was not significant. \( F(1, 120) = 0.46, p = .50 \). Taken together, these results suggested that the programs were equally effective in terms of enabling cognitive elaboration in both low and high hypermasculine men.

**Hypothesis 5**

A one-way ANCOVA was used to test the fifth hypothesis: that hypermasculine men would be less likely to adhere to rape myths in the Believable Yes when compared to hypermasculine men in the Traditional Intervention, but that no such difference would be noted for low hypermasculine men. Both hypermasculinity and pretest scores on the RMAS served as covariates. There was a main effect of program type on rape myth acceptance. \( F(1, 117) = 9.83, p < .01 \). Rape myth acceptance was less for participants in the Traditional Intervention (\( M = 42.50, SD = 12.91 \)) than the Believable Yes (\( M = 47.25, SD = 14.10 \)).

There was no main effect of hypermasculinity on rape myth acceptance. \( F(1, 117) = 0.16, p = .69 \), indicating that hypermasculinity was ineffective as a covariate when pretest scores on the RMAS were entered into the model. The interaction between hypermasculinity and program type was not significant. \( F(1, 116) = 0.07, p = .79 \).

**Hypothesis 6**

A series of one-way ANCOVAs was conducted to assess the sixth hypothesis: that hypermasculine men in the Believable Yes would be more likely to demonstrate positive
change on the behavioral intent measures when compared to hypermasculine men in the Traditional Intervention, but that no such difference would be detected for low hypermasculine men. Hypermasculinity and pretest scores on the intention measures served as covariates. There was only one significant effect: likelihood of engaging in sexually coercive behavior. Participants in the Traditional Intervention reported a lower likelihood of engaging in coercive behavior (M = 2.53, SD = 1.44) than participants in the Believable Yes (M = 3.16, SD = 1.72). $F(1, 110) = 4.16, p = .04$. There was no main effect of hypermasculinity, $F(1, 110) = 0.94, p = .34$. The interaction between hypermasculinity and program type was not significant, $F(1, 109) = 1.96, p = .16$. See Table 2 for a summary of $F$ and $p$ values for all behavioral intent measures.

A one-way ANCOVA was conducted to test whether hypermasculine men in the Believable Yes would be more likely to demonstrate positive change on the composite behavioral intent measure when compared to hypermasculine men in the Traditional Intervention. There was a main effect of program type on the composite behavioral intention, $F(1, 107) = 5.70, p = .02$. Participants in the Traditional Intervention reported more positive intentions (M = 26.33, SD = 6.25) than participants in the Believable Yes (M = 23.20, SD = 4.69). There was no main effect of hypermasculinity, $F(1, 107) = 0.52, p = .47$. The interaction between hypermasculinity and program type was not significant, $F(1, 106) = 0.43, p = .51$.

**Test of Effect of Facilitator**

A two-way univariate analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), program type (Believable Yes vs. Traditional) by facilitator (Facilitator A vs. Facilitator B) with hypermasculinity as
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Program x Hypermasculinity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df F p</td>
<td>df F p</td>
<td>df F p</td>
<td>df F p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Seek Consent</td>
<td>1,112 2.81 .10</td>
<td>1,112 0.48 .49</td>
<td>1,111 0.50 .48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Coerce</td>
<td>1,110 4.16 .04*</td>
<td>1,110 0.94 .34</td>
<td>1,109 1.96 .16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Confront</td>
<td>1,112 0.01 .93</td>
<td>1,112 2.61 .11</td>
<td>1,111 0.55 .46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Facilitate</td>
<td>1,111 1.09 .30</td>
<td>1,111 0.06 .81</td>
<td>1,110 0.34 .56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Volunteer</td>
<td>1,112 1.82 .18</td>
<td>1,112 0.24 .62</td>
<td>1,111 0.15 .70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Support Tuition</td>
<td>1,112 0.04 .85</td>
<td>1,112 0.05 .83</td>
<td>1,111 3.07 .08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Intention Score</td>
<td>1,107 5.70 .02*</td>
<td>1,107 0.52 .47</td>
<td>1,108 0.43 .51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = significant at the .05 level
the covariate was used to test whether responses to program type differed as a function of facilitator. Results for these analyses are summarized in Table 3.

There was no main effect of program type on scores on the ELMQ. $F(1, 118) = 0.09$, $p = .77$. There was a significant main effect for facilitator: Facilitator A ($M = 44.8, SD = 6.32$) produced less cognitive elaboration than did Facilitator B ($M = 47.27, SD = 5.98$), $F(1, 118) = 4.11, p = .05$. The interaction between facilitator and program type was significant, $F(1, 118) = 6.14, p = .02$. For Facilitator A, participants in the Traditional Intervention ($M = 47.14, SD = 5.92$) reported higher scores on the ELMQ than participants in the Believable Yes ($M = 43.65, SD = 6.26$), $t(62) = 2.13, p = .04$. However, for Facilitator B, participants in the Traditional Intervention ($M = 46.63, SD = 5.87$) did not report different levels of elaboration on the ELMQ than the Believable Yes ($M = 48.63, SD = 6.13$), $t(57) = 1.21, p = .23$.

There was a main effect of program type on scores on the RMAS posttest. $F(1, 115) = 7.96, p < .01$, with the Traditional Intervention ($M = 42.5, SD = 12.91$) producing lower scores than the Believable Yes ($M = 47.25, SD = 14.10$). There was no main effect of facilitator on scores on the RMAS. $F(1, 115) = 0.11, p = .74$. The interaction between facilitator and program type displayed a non-significant trend. $F(1, 115) = 3.03, p = .08$.

There was a non-significant trend of program type on intention to seek unambiguous consent. $F(1, 110) = 3.07, p = .08$. There was also a non-significant trend of program type on intention to engage in sexually coercive behavior. $F(1, 108) = 3.63, p = .06$.

Finally, there was a significant main effect of program type on the composite intention measure. $F(1, 105) = 8.11, p < .01$, with the Traditional Intervention ($M = 26.33$,
Table 3. Test of Effect of Facilitator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th></th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th></th>
<th>Program x Facilitator</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELMQ</td>
<td>1, 118</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1, 118</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMAS posttest</td>
<td>1, 115</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>1, 115</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Seek Consent</td>
<td>1, 110</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1, 110</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Confront</td>
<td>1, 110</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1, 110</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Coerce</td>
<td>1, 108</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1, 108</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Facilitate</td>
<td>1, 109</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1, 109</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Volunteer</td>
<td>1, 110</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>1, 110</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Support Tuition</td>
<td>1, 110</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1, 110</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Intention Score</td>
<td>1, 105</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>1, 105</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = significant at the .05 level
SD = 6.25) producing higher scores than the Believable Yes (M = 23.20, SD = 4.69). There was no main effect of facilitator, $F(1, 105) = 2.17, p = .14$. The interaction between facilitator and program type was significant, $F(1, 105) = 4.24, p = .04$. For Facilitator A, participants in the Traditional Intervention (M = 29.00, SD = 6.16) reported higher scores on the composite intention measure than participants in the Believable Yes (M = 23.03, SD = 6.25), $t(55) = 3.91, p < .01$. However, for Facilitator B, participants in the Traditional Intervention (M = 25.00, SD = 5.93) did not report different levels of elaboration on the composite intention measure than participants in the Believable Yes (M = 23.53, SD = 4.39), $t(56) = 0.95, p = .34$.

Test of Effect of Fraternity

A two-way univariate ANCOVA, program type (Believable Yes vs. Traditional) by fraternity (Fraternity 1 through Fraternity 8) with hypermasculinity as the covariate, was used to test whether responses to program type differed as a function of fraternity on each of the dependent measures. Each of the dependent measures was assessed individually. Results from these analyses are summarized in Table 4.

Cognitive Elaboration. There was no main effect of program type on scores on the ELMQ, $F(1, 101) = 0.78, p = .38$. There was no main effect of fraternity, $F(7, 101) = 1.49, p = .18$. The interaction between fraternity and program type was not significant, $F(7, 101) = 1.08, p = .38$.

Rape Myth Acceptance. There was a main effect of program type on scores on the RMAS, $F(1, 98) = 7.31, p < .01$. Participants in the Traditional Intervention (M = 41.75, SD = 13.11) reported less rape myth acceptance than participants in the Believable Yes
Table 4. Effect of Fraternity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Fraternity</th>
<th>Program x Fraternity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELMQ</td>
<td>1, 101</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMAS posttest</td>
<td>1, 98</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Seek Consent</td>
<td>1, 93</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Coerce</td>
<td>1, 91</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Confront</td>
<td>1, 93</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Facilitate</td>
<td>1, 92</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Volunteer</td>
<td>1, 93</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Support Tuition</td>
<td>1, 93</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Intention Score</td>
<td>1, 88</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = significant at the .05 level
(M = 47.25, SD = 14.10). There was no main effect of fraternity, $F(7, 98) = 0.91, p = .50$. The interaction between fraternity and program type was not significant, $F(7, 98) = 0.78, p = .60$.

**Consent.** Program type did not affect likelihood of seeking unambiguous sexual consent, $F(1, 93) = 1.66, p = .20$. However, fraternity did affect the likelihood of seeking unambiguous sexual consent, $F(7, 93) = 2.24, p = .04$. Tukey's post-hoc tests revealed that Fraternity 5 (M = 3.14, SD = 1.61) and Fraternity 6 (M = 3.46, SD = 2.11) were significantly less likely to seek consent than Fraternity 7 (M = 5.92, SD = 1.51), $p = .02$ and $p = .06$ respectively. The remaining fraternities did not differ significantly from one another, all $p$'s $> .14$. The interaction between fraternity and program type was significant, $F(7, 93) = 3.65, p < .01$. Independent samples t-tests were conducted to assess within group differences. For Fraternity 3, participants in the Traditional Intervention (M = 5.82, SD = 1.47) were significantly more likely to seek consent than participants in the Believable Yes (M = 2.33, SD = 1.12), $t(18) = 5.85, p < .01$. Similarly, for Fraternity 4, participants in the Traditional Intervention (M = 5.67, SD = 1.86) were significantly more likely to seek consent than participants in the Believable Yes (M = 2.83, SD = 2.32), $t(10) = 2.34, p = .04$. For the remaining fraternities, there was no difference in reported likelihood of seeking unambiguous sexual consent as a function of program type, all $p$'s $>.20$.

**Coerce.** There was a main effect of program type on likelihood to engage in sexually coercive behavior, $F(1, 93) = 4.65, p = .03$. Participants in the Traditional Intervention (M = 2.53, SD = 1.44) were significantly less likely to report an intention to engage in coercive behavior when compared to the participants in the Believable Yes (M = 3.16, SD = 1.72). There was no main effect for fraternity, $F(7, 93) = 0.92, p = .50$. The interaction between
fraternity and program type was significant. $F(7, 93) = 2.41, p = .03$. Independent samples t-tests were conducted to assess within group differences. For Fraternity 1, participants in the Believable Yes ($M = 3.50, SD = 1.22$) were significantly more likely to engage in sexually coercive behavior than participants in the Traditional Intervention ($M = 1.67, SD = 1.21$). $t(10) = 2.61, p = .03$. Similarly, for Fraternity 4, participants in the Believable Yes ($M = 4.67, SD = 1.97$) were significantly more likely to engage in sexually coercive behavior than participants in the Traditional Intervention ($M = 2.33, SD = 1.37$). $t(10) = 2.39, p = .04$. For the remaining fraternities, there was no difference in reported likelihood of engaging in sexually coercive behavior as a function of program type, all $p$'s > .20.

The fraternities did not differ on the remaining four behavioral intent items: intention to support a tuition increase for rape prevention programs, intention to serve as a facilitator of rape prevention programs, intention to confront friends and family members who make sexist or rape supportive comments, and number of hours willing to volunteer for rape prevention causes.

There was a main effect of program type on scores on the composite behavioral intention measure, $F(1, 88) = 6.96, p = .01$. Participants in the Traditional Intervention ($M = 27.23, SD = 5.60$) reported higher scores than participants in the Believable Yes ($M = 23.20, SD = 4.69$). There was no main effect of fraternity, $F(7, 88) = 1.12, p = .36$. The interaction between fraternity and program type was not significant, $F(7, 88) = 1.68, p = .13$. F and $p$ values for these items are included in Table 4.
DISCUSSION

In an effort to address the serious problem of sexual assault in the university setting, researchers have developed and implemented a variety of rape prevention programs. Until the last decade, there has been scant research on the effectiveness of such programming. Unfortunately, much of this recent research has been limited by methodological and conceptual problems (Lonsway, 1996). The current study attempted to improve upon past studies by incorporating several strengths of rape prevention programming that have been identified in the literature. This study was designed to assess the effectiveness of two acquaintance rape prevention programs in fostering cognitive elaboration with low and high hypermasculine men; thereby, yielding better outcomes in regard to attitude change and behavioral intent.

The first three hypotheses examined the role of hypermasculinity in predicting responses to rape prevention programs. It was predicted that men who scored high in hypermasculinity would demonstrate greater acceptance of rape myths, weaker intentions to support rape prevention efforts, and less cognitive elaboration about the program material when compared to low hypermasculine men. Results provided support for some of these predictions. For example, hypermasculinity scores were negatively correlated with scores on the ELMQ, reported intention to confront friends and family members who make rape supportive comments, intention to serve as a facilitator of the programs, and intention to support a tuition increase that would fund rape prevention programs. In addition, hypermasculinity scores were positively correlated with scores on the RMAS, suggesting that hypermasculine men are more likely to endorse rape myths than are men who score low in
hypermasculinity. These correlations suggest that high hypermasculine men may be particularly unresponsive to rape prevention programming, an issue discussed below.

The second three hypotheses examined the interaction between hypermasculinity and program type. It was predicted that hypermasculine participants in the Believable Yes would demonstrate increased cognitive elaboration of the information presented in the intervention, decreased acceptance of rape myths, and increased intentions to support rape prevention efforts (e.g., agreeing to be a facilitator of a rape prevention program) when compared to hypermasculine men in the Traditional Intervention, but that no such difference would be detected for low hypermasculine men. Contrary to these predictions, there was no support for the superiority of the Believable Yes program. The implications of these results are discussed below. Finally, limitations of the study are discussed and directions for future research are explored.

Hypermasculinity

Hypothesis 1

As predicted, hypermasculinity was positively correlated with rape myth acceptance. This finding is consistent with Mosher and Sirkin's (1984) conceptualization of hypermasculinity as a personality constellation characterized by calloused sexual attitudes towards women, the view of danger as exciting, and the view of violence as manly. Many of the items in the RMAS emphasize the responsibility of women in sexual assault, such as "when women go around braless or wearing short skirts or tight tops, they are just asking for trouble" (Burt, 1980). The positive correlation between the RMAS and hypermasculinity suggested that hypermasculine men have a higher number of rape supportive attitudes than low hypermasculine men. It also provided further support for research indicating that
hypermasculine men tend to attribute responsibility for sexual assault to women (Beaver, Gold, & Prisco, 1992).

Hypothesis 2

As predicted, hypermasculinity was negatively correlated with several pre-test behavioral intention measures: likelihood of confronting friends and relatives who make sexist or rape supportive statements, likelihood of supporting a tuition increase for rape prevention programming, and likelihood of serving as a facilitator of the programs. These results suggest that hypermasculine men are less supportive of rape prevention efforts than men scoring lower on this dimension. Given the positive correlation between hypermasculinity and rape myth acceptance, it was not surprising that hypermasculine men were less likely to confront others who make rape supportive comments. Simply stated, such comments may accurately describe their own beliefs. In addition, Mosher and Sirkin (1984) posited that hypermasculine attitudes emerge through socialization experiences with the male peer group and the family of origin. If so, confronting friends and family members may represent a difficult and costly endeavor for hypermasculine men.

Hypermasculinity was positively correlated with reported likelihood of engaging in sexually coercive behavior in the future. This finding is consistent with research demonstrating a positive correlation between hypermasculinity and self-reported history of sexual aggression (Gold et al., 1992; Vass & Gold, 1995) and provides further evidence of the utility of this instrument. This finding also has implications for prevention efforts. Specifically, it provides support for the contention that hypermasculine men are different from other men in ways that are very relevant to acquaintance rape. Because hypermasculine men are at risk to engage in sexual aggression, prevention programs should be designed with
strategies that are effective with this group. Prevention programming aimed at men who are at less risk to engage in sexually assaultive behavior has questionable utility in terms of reducing the incidence of sexual assault. In addition, research relying on low risk samples (i.e., low hypermasculine men or volunteers) may have limited generalizability to samples that are at a higher risk of engaging in sexually coercive behavior (Lonsway, 1996).

It is interesting to note that hypermasculinity was not correlated with intention to seek unambiguous sexual consent. Given that calloused sexual attitudes about women are a fundamental aspect of hypermasculinity, it was expected that such men might regard consent seeking as an exaggeration of political correctness or counter-productive to the goal of gaining sexual access to women. The results indicated that hypermasculine men were no less likely to seek consent than low hypermasculine men. Although speculative, the lack of a significant correlation here may reflect the fact that, in general, college men are unlikely to seek verbal consent. Limited support for this possibility is provided by an examination of the means in the current study. For the behavioral intent item to seek consent, the scale ranged from 1 (definitely will seek consent) to 4 (not sure) to 7 (definitely will not seek consent). The mean for intent to seek consent across groups was 4.1, indicating that participants were ambivalent about seeking verbal consent. It seems likely that few participants would be willing to admit to never seeking verbal consent (i.e., scoring a 6 or 7) because of social desirability. The scale could have been designed to assess reluctance to seek verbal consent: 1 representing ambivalence and 7 representing no intent to seek consent. This scale would have minimized the possibility of a ceiling effect.
Hypothesis 3

It was predicted that men scoring higher on hypermasculinity would be less likely to engage in cognitive elaboration than men scoring low on this dimension. Consistent with this hypothesis, hypermasculinity scores were significantly and inversely correlated with ELMQ scores. As noted previously, the ELMQ is designed to assess the core components of central route processing: personal relevance, motivation, and the ability of the individual to understand and process the persuasive message. Thus, hypermasculine men in the current study endorsed fewer components of central route processing than men scoring lower on this dimension. Based on the premises of the ELM, any attitude change that occurred in the hypermasculine men should therefore be less enduring and less predictive of future behavior.

By contrast, hypermasculinity scores were unrelated to the number of relevant, irrelevant, positive, or negative thoughts listed by participants following the intervention. This finding suggested that there were no differences between low and high hypermasculine men in terms of cognitive elaboration. The disagreement between scores on the ELMQ and the thought listing form could be explained in two ways. First, it is possible that the ELMQ is not as effective a measure of cognitive elaboration as the thought listing exercise. Thought listing has been widely used to assess the level of cognitive activity following a persuasive message (e.g., Helweg-Larsen & Howell, 2000). The ELMQ, by contrast, does not have the same level of empirical support for its use.

A second possibility, however, is that the thought listing exercise in the current study was not as effective as it was intended to be. Participants in this study had significant time constraints and may have been unwilling or unmotivated to take the time to write out thoughts that occurred during the program. If so, this may have interfered with the thought
listing form's sensitivity. Although speculative, some evidence for this may come from a comparison of the mean for number of thoughts listed in the current study (M = 1.81) to the mean number of thoughts listed in similar research (M = 3.45) (Heppner et al., 1995). This tendency to write fewer thoughts could reflect either a lack of motivation to complete the thought listing form or a lack of cognitive elaboration during the program. Provided that participants are willing to devote the time and effort required for the thought listing form, this instrument may be preferable to the ELMQ.

These results bring us back to one of the fundamental questions of the study: why would hypermasculine men be less likely to think deeply about messages on acquaintance rape prevention? Hypermasculine men may realize that if they analyze rape supportive belief systems and find them illogical or untenable, they will experience cognitive dissonance if they engage in coercive behavior. As a result, hypermasculine men may lack two core aspects of central route processing, motivation and personal relevance. As discussed in the literature review, Mosher & Sirkin (1984) generated a number of descriptors for hypermasculine men, including “unreflective”, “noncurious”, and individuals who are unlikely to “value synthesizing ideas or logical thought” (p. 162). However, there is little empirical support for this broad conceptualization of hypermasculine men. The findings in the current study offer some preliminary empirical support for the notion that men who score high in hypermasculinity are less likely to engage in cognitive elaboration when compared to men who score low in hypermasculinity in the context of an acquaintance rape prevention program. It will be important for researchers to differentiate between a lower intrinsic tendency to engage in cognitive elaboration and a tendency that is specific to information in
an acquaintance rape prevention program. Measures assessing need for cognition, such as the Need for Cognition Scale, may be able to provide information on this question.

This finding has important implications for programming efforts. If hypermasculine men are less likely to engage in cognitive elaboration of rape prevention messages and, at the same time, comprise a high risk group in terms of engaging in sexually aggressive behavior, then an alternative to the current programming efforts that focus on attitude change must be established. It may be that attitude change is only being accomplished in subjects who are at a low risk for sexual assault (i.e., low hypermasculine men) because these subjects are more likely to engage in central route processing of rape prevention messages. An alternative would be to model acquaintance rape prevention programs after batterer education programs, which have demonstrated promise for changing batterers’ tendency to engage in aggressive behavior and verbal threats (Gondolf, 1997). These programs typically combine behavioral strategies, such as skill building and teaching anger management techniques, and cognitive strategies, such as challenging rationalizations and confronting participants with the consequences of their behavior. Researchers in this area have promoted an emphasis on interruption techniques, arguing that a substantial portion of the men may lack the cognitive faculties required to understand the persuasive message and allow for attitudinal change (Gondolf, 2000).

Although elements of these programs could be adapted for acquaintance rape prevention programming, it should be noted that batterer programs focus on remediation rather than prevention and are focused on an inherently different population. Although effective with the batterer population, confronting college men on the consequences of their behavior may only serve to increase defensiveness. In addition, the outcome measures used
in the batterer education programs, such as arrest records, spouse reports, and structured interviews with participants (e.g. Gondolf, 2000), are simply not practical for this population. Finally, it seems unlikely that hypermasculine college men will volunteer for time intensive programs, especially in the absence of a mandate from a court. This is, perhaps, exemplified by the current study in which 7 fraternities were unwilling to sponsor a 90 minute program on this topic. Thus, program developers will need to consider the applicability and relevance of the batterer education programs to the college setting.

**Program Type**

**Hypothesis 4**

Hypothesis 4 predicted that hypermasculine participants in the Believable Yes would demonstrate greater cognitive elaboration than hypermasculine participants in the traditional intervention, but that no such difference would be found for low hypermasculine participants. The results did not provide support for this hypothesis. Scores on the ELMQ were equivalent for hypermasculine participants in the Traditional intervention and the Believable Yes. In addition, there were no statistically significant differences between the programs in terms of number of relevant, irrelevant, positive or negative thoughts listed by participants. The results suggested that the programs were equivalent in terms of fostering cognitive elaboration, a surprising finding for four reasons. First, The Believable Yes was more interactive than the Traditional intervention. Individual involvement in rape prevention programs has been associated with reported attitude change (Lonsway, 1996). Therefore, it was expected that the interactive nature of the Believable Yes would produce more cognitive elaboration.
Second, the Believable Yes was expected to produce more cognitive elaboration than the traditional intervention because the Believable Yes was designed to make acquaintance rape particularly salient to participants, thereby increasing personal relevance. According to the ELM, personally relevant messages prompt cognitive elaboration and subsequent attitude change if the arguments presented are evaluated favorably. Personal relevance is emphasized in the Believable Yes by requiring the men to imagine themselves in a sexual context and practice gaining sexual consent. Given that many of the men were currently in romantic relationships or had dates the previous semester, they were at least occasionally in sexual situations. Thus, the information pertaining to such situations was expected to be personally relevant.

Third, the Believable Yes was designed based upon guidelines for psychoeducational programming that were established by Drum and Lawler (1988). These guidelines emphasized the importance of incorporating several different learning modalities to accommodate the fact that individuals synthesize and integrate information in different ways. The Believable Yes accomplished this by combining the didactic presentation of information with an interactive, behavioral component. By contrast, the Traditional Intervention was not designed with these guidelines and relied solely on the didactic presentation of information.

Finally, the Believable Yes was expected to facilitate cognitive elaboration by removing some barriers to motivation that are present in other intervention programs. For example, an explicitly or implicitly confrontational approach may make participants defensive (Ring & Kilmartin, 1992), preventing careful scrutiny of the messages presented. The Believable Yes was designed to reduce defensiveness by adopting a non-confrontational approach in which the facilitators state that they assume that none of the men wish to harm
women and use "we" throughout the program rather than "you". It was expected that reducing defensiveness would increase the participants' motivation to attend to and critically evaluate the information in the program, thereby leading to higher scores on the ELMQ and the Thought Listing Form.

What might have accounted for these results? Did the Traditional Intervention foster a higher level of cognitive elaboration than expected? Or, conversely, did the Believable Yes produce a lower level of cognitive elaboration than expected? A possible explanation may be derived from a comparison of this study to the study conducted by Heppner et al (1995). As discussed previously, the Traditional program of the current study was based upon the description of the didactic-video program in Heppner et al (1995). The mean scores on the ELMQ for participants in the Traditional Intervention (M = 46.34, SD = 5.34) were similar to the mean scores on the ELMQ for participants of Heppner's didactic-video condition (M = 49.84, SD = 8.73). This suggested that the Traditional Intervention performed as well as expected. However, the mean scores on the ELMQ for participants in Heppner's interactive drama condition (M = 55.92, SD = 6.28) were much higher than the mean scores of participants in the Believable Yes (M = 44.85, SD = 6.40). This suggested that the Believable Yes may not have performed as well as expected.

**Facilitator Differences.** Recall that there was a significant Program Type x Facilitator interaction on ELMQ scores: For Facilitator A, participants in the Traditional condition scored significantly higher than participants in the Believable Yes. There were no significant differences for Facilitator B. There are several possible explanations for this result. It is possible that certain facilitators will be more proficient at certain types of programs. If Facilitator A were more comfortable with lecturing, he would be more effective in a didactic
format (e.g., the Traditional Intervention) rather than an interactive format (e.g., the Believable Yes). Based upon the ELM characteristics of the source can affect an individual’s processing level. For example, the expertness of a facilitator might cause an individual to attend more closely to the core arguments of the persuasive message, thereby engaging in more central route processing. If this were the case in the current study, it would be important to study program effectiveness with an expert interactive facilitator and an expert didactic facilitator. However, the similarity of the facilitators argues against this explanation. Both men were advanced graduate students in Counseling Psychology, were approximately the same age, received the same training, and had similar experience in counseling and public speaking.

An alternate explanation for the interaction between program type and facilitator involved the disparity in group sizes. For the Believable Yes, the average group size for Facilitator A was 11.25 and the groups ranged from 6 to 19 participants. By contrast, the average group size for Facilitator B was 6.60 and the groups ranged from 5 to 8 participants. Given that the Believable Yes is an interactive program, it may be that the larger group size resulted in less interaction among the participants, allowing some of them to pay less attention and, therefore, engage in less cognitive elaboration.

Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis five predicted an interaction between program type and hypermasculinity: that hypermasculine participants in the Believable Yes would score lower on the RMAS posttest than hypermasculine participants in the traditional intervention. whereas no such difference would be detected for low hypermasculine men. The results did not support this
prediction. This is not surprising, given that the interaction between program type and hypermasculinity was also not significant for cognitive elaboration.

However, there was a significant main effect for program type: participants in the Traditional intervention scored lower on the RMAS than participants in the Believable Yes. Researchers have used similar changes on the RMAS as evidence that programs were effectively altering participant attitudes (e.g. Shultz, et al., 2000). However, given that participants in the Traditional intervention did not produce more cognitive elaboration than participants in the Believable Yes, it seems reasonable to challenge RMAS post-test scores as indicative of lasting attitude change. According to the ELM, central route processing and cognitive elaboration are prerequisites of lasting attitude change. The Traditional intervention did not produce more cognitive elaboration as assessed by ELMQ scores than the Believable Yes, so it seems reasonable to argue that the change observed may have reflected the participants’ ability to integrate the material and then discern the “correct” answer on a transparent measure. The Traditional intervention contained a section in which specific rape myths were presented and challenged while the Believable Yes contained no such section. It is possible that subjects in the Traditional intervention were therefore more attuned to rape myths and that this accounted for the subsequent change on the RMAS. Thus, the observed difference in post-test RMAS scores may reflect learning or social desirability rather than lasting attitude change.

Hypothesis 6

Hypothesis six predicted an interaction between hypermasculinity and program type: that high hypermasculine participants in the Believable Yes would be more likely to endorse behavioral intentions supportive of rape prevention programming than hypermasculine
participants in the Traditional intervention, whereas no such difference would be detected for low hypermasculine men. None of the interactions on the behavioral intention measures were significant.

In general, the Believable Yes was expected to be superior to the Traditional intervention on the behavioral intention measures. Because consent seeking is the central goal of the Believable Yes, one of the most striking results of the study was the lack of difference between the programs in terms of intention to seek unambiguous consent. Although speculative, there are two possible explanations that could account for the relative ineffectiveness of the Believable Yes in this area. The first explanation deals with the core assumption of the Believable Yes: that men do not want to hurt their sexual partners. Men who are goal oriented to gain access to a sexual partner are unlikely to be influenced by a program advocating a system of behavior designed to gain unambiguous sexual consent because such a system could be self-defeating. By seeking consent, such men might believe that they are making it easy for women to say no and increasing the likelihood of rejection (Osman & Davis, 1997). The Believable Yes would seem to be most effective with men who are at risk for inadvertently hurting a partner through miscommunication or missing important cues. It may not be as effective with men scoring high on hypermasculinity who are more likely to engage in sexually coercive behavior.

A second explanation is that it is unrealistic to recommend that college men seek verbal consent for sexual behaviors. As noted in previous sections, the mean for intent to seek sexual consent (M = 4.1) was indicative of ambivalence on the part of participants. This supports some research which has demonstrated that men tend to infer sexual consent based on non-verbal signals or compliance (Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999). Men may be reluctant
to seek verbal consent because this may be seen as excessive political correctness or unnecessarily intrusive to sexual encounters. This is illustrated in the current study by one of the participant’s statements on the thought listing form: “verbal consent isn’t practical.”

Hypothesis six also predicted that hypermasculine men in the Believable Yes would be less likely to engage in sexually coercive behavior than hypermasculine participants in the Traditional intervention. Results did not support this prediction, as the interaction between hypermasculinity and program type was not significant. However, the main effect for program type indicated that participants in the Traditional intervention reported less intention to engage in sexually coercive behavior than did participants in the Believable Yes. There are several aspects of the programs that may have contributed to this difference. The video in the Traditional intervention contained a series of vignettes narrated by women who had suffered an assault. The survivors’ testimonials may have fostered a deeper level of empathy in the participants when compared to the Believable Yes, in which the facilitator read a rape vignette. In addition, the Traditional intervention spent significantly more time discussing the physical and emotional consequences of rape to victims. It should be noted that a comparison of the mean for the traditional intervention and the Believable Yes suggested that there may be little clinical difference between the two groups. The effect size for this difference was very small, at 0.04. The mean for participants in the Believable Yes (M = 3.16) and the Traditional intervention (M = 2.53) were on the same side of the midpoint, indicating a low likelihood of coercing a woman.

Limitations

The current study improved on past studies in several ways, including the use of multiple outcome measures, the use of a high risk sample, and the examination of the impact
of hypermasculine personality style on response to programming. However, there are several limitations which must be noted that are related to the outcome measures, aspects of the sample, and design of the programs.

**Measures.** This study attempted to assess attitude change both directly, using the RMAS, and indirectly, using the ELMQ and thought listing to assess cognitive elaboration. Although there is empirical support for the use of such indirect measures in assessing cognitive elaboration (Heppner et al., 1995; Helweg-Larsen & Howell, 2000), it should be noted that assessment of thoughts and attitudes is an inherently difficult task, especially when assessing attitudes that are highly influenced by social desirability. It will be important for researchers to continue to develop the sophistication of measures used in this area of research. Despite its statistical reliability, the transparent nature of the RMAS leaves much to be desired and researchers should question whether a statistically significant change on this instrument actually reflects lasting attitude change.

In addition, the administration of the measures was problematic. If the hypermasculinity inventory had been administered to subjects at an earlier point in time, scores on this instrument may have more accurately reflected their adherence to hypermasculine beliefs. For example, it would have been optimal to administer the Hypermasculinity Inventory in a context that was presumably unrelated to the acquaintance rape prevention programs.

**The Sample.** Self-selection of participants occurred at two levels, the fraternity level and the individual level. All fraternities were approached but only 26% of the fraternities on campus participated. It was possible that fraternities who chose not to participate in the study were characterized by a membership that held more traditionally masculine values or
ascribed to more rape myths than members of participating fraternities. Given that some fraternities have been identified as more dangerous places than others for women (Boswell & Spade. 1996). it would have been important to know how the fraternities differed from each other.

Another limitation of the sample involved the self-selection of members within the individual fraternities. Involvement in the study was voluntary and participants were told that they could choose to discontinue at any time without sanction from fraternity officers or members. It should be noted that no members present at the meeting declined to fill out questionnaires or participate in the study, although five participants left early due to prior engagements. However, it could be argued that the individuals who chose not to attend the programs differed in significant ways from the members in attendance. For example, they may have sexually coerced a woman in the past or they may have held more hypermasculine beliefs.

A final limitation of the sample of this study involved the lack of diversity among participants. Given that 96% of the sample was Caucasian, the results should not be generalized to minority populations. This limitation was, in many ways, a result of the relative lack of diversity on the campus from which the sample was taken. Heppner et al. (1999) explored the issue of cultural diversity in programming and found that culturally relevant programming was more effective than traditional programming with minority populations. Clearly, future research needs to continue with culturally diverse populations.

Program Design. The design of the programs was another potential limitation. Sexual assault programming has been criticized for its lack of standardization in program design and, in the majority of studies, researchers do not publish the contents of the
presentations. The traditional acquaintance rape intervention in the current study was based upon the intervention used by Heppner et al. (1995), who provided one of the most detailed descriptions of the interventions. However, it is undoubtedly not the same program given that Heppner did not provide a manual. In order to truly move forward in this area, researchers will need to publish presenters' manuals so that the programs may be more closely replicated.

Suggestions for Further Research

Despite the difficulties inherent in conducting a study within the framework of a fraternity system, it is critically important that research be conducted within such environments. Fraternities have been identified as environments that reinforce traditional masculine attitudes and behavior, valuing competition, dominance, conflict and sexual prowess (Martin & Hummer, 1989). Some fraternities may be characterized by a system of values that normalizes the sexual coercion and objectification of women through alcohol use, pornography, and the conceptualization of women as spoils of war. If masculinity is defined as success in obtaining sex from women, then a competitive environment that values masculinity is likely to promote coercive tactics to increase the possibility of a score. On college campuses, coercive tactics include the use of substances such as the date rape drugs and hunch punch, a combination of everclear and Kool-aid that is designed to mask the amount of alcohol.

It would also be interesting to explore possible differences within the fraternity system. This could be accomplished by conducting rape prevention programs at fraternities on different university campuses. It may be that certain fraternities nationwide demonstrate a higher endorsement of rape myths or engage in a higher level of sexually coercive behavior.
Future research should also examine differences between introductory psychology courses and individuals within the fraternity system in terms of the level of hypermasculinity, response to prevention programming, and, if possible, the level of sexually coercive behavior. Programming based on research conducted in psychology classes such as that conducted by Gilbert et al. (1991) and Heppner et al. (1995) is limited by the baseline of masculine values and sexually coercive tendencies in that population. Successfully altering verbalized attitudes in a psychologically minded sample may be of limited utility in terms of reducing the incidence of sexual coercion.

A related focus for future research deals with sample size. Much research in this area has been characterized by the use of small samples: 60 participants (Shultz. et al. 2000), 87 participants (Davis & Liddell. 2002), and 75 participants (Gilbert. et al., 1991). Future research should be conducted with larger samples to ensure that there is sufficient power to substantiate claims of attitudinal change.

In addition, it may be worthwhile to explore the issue of group size with such programs. Intuitively, it makes sense that individual participation and investment may be less likely in a larger group. As discussed earlier, this could result in reduced cognitive elaboration. Such research could have important implications for program development. If a group of 10 men demonstrate greater cognitive elaboration than a group of 40 men. this could encourage program development in which men meet in small groups to discuss and process rape myths, gender socialization, and related information.

The anonymous nature of this study appeared to be helpful in recruiting fraternities for participation. It is this author's opinion that fewer fraternities would have chosen to participate in the study if identifying information had been associated with the responses on
the questionnaires. It also seems likely that the responses would have been more vulnerable to social desirability. However, it is clear that gathering data over time is essential in order to determine whether these programs can have lasting effects. This is a dilemma that may require a creative solution: for example, issuing guarantees of confidentiality that approximate anonymity.

In addition, future research should explore other personality dimensions hypothesized to have an impact on a program's effectiveness in enhancing cognitive elaboration or changing attitudes. Such dimensions could include conversational domineeringness (Malamuth & Thornhill, 1994) and need for cognition (Cacioppo & Petty, 1982). An understanding of how personality variables interact with program effectiveness could lead researchers to focus efforts on developing programs that will be effective with different populations.

Another area of future research could focus on identifying the components of rape prevention programs that are the most effective. One possibility for this research may be to break the programs down into brief modules and then compare their effectiveness. A possible list of modules would be challenging rape myths, inducing empathy, a video presentation, a dramatic presentation, and an interactive component designed to encourage men to seek consent. A program designed with the most powerful components will be more influential than programs designed on researchers' intuition.

Finally, the role of men in prevention programming is a critical issue. Several recent studies have found that emphasizing the role of men as campus leaders (e.g. Heppner et al., 1999) is successful in reducing defensiveness, thereby increasing the possibility that the programs will successfully impact attitudes. In the current study, thoughts listed by
participants suggested that placing them in the role of brother to a victim was powerful in terms of both reducing their defensiveness and increasing the relevance of the issue. One participant wrote, “the thought of my sister being raped was horrifying.” It would seem important to foster this sense of protectiveness without reinforcing gender stereotypes which conceptualize women as weak. The Believable Yes did not emphasize the role of men as protector, consistently placing them in the role of sexual partner and this may have increased the participants’ defensiveness. However, it is important to explore the issue of acquaintance rape from the perspective of men as sexual partners because this is the context in which sexual coercion occurs.

Summary

Although the current study did not demonstrate a significant difference in the efficacy of the two programs, it did provide interesting information on current rape prevention programming. A majority of research in this area remains limited by the use of small samples of volunteers and the use of transparent outcome measures to assess attitude change. Given the extensive efforts on college campuses to reduce the incidence of sexual violence, it remains important to identify those efforts that are having an impact. Although it may be necessary to move towards a focus on behavioral outcomes of programming for methodological reasons, researchers should be cautious in asserting that attitudinal change has already been demonstrated.
Facilitator's Manual

Supplies:
Flipchart or overheads
Music CD's - CD player usually provided by requester
Candy and Condoms (Candy sometimes provided by requester)
Baseball diamond, overview, myths and evaluation handouts
Optional: consequences to victims handouts

Play music before the program as people are entering the room

1. Presenter introductions:

Assumption 1: We assume that most men do not want to harm their romantic partners. We also believe that harm can occur unintentionally because of confusion about romantic and sexual rules. There are a lot of messages out there about how to approach physical intimacy. One such view is that you should approach your potential partners as adversaries, whose resistance you need to overcome. There is also a preference to use nonverbal means of communicating. We are here to recommend a clearer gameplan for having satisfying, respectful and safe physical encounters in which you and your partner are on the same team. This new gameplan puts emphasis on using verbal means for ensuring consent or in other words, "talking before touching."

Assumption 2: Nonheterosexual language
Since 10% of the population has same sex attraction, we will use language that acknowledges men and women as potential partners.

Assumption 3: Religious background
This program is appropriate for men from differing religious backgrounds because we respect that some of you will not engage in intercourse or other actions until after marriage, but you will still need to obtain consent for other forms of intimacy. In addition, the consent model we will teach should be followed in marriage as well.

Assumption 4: Sexual Experience
We also want to acknowledge that men may have different levels of sexual experience and we do not want to communicate that we think that you should or should not be engaging in any particular activity by any particular age. In addition we affirm the right of men to refuse sexual activity at any time and to be treated in the same ways we are suggesting you treat your partners.

II. Overview -

1) What is consent?
2) When do I need to ask for consent?
3) How do I ask for consent?
4) How do I know I have consent?
5) Costs if consent not obtained
6) Optional if an intact community - how will you as a group support each other?

III. Ground Rules: confidentiality, respect, and honesty

Confidentiality - in order for people to feel free to be honest, it is important for you all to believe that you will not be talking about what people have said, with their names attached to it, after the session. You can still talk about your own reactions and what things were said in general.

Respect: Have a mind for listening to understand each other's perspectives.

Honesty: Please share your honest reactions, because if they remain unspoken, they cannot be addressed and less learning will occur for everyone, including the facilitators.

IV. What is consent?

Group discussion: What is sex? Participants will usually say intercourse. We then encourage them to broaden their definition.

Lecture:

- Sex: any erotic contact performed by either person
- Sexual assault: initiating sex without consent

Consent is the verbal or physical indication of agreement to a particular sexual act. Obtaining consent is an ongoing process in any sexual interaction. Verbal consent should be obtained for each new level of contact and the request must be specific to each act.

One reason that it is important to obtain consent at each level is that it is likely that our potential partners have experienced some form of sexual assault in their past. The Dept of
Justice has found that 1 in 3 women and 1 in 10 men are raped in their lifetime. We also know that 1 out of 2 rape victims were under the age of 18 at the time of the assault. We do not know what will trigger a reaction in people. We don't know that so and so's uncle grabbed her shoulder right before committing a violent act. We don't know that someone's neighbor forced kissing on someone. In order to not participate in revictimizing someone, it is wise to move slowly in sexual interactions.

**Conditions under which consent was not obtained:**

Ask audience: In a group of college men, what percent do you think said they forced sex?

Answers:

- **Coercion** In a survey of 201 college men*, of those who forced sex, which was 43% (!!).

- 13% said they used physical force. (*Rapaport and Burkhart 1984. Journal of Abnormal Personality. 93. 216-221)

One thing you need to know is that women perceive men's physical strength and size as inherently threatening, so that if there is a verbal threat or low degree physical force, the woman may perceive that physical harm is likely to happen.

**verbal** coercion is actually more common - 70% of the college men who forced sex, used persuading the woman through verbal means at least once, and 35% ignored protests, which might leave men believing that they didn't rape, because they feel they did not have to use physical force.

Verbal coercion would include, persistent pleading, threatening to break up, ridicule her as uptight, accusing her of being a tease, threatening to say you had sex with him or her to others, threatening that you will tell others she is lesbian, insulting her physical appearance etc. Just an additional note - talking about a woman's sexual experiences can be very dangerous to her, because another study found that some men believe that if a woman has had sex with one man, that makes her "fair play" for them.

- partner unable to give consent due to:
  - drugs or alcohol
  - unconscious or asleep (*Shares pregnancy as outcome story)* see below
  - mental status
  - age - seriousness of charge depends on age and age difference, general rule 16 years

** We have formal permission to use this story - Suzanne has a signed consent form:
"One student that was seen at Student Counseling had the experience of visiting a friend, they drank some alcohol and then she fell asleep in his bed. In the morning, she noticed that her underpants were off and asked if anything had happened and he denied it. She later became pregnant and wasn't sure if it was him or her current boyfriend. She went through the whole pregnancy, labor and adoption process and through blood testing found out that the baby was indeed the result of being sexually assaulted while she was asleep or unconscious."

Sexual assault has broad and long lasting negative effects. One study done by Duke University of 3000 North Carolina residents found that women with a history of sexual assault are six times more likely to attempt suicide at somepoint in their lifetime.

(You may choose to distribute the "Impacts of Rape on Victims" handout)

V. When do I need to ask for Consent?

**Purpose:** To increase participant's awareness of their own boundaries as well as others

**Large group discussion:**
Ask men what the traditional interpretation of sex bases are: usually, first base is kissing, second base is fondling, third base is heavy petting, perhaps to orgasm, and homerun is vaginal, anal or oral intercourse.

**Response:** What is interesting about the bases is that we as a culture acknowledge that there is something qualitatively different between certain physical acts, and that some are more intimate or advanced than others. In the past, the image of the bases was a way to measure a goal of achievement, something to push for. We are here today to recommend that you view the bases as places to stop and ask for permission before "stepping" on that base. In order to prepare you for that, we have a few activities with the baseball diamond.

**Exercise:** Bases. Give students handout of baseball diamond.

1) Ask them to individually think about and write on sheet what their personal bases are - when would they want someone to ask for their consent before moving to next level of interaction? If they say they have no level, ask them to think about someone they don't like or find unattractive wanting to have sexual contact with them.

2) Ask them to write in when they think women or a male partner would want to be asked for consent.

**PLAY MUSIC** ("Mouth" by Merle Bainbridge)

**Large Group Discussion:**
3) Ask if there were differences between their own and the second set of bases—and then why
the differences—do this for women as well as male partners. E.g., fear of reputation,
pregnancy, disease, Glbt coming out issues, emotional connection, prior sexual abuse)

4) If they say that they think their partner's would be the same as theirs. You may need to ask
some participants to share what they actually wrote down for bases. Point out that they would be wrong in assuming their bases are the same as their partner by noting that there were
differences within the workshop participants.
Summarize by saying we cannot assume another's bases are the same as ours so it is safer to
ask. It is important not to "steal" bases.

VI. How do I ask for consent?

Discussion: Why is it hard to verbally ask someone for consent?
E.G. shame, fear of rejection, won't be romantic etc. - try to respond to these objections

MOTTO 1: "Can't ask it? Shouldn't do it"

Elaboration: If you are not comfortable enough to speak up about your intentions, then
maybe you really aren't yet comfortable with your partner to act on your intentions.

OUR MAIN MOTTO

CONSENSUAL SEX IS SENSUAL SEX!

MODEL: Intent Communication Consent

Intent - desire to have sexual contact on part of initiator

Both parties need to go through all three steps. Example:
Joe and Jenny have been heavy petting. Joe tells Jenny if he wants to be “inside” her. Jenny
pauses and thinks about whether she wants to have intercourse. She asks Joe if he has a
condom. He says yes. she decides that she wants to have intercourse and says “OK, get it.”

Substance Use as Risk Factor: As you can imagine, alcohol or other drugs is going to
interfere with your being able to communicate well and pay attention to the communications
of who you are with. We therefore recommend that you avoid sexual contact if you or the
other person are intoxicated or significantly influenced by drugs.

Exercise: What's my line? : Developing phrases or "lines"

Purpose: Skill building - trying out verbal methods for consent
Have men get into groups of 3 or 4. Tell them to generate lines that would request consent at the different bases they identified, including kissing. Tell them they will get a piece of candy or condom for each acceptable line. Remind them that they do not have to be witty; that in fact it is better to not try to be witty or use slang, and that it is important that they come up with things they would actually be willing to say to a fairly new sexual partner.

PLAY MUSIC ("Let's Talk About Sex" by Salt N Pepa)

Have each group report on lines generated. You can go around or have the group report all theirs at once. Reward participants with candy or condoms for coming up with a clear request for consent. Help them create clear requests. For example, one student said "Can I let my fingers do the walking?" He was asked to clarify where would his fingers be walking - what is he asking consent for specifically? Another student used a slang word that no one else knew, so we were unable to determine what he was asking for. Give the candy when they come up with a corrected revision!

VII. How do I know I have consent?

Discussion on verbal and nonverbal indications of consent. Which nonverbals indicate lack of consent even if verbally received consent? What do you do if the verbals say no and the nonverbals say yes?

MOTTO 2: Hint of "no"?, then it's "no".

We may bring up the issue of that it is not the man's responsibility to ensure that a partner has a sexual experience - if a woman or man really wants sex and can't be direct about it, it is their loss that their needs were not met and that person can go home frustrated and learn to be more direct in the future. It is much better to leave a partner frustrated than feeling raped.

VIII. Costs of not obtaining consent/ Benefits of obtaining consent - a review

Costs: legal. hurt reputation (of group or individual), hurts victim

If a group setting, like a fraternity, ask them "How will you support each other in trying out what we have taught you today?"

Benefits: more intimate, more exciting, improved relationships, integrity

IX. Concluding Remarks

Remember:
CONSENSUAL SEX IS SENSUAL SEX!
INTRODUCTIONS/OVERVIEW

Overview
We will present several different definitions of sexual assault, prevalence statistics, consequences to the victim, theories of sexual assault, and myths. We will present a brief video that focuses specifically on sexual assault in the college setting. Finally, we will leave some time for discussion.

DEFINITIONS

What is sexual assault?

Have the participants volunteer some definitions for sexual assault.

Conservative definitions of sexual assault define it as non-consensual vaginal, anal, or oral penetration or intercourse. Less conservative definitions include contact such as fondling and kissing.

Acquaintance rape is defined as being forced into sexual activity by someone you know, whether a romantic partner, neighbor, co-worker or friend. Force refers to a range of behaviors including but not limited to verbal threats, intimidation, use of physical force (battering or restraining arms/legs), and use of a weapon.

Sexual assault is defined in Section 709 of the Iowa Code. Any sex act between persons is sexual abuse by either of the persons when the act is performed with the other person in any of the following circumstances:

1. The act is done by force or against the will of the other. If the consent or acquiescence of the other is procured by threats of violence toward any person or if the act is done while the other is under the influence of a drug inducing sleep or is otherwise in a state of unconsciousness, the act is done against the will of the other.

2. Such other person is suffering from a mental defect or incapacity which precludes giving consent, or lacks the mental capacity to know the right and wrong of conduct in sexual matters.

3. Such other person is a child.

709.1a "Mentally incapacitated" means that a person is temporarily incapable of apprising or controlling the person's own conduct due to the influence of a narcotic, anesthetic, or intoxicating substance.
PREVALENCE

Why does sexual assault deserve our attention?

- The majority of rape victims fall between the ages of 16 and 25
- Depending upon the definition used, from 10% to 25% of women experience some form of sexual coercion in their lifetimes, from fondling to penetration. That means that some of you probably know a woman that has experienced a form of coercion, whether a friend, a romantic partner, or a sister.
- An early study was conducted by Koss (1987) who administered the Sexual Experiences Survey to 6,159 female and male college students.
  - women: 46% indicated no sexual victimization
  - 54% some form of sexual victimization (ranging from coerced kissing to rape)
  - 14% unwanted sexual contact consisting of verbally pressured or coerced kissing or fondling
  - 12% experienced sexual coercion where the man used force or threat of force to engage in fondling/kissing, but not intercourse
  - 12% experienced attempted rape
  - 15% experienced rape
  - men: 75% engaged in no form of sexual aggression
  - 25% engaged in some form of sexual aggression
  - 10% perpetrated unwanted sexual contact
  - 3% attempted a rape
  - 4% perpetrated a rape
- More than a decade later, another study found similar results – a prevalence rate of 15% for completed rapes since the victim was 15 (Brener, McMahon, Warren, & Douglas, 1999)
- The National Violence Against Women Survey noted a prevalence rate of 15% for completed rape (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998)
- In industrialized nations, the lifetime prevalence rate for sexual assault of college-aged women ranges between 21% and 27% (Koss, 2001).
- Non-industrialized nations do not have systematic data but it is estimated that from 43% to 90% of such societies deal routinely with rape.
- These victim statistics were found to be 10 to 15 times greater than statistics available at the FBI. Koss concluded that this reflected significant under-reporting of this crime.
- This brings up the relevance of the issue of false reporting. Research indicates that women are no more likely to lie about rape than any other felony. However, it does happen and when it does, the issue is taken seriously. When a woman falsely reports an assault she can face multiple levels of sanction, including suspension or expulsion by the university and criminal charges.
However, false reporting, especially sensational false reporting, has a detrimental effect for those women who do experience assaults. As a result, they may be less likely to report the crime or prosecute the offender.

THE IMPACT OF RAPE

Given the prevalence of this problem, it is also important to consider the consequences. What impact do you think that sexual assault has on women, men, and society?

The most obvious consequences are physical, occurring immediately after the rape
- ripped tissue, bruises, broken bones, cuts

However, there are also physical consequences that persist long after the rape
- physiological symptoms of anxiety, general fatigue, and insomnia
- use of alcohol or an eating disorder to exert control/cope with feelings
- disease, such as syphilis or AIDS (this is an issue for both the perpetrator and the victim)
- pregnancy or methods to prevent or terminate the pregnancy

In addition to physical effects, there are also emotional consequences for the victim that may be less apparent but which may last for years after the rape.
- Fear of rapist, of diseases, of potential danger
- Anger at the rapist and internalized anger at self for being unable to maintain safety
- Depression, feelings of worthlessness and suicidality (attempts and completions)
- Learned helplessness (sense that the victim has no control and is unable to keep self safe)
- Nightmares or flashbacks
- Loss of interest in sex/fear of sex or hypersexuality
- Self-blame or shame (perpetrators and police often place responsibility on the woman to keep herself safe)
- Worldview or spirituality disrupted (sense of the world as an unsafe place, why did God let this happen)

The physical and emotional consequences often have a direct impact on the victim's life.

Academic problems
- Decreased concentration, skipped classes, low grades, avoidance of library or places necessary to accomplish goals

Social problems
- Isolation from friends and family, keeping secrets (resulting in greater isolation), may avoid places where she normally received social support, romantic relationship strain or break-up
- If a woman decides to share, she may experience blame from others
• If a woman confides that she has been sexually assaulted, the support that she receives may have a profound impact in lessening the emotional distress that she experiences. One of the most important messages to reinforce is that the assault was not her fault.

GENDER ROLE SOCIALIZATION

So what factors contribute to sexual assault?
A sociocultural explanation of sexual assault suggests that this behavior is a “by-product” of normal male and female socialization. That is, the way in which society teaches us to be men and women fosters sexual assault. This includes the media (movies, novels, TV), family history, etc.

“What does it mean to be a man?”

• Men socialized to be aggressive, goal oriented for power and status, tough, unemotional

• Men as pursuers and women as gatekeepers of sexual activity
  • “Men feel pressure from other men to be sexual as a means of confirming their masculinity” (Berkowitz, 1992)
  • Because this serves as a measure of masculinity, there is often enormous pressure placed on men to be sexual. The cost to men is emotional intimacy.

• The perception of sex as a commodity
  • women may be taught that sex can be used as a bargaining tool to obtain desired goals (i.e. no sex if you don’t clean the garage)
  • this sets up an adversarial sexual relationship (i.e. if men are unable or unwilling to find ways to obtain this commodity, they may take it by force)

• Research indicates that men have a more sexualized view of the world and are therefore more likely to interpret ambiguous cues as indicative of sexual interest.
  • Although both men and women make distinctions between “friendly” and “interested” men have a lower threshold for perceiving sexual interest (Shotland & Craig, 1988).
  • For example, men may perceive a woman smiling at him as an indication of romantic or sexual interest, while a woman may perceive this as merely friendly

• Media encourages sexual objectification of women. This fosters an environment in which women are devalued, depersonalized and treated callously.

• Pornography provides a script for sexual interactions that is mythological and false, often portraying women as being aroused by violence or rough treatment. In such situations, men may confuse fear with sexual arousal.
  • Nine out of ten adults have viewed pornography in some form (FBI statistics)
• Frequent pornography use has been associated with sexually aggressive behaviors, especially violent pornography (Malamuth, 2000)
• Soft-core porn has been associated with the use of sexual force as well as non-violent sexual coercion (Boeringer, 1994)

RAPE MYTHS

Rape myths are defined as attitudes or beliefs that are generally false but widely and persistently held and serve to deny and justify male sexual aggression (Lonsway, 1996).

Myth: If a woman teases or flirts with a man, or if she agrees to go to his house or ride in his car, she deserves to be raped.
Reality: Male or female, no one deserves to be raped. There is no justification for rape.

Myth: When a woman says "no" to sex, she really means "yes". It is up to the man to seduce her and convince her that she wants to have sex.
Reality: This myth refers to the idea of the "token no". When a woman says "no", verbally or nonverbally, she is not fully consenting to sexual activity. It is her responsibility to be direct if she really desires sexual contact, not the man's to try and read her mind or force things.

Myth: If someone engages in necking or petting, it means s/he has agreed to have sexual intercourse, and it is her/his fault if the other person forces intercourse on her.
Reality: Everyone has a right to stop sexual interaction at any point and have that decision respected, regardless of any foreplay or body signals which have occurred.

Myth: If a woman is drunk, she really wants sex and it is her fault if she is raped.
Reality: One cannot assume a person's alcohol consumption indicates that they want to have sex. Alcohol use does, however, put individuals at risk for not having the awareness and coordination to protect themselves, but rape is never the victim's fault. The Iowa State Code 709.1 states that if sex occurs while a person is "under the influence of drug inducing sleep or is otherwise in a state of unconsciousness, the act is done against the will of the other."

Myth: Being roughed up is sexually stimulating to many women. Sometimes the only way a man can get a cold woman turned on is to use force.
Reality: No one wants to be physically or sexually assaulted. Some men believe that women secretly want to be overpowered. In truth, virtually all rape victims report feelings of terror, humiliation, and degradation.

Myth: Men who commit rape are psychologically disturbed deviants.
Reality: Research indicates that men without evidence of psychological disturbance are just as likely to commit sexual assault. In addition, "men who committed a sexual assault did not define their behavior as rape, placed equal responsibility on their partners for what happened, and said they were willing to engage in similar behavior again" (Koss, 1988).
Myth: A woman who did not fight back wasn't raped.
Reality: Forced sexual activity is rape. The Iowa State Code C79. 81. 709.5, indicates that "it shall not be necessary to establish physical resistance by a participant in order to establish that an act of sexual abuse was committed by force or against the will of the participant". In addition, despite suggestions for ways to decrease women's vulnerability to rape, a woman who has been raped did the best she could, and is in no way responsible for the actions of the rapist.

Myth: Women who fight back increase their chance of serious injury.
Reality: Women who fight back decrease their chance of rape and serious injury, while women who plead with their attackers increase their chances. Women who use one self-defense strategy have a 63% chance of escaping a rapist. Those who use two strategies have a 78% chance of escaping.

Myth: Women often lie about being raped, especially if they have regrets about sex with a boyfriend, date, or if they want revenge.
Reality: Only about two percent of all rape and related sex charges are determined to be false, the same percentage as for other felonies. Although many cases are dropped because of insufficient evidence for conviction, this should not be confused with false reporting. In addition, a woman admitting that she was raped suffers many costs, including her reputation ("damaged goods"), ridicule, disbelief from others, and retraumatization. As we indicated earlier, actual rapes often go unreported.

VIDEO (Campus Rape. Rape Treatment Center. 1990)

This video was made several years ago, but many aspects remain relevant today. Some of the information in the video may not seem useful to you. However, attend to similarities between the video and what we’ve already discussed.

- women's account of assaults
- distrust of men
- difference between stranger and acquaintance rape (in terms of cost to the women)
- use of alcohol

GENERAL DISCUSSION
APPENDIX C. DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Demographic Questionnaire
Case # ________________

Please provide the following information:

1. Age __________
2. Year in school __________
3. Ethnicity __________
4. College major __________
5. Are you currently in a romantic relationship? Yes No
6. If so, how many months have you been dating? __________
7. Please estimate the number of dates that you had in the last semester.
   
   0   1   2   3   4   5   6 +
APPENDIX D. HYPERMASCULINITY INVENTORY

HI
Case # __________

Please choose one option for each numbered item below.

1. A. After I’ve gone through a really dangerous experience my knees feel weak and I shake all over.
   B. After I’ve been through a really dangerous experience I feel high.

2. A. I’d rather gamble than play it safe.
   B. I’d rather play it safe than gamble.

3. A. Call me a name and I’ll pretend not to hear you.
   B. Call me a name and I’ll call you another.

4. A. Fair is fair in love and war.
   B. All is fair in love and war.

5. A. I like wild, uninhibited parties.
   B. I like quiet parties with good conversations.

6. A. I hope to forget past unpleasant experiences with male aggression.
   B. I still enjoy remembering my first real fight.

7. A. Some people have told me I take foolish risks.
   B. Some people have told me I ought to take more chances.

8. A. So-called effeminate men are more artistic and sensitive.
   B. Effeminate men deserve to be ridiculed.

9. A. Get a woman drunk, high, or hot and she’ll let you do whatever you want.
   B. It’s gross and unfair to use alcohol and drugs to convince a woman to have sex.

10. A. I like fast cars and fast women.
    B. I like dependable cars and faithful women.

11. A. So-called prick teasers should be forgiven.
     B. Prick teasers should be raped.

12. A. When I have a few drinks under my belt. I mellow out.
     B. When I have a few drinks under my belt. I look for trouble.

13. A. Any man who is a man needs to have sex regularly.
     B. Any man who is a man can do without sex.

14. A. All women, even women’s libbers, are worthy of respect.
     B. The only woman worthy of respect is your own mother.

15. A. You have to fuck some women before they know who’s boss.
     B. You have to love some women before they know you don’t want to be boss.
16. A. When I have a drink or two I feel ready for whatever happens.
    B. When I have a drink or two I like to relax and enjoy myself.

17. A. Risk has to be weighed against possible maximum loss.
    B. There is no such thing as too big a risk, if the payoff is large enough.

18. A. I win by not fighting.
    B. I fight to win.

19. A. It's natural for men to get into fights.
    B. Physical violence never solves an issue.

20. A. If you're not prepared to fight for what's yours, then be prepared to lose it.
    B. Even if I feel like fighting, I try to think of alternatives.

21. A. He who can, fights; he who can't, runs away.
    B. It's just plain dumb to fight.

22. A. When I'm bored I watch TV or read a book.
    B. When I'm bored I look for excitement.

23. A. I like to drive safely avoiding all possible risks.
    B. I like to drive fast, right on the edge of danger.

24. A. Pick-ups should expect to put out.
    B. So-called pick-ups should choose their men carefully.

25. A. Some women are good for only one thing.
    B. All women deserve the same respect as your own mother.

26. A. I only want to have sex with women who are in total agreement.
    B. I never feel bad about my tactics when I have sex.

27. A. I would rather be a famous scientist than a famous prizefighter.
    B. I would rather be a famous prizefighter than a famous scientist.

28. A. Lesbians have chosen a particular life style and should be respected for it.
    B. The only thing a lesbian needs is a good, stiff cock.

29. A. If you are chosen for a fight, there's no choice but to fight.
    B. If you are chosen for a fight, it's time to talk your way out of it.

30. A. If you insult me, be prepared to back it up.
    B. If you insult me, I'll try to turn the other cheek.
APPENDIX E. RAPE MYTH ACCEPTANCE SCALE

IDEAS ABOUT SEXUAL ASSAULT

CASE # ____________________________

FOR THE STATEMENTS WHICH FOLLOW, PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER THAT BEST INDICATES YOUR OPINION. IF YOU STRONGLY DISAGREE, YOU WOULD ANSWER "1"; IF YOU STRONGLY AGREE, YOU WOULD ANSWER "7"; IF YOU FEEL NEUTRAL YOU WOULD ANSWER "4"; AND SO ON.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. A woman who goes to the home or apartment of a man on their first date implies that she is willing to have sex with him.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
| 2. Any female can get raped. |
1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
| 3. One reason that women falsely report a rape is that they frequently have a need to call attention to themselves. |
1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
| 4. Any healthy woman can successfully resist a rape if she really wants to. |
1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
| 5. When women go around braless or wearing short skirts or tight tops, they are just asking for trouble. |
1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
| 6. Women who get raped while hitchhiking get what they deserve. |
1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
| 7. A woman who is stuck-up and thinks she is too good to talk to guys on the street deserves to be taught a lesson. |
1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
| 8. Many women have an unconscious wish to be raped, and may then unconsciously set up a situation in which they are likely to be attacked. |
1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
| 9. If a woman gets drunk at a party and has intercourse with a man she’s just met there, she should be considered “fair game” to other males at the party who want to have sex with her too, whether she wants to or not. |
1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
| 10. In the majority of rapes, the victim is promiscuous or has a bad reputation. |
1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
| 11. If a girl engages in necking and petting and she lets things get out of hand, it is her own fault if her partner forces sex on her. |
1 2 3 4 5 6 7  

---
12. What percentage of women who report a rape would you say are lying because they are angry and want to get back at the man they accuse?

13. What percentage of reported rapes would you guess were merely invented by women who discovered they were pregnant and wanted to protect their own reputation?

14. A person comes to you and claims that he/she was raped. How likely would you be to believe the statement if the person were:

a) your best friend?

b) an Indian woman?

c) a neighborhood woman?

d) a young boy?

e) a black woman?

f) a white woman?
APPENDIX F. ELABORATION LIKELIHOOD MODEL QUESTIONNAIRE

The ELMQ
Case # ________________________________

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not important</th>
<th>very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>at all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not motivated</th>
<th>very motivated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>at all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>at all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How difficult to understand was the information presented?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>too simple</th>
<th>too difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>at all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>at all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. There was enough time in the presentation to think about the topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>at all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. The presenter made good points about the topic.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 strongly disagree 5

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

did not try at all 1 2 3 4 tried to an extent 5

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

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

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

not at all difficult 1 2 3 4 very difficult 5

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

not at all logical and accurate 1 2 3 4 very logical and accurate 5

12. How would you rate the quality of the presenters' information?

very poor 1 2 3 4 excellent 5
APPENDIX G. THOUGHT LISTING EXERCISE

Thought Listing
Case # ____________

Please write down all thoughts that crossed your mind during the program. Use the reverse side of this page if necessary.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.
APPENDIX H. BEHAVIORAL INTENTIONS INVENTORY

Please provide the following information:

Do you think that you will seek unambiguous sexual consent with future partners?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I definitely will not</th>
<th>I am not sure</th>
<th>I definitely will</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think that you will confront a friend or family member that makes sexist or rape-supportive comments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I definitely will not</th>
<th>I am not sure</th>
<th>I definitely will</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How likely is it that you will engage in sexually coercive behavior in the future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>I am not sure</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you be willing to serve as a facilitator of this program in the future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I definitely would not</th>
<th>I am not sure</th>
<th>I definitely would</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many hours would you be willing to volunteer in support of anti-rape causes over the next semester?

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6+ |

Will you support an increase in tuition fees by $5 to support further acquaintance rape prevention programming on campus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I definitely will not</th>
<th>I am not sure</th>
<th>I definitely will</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I. RECRUITING LETTER

Fraternity men have been challenged to ensure that their sexual interactions are respectful. Fraternities who are proactive in programming around issues of sexual responsibility increase the likelihood that they will maintain a positive reputation on campus and experience the least amount of disruption from allegations of sexual misconduct. I am writing to offer your fraternity an opportunity to participate in one of two workshops on sexually responsible behavior. These workshops have been endorsed by the Diversity Outreach Team of the Student Counseling Services at ISU. These workshops on sexual responsibility are offered as part of my dissertation research as a doctoral candidate in counseling psychology here at Iowa State.

Two workshops are offered because I am interested in identifying which program is most likely to foster a deep level of thought and discussion among program participants. The first program is comprised of three parts. First, general information about acquaintance rape is presented (e.g., statistics, misconceptions about rape). Second, a nationally available video is presented. Finally, there is time for discussion. The second program is called “The Believable Yes”. It is an interactive program that highlights the importance of communication in sexual interactions. Fraternity members will be randomly assigned to participate in one of the two programs.

Workshops will be conducted in fraternity houses. The time commitment for either program is approximately 90 minutes. The programs themselves are expected to take 70 minutes. Participants will complete brief questionnaires that are expected to take no more than 20 minutes to complete. These programs will be facilitated by people who have been specifically trained to present sexual responsibility workshops. They will bring a sense of humor and compassion as well as an understanding of the complexity of the issues being discussed. To ensure anonymity, no personally identifying information will be associated with participants’ responses.

In the past, fraternities have used similar programs to document efforts at effective risk management. Participation in these programs will alert the members of your fraternity to issues of sexual responsibility, an important component of college life. In return for participation, I will write a letter to the national chapter of each fraternity that describes the nature of the programs and verifies that a certain number of members of the chapter participated. Members of your fraternity should have the freedom to individually decide whether or not they would like to volunteer to participate. No coercion or pressure should be exerted on members to induce participation. If a member decides not to participate, he should be free to do so without criticism, pressure or sanctions from officers or other members.

If you have questions about my research or the details of either program, I encourage you to contact me by phone (294-0161) or email (owen@iastate.edu). Thanks for your time.

Sincerely,

Luke Douglass, M.S.
APPENDIX J. CONSENT FORM

Acquaintance Rape Prevention

I. ________________________, agree to participate in the research study being conducted by Luke Douglass, M.S., under the direction of Douglas Epperson, Ph.D.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of the research is to examine acquaintance rape prevention programs.

PROCEDURES AND DURATION:
In this program you will complete several brief questionnaires and discuss issues related to sexual assault. Your participation is expected to last 90 minutes. After completion of the program, the principal investigator (Louis Douglass, M.S.) will write a letter of compliance to your national chapter headquarters and the Office of Greek Affairs at Iowa State University.

RISKS OR DISCOMFORTS:
It is possible that you may experience some discomfort discussing issues related to sexual assault. However, the programs will be conducted by people who are trained to lead discussions on sensitive issues. Therefore, the potential for discomfort experienced will be minimized. If you are uncomfortable, you may discontinue participation at any time without penalty to yourself or your fraternity or pressure from officers or other members. In addition, you may choose to participate in the educational program but decline to fill out the research questionnaires.

CONFIDENTIALITY:
Your questionnaire responses will be completely confidential. There will be no identifiers associated with any of your data.

Participation is completely voluntary. I understand that refusal to participate will involve no penalty to myself or my fraternity. I have read the above consent form and have had the information explained to me by the principal investigator and agree to participate in the prevention program research.

____________________________________  ________________________
Signature of research participant         Date
APPENDIX K. DEBRIEFING FORM

I want to thank you for participating in my research on Acquaintance Rape Prevention. I would like to use this opportunity to discuss with you the specific purpose of the research. The primary purpose of the study was to determine the effectiveness of rape prevention programs in terms of fostering a deeper level of thought and discussion among program participants. The study was also designed to explore how different personality types perceive the programs (i.e. do traditional men perceive the programs the same way that non-traditional men do).

At the beginning of the study, you were told that you would be participating in one of two programs. If you attended a program that included an interactive discussion of sexual consent issues, you were a participant in the experimental condition. If you attended a program that included a significant amount of information on date rape and a video, you were a participant in the traditional acquaintance rape program.

If you have any questions about the study, please feel free to contact me at your convenience. I can be reached at (515) 294-0161. You may also email me (owen@iastate.edu). If participation in this study raised concerns or anxieties about the topics being discussed and you wish to seek counseling, please contact Student Counseling Service (3rd Floor Student Services Building: 294-5056).

Once again, thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

Luke Douglass, M.S.
APPENDIX L. INSTRUCTIONS FOR THOUGHT CLASSIFICATION

Thoughts will be classified on two dimensions. The first dimension is relevance. Examples of relevant thoughts include acquaintance rape facts, reporting of emotion experienced during the program, and evaluation of the program quality. Examples of irrelevant thoughts include comments about the questionnaires and comments about irrelevant activities or beliefs.

issue relevant examples
"sadness"
"rape"
"how do girls perceive how we act"
"I got angry when I thought of someone raping my sister"

issue irrelevant examples
"I’m hungry"
"the questionnaire wasn’t very good"
"I can’t wait to play basketball tonight"

The second dimension is quality of the comments, and only issue relevant thoughts will be assessed on this dimension. Positive thoughts are those that are consistent with the philosophy of the program, that evaluate the program positively, or demonstrate learning (including increased emotional awareness, such as sadness or anger). Negative thoughts are those that reflect negative evaluations or anger towards women, the presenters, the programs, or the subject material.

positive
"this is a good program"
"I didn’t realize how common rape is"

negative
"women really piss me off"
"the material was outdated and too simple"
"the presentation was boring"
|   |  1 |    |  2 |    |  3 |    |  4 |    |  5 |    |  6 |    |  7 |    |  8 |    |  9 |    | 10 |    | 11 |    | 12 |    | 13 |    | 14 |    | 15 |    | 16 |    | 17 |    | 18 |    | 19 |    |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | hyp |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 2 |  .39** |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 3 |  .29** |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 4 | -0.25** | -0.28** |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 5 |    |  .168 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 6 | -0.27** |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 7 | -0.22* |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 8 | -0.30** | -0.25** | -0.26** |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 9 |    |  .19* |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|10 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|11 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|12 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|13 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|14 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|15 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|16 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|17 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|18 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|19 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|20 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |

* = significant at the .05 level, ** = significant at the .01 level

Note: 1 = hypermasculinity, 2 = RMAS pretest, 3 = RMAS posttest, 4 = ELMQ, 5 = intent to seek consent pretest, 6 = intent to confront friends and family pretest, 7 = intent to facilitate program pretest, 8 = willingness to support tuition pretest, 9 = likelihood of engaging in sexually coercive behavior pretest, 10 = number of hours willing to volunteer pretest, 11 = intent to seek consent posttest, 12 = intent to confront friends and posttest, 13 = intent to facilitate program posttest, 14 = willingness to support tuition increase posttest, 15 = likelihood of engaging in sexually coercive behavior posttest, 16 = number of hours willing to volunteer posttest, 17 = number of relevant thoughts listed, 18 = number of irrelevant thoughts listed, 19 = number of positive thoughts listed, 20 = number of negative thoughts listed
REFERENCES


ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Suzanne Zilber for her assistance and support throughout this project. Her expertise in rape prevention and program design was extremely important and I am deeply thankful for her willingness to volunteer her time and materials. I would like to thank Aaron Quinn and Michael Mallen for their invaluable assistance as facilitators of the programs. In addition, I would like to thank my major professor, Dr. Douglas Epperson, for his considerable role in the finished product.

This project was greatly improved by the contributions of Dr. Amy Bradfield. I am indebted to her for the time she spent editing my drafts and discussing the implications of the study. Given the duration of this project, I am also deeply thankful for her continued support, understanding, and sense of humor. Even more important, however, was her ability to make a daunting task seem possible and, eventually, probable. Realizing this dream would not have been possible without you.