

**SCREAM ATHLETES:
Assessing the impact of a peer education program on sexual violence for
student-athletes**

Sarah McMahon, PhD
Department of Sexual Assault Services and Crime Victim Assistance
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
October, 2004

Introduction

This report summarizes the background, methodology, and findings for a research study conducted by the Department of Sexual Assault Services and Crime Victim Assistance at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey. This study assessed the effectiveness of a student-athlete peer educational theater program (SCREAM Athletes) in changing sophomore and junior student-athletes' attitudes related to sexual violence. The final sample analyzed for this report included 205 student-athletes for the pretest and 120 student-athletes for the posttest. A quantitative survey was administered before and after viewing a SCREAM Athletes presentation. Results indicate that SCREAM Athletes was effective in changing students' attitudes related to sexual violence, and that this change was demonstrated across many demographic variables. Limitations of the study will also be discussed as well as suggestions for further research.

Literature Review

Sexual assault on college campuses is not a new phenomenon. According to statistics compiled by Koss, Gidycz and Wisniewski (1987), 20-25% of all college women will experience rape or attempted rape. A decade after this landmark publication, studies indicate that sexual assault is still a serious problem on college campuses. A 1998 study by the National Institute of Justice found that 29.4% of women victimized by rape were between the ages of 18-24 at the time of the incident. The National College Women Victimization Study (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000) estimates that approximately 5 percent (4.9%) of college women are victimized in any given calendar year. The study also estimates that during their stay at a four year college the percentage of completed or attempted rapes might climb to between one-fifth and one quarter.

Many of the researchers who focus on the interpersonal causes of sexual assault have identified problematic attitudes towards sexual relationships among college students as a major factor in sexual assault cases (Baier, Rosenzweig, & Whipple, 1991; Bostwick, DeLucia-Waack, & Watson, 1995; Briere and Malamuth, 1983; Sandberg, Jackson, & Petretic-Jackson 1987). For example, Harrison, Downes, & Williams (1991) found evidence that "some students may believe that there are circumstances when sexual aggression may be justified or that the victim may be responsible" (Harrison et al., 1991, 131). Similarly, Bostwick et al. (1995) found that men give certain reasons used to justify forced intercourse.

In addition to factors such as problematic attitudes, the role of all male settings in the occurrence of sexual assault on campus has recently received attention by many researchers. In particular, fraternity members and male athletes have been identified as disproportionately representing perpetrators in sexual assault cases. Extensive scholarly research has been conducted with fraternity

members to examine the incidence, attitudes, and group-level activities that may contribute to the occurrence of sexual assault. Scholars have just begun to examine the connection between male athletes and sexual assault, with little empirical research available. Much of the literature that does exist in the field has been journalistic accounts of violence committed by professional athletes (Benedict and Klein, 1997).

Over recent years, attention to the role of college athletes and violence against women has been slowly increasing, although it is still scant. Within the literature that does exist on college athletes and sexual assault, the debate still exists to whether athletes are more likely to commit acts of sexual violence, or whether they are simply more likely to be reported and publicized because of their celebrity status. A few studies have indicated that there is no significant difference between athletes and non-athletes (Crossett, 2000; Crosset, Benedict, and McDonald, 1995; Schwartz and Nograd, 1996). However, over the past decade, a small body of empirical studies has been conducted that conclude that college athletes are over-represented as perpetrators of sexual assault on college and university campuses (e.g. Boerigner, 1996, 1999; Crosset, Bendict, and McDonald 1995; Crosset, Ptacek, McDonald, and Benedict, 1996; Curry, 1991; Frintner and Rubinson, 1987; Koss and Gaines, 1993; Schacht, 1996). Findings from these studies include that sexual aggression was related particularly to those sports that were revenue-producing (Koss and Gaines, 1993), that athletes were more likely than non-athletes to use force for obtaining sex (Boeringer, 1996), and that athletes were more likely than non-athletes to support rape-supportive attitudes (Boeringer, 1999).

Program Description

As a response to the research that links problematic attitudes to the incidence of sexual assault along with the findings that athletes may be at higher risk for perpetrating sexual violence, Rutgers University introduced SCREAM Athletes as a program designed to address the student-athlete culture. SCREAM Athletes is a "sister program" to SCREAM (Students Challenging Realities and Educating Against Myths) Theater, which is a peer educational, improvisational theater program used to facilitate discussion about issues of interpersonal violence.

SCREAM and SCREAM Athletes are designed to change student attitudes and behaviors about sexual violence by presenting facts about the issues using interactive theater. The programs are reality based, as students create scenes that depict situations common to the audience and discuss the myths that many people hold about violence. SCREAM Athletes is unique in that it is performed by and for student athletes. The skits use settings, language and situations that are familiar to student-athletes and address stresses such as managing athletics and academics; the impact of injuries and poor athletic performance; and the pressure to perform. The program also includes an opportunity for audience members to question the student-athlete peer educators both as the characters they play in the scene and as

the students they actually are. This aspect of the program allows audience members to challenge what they have seen and the performers to present accurate information on the issues, resources, and on their commitment to educating against interpersonal violence. It also offers an opportunity for student-athletes to demonstrate a leadership position on addressing issues of interpersonal violence and encourage their peers to do the same.

Purpose of study

This study was conducted to determine whether SCREAM Athletes is actually impacting student-athletes' attitudes about sexual assault and to what degree. Several researchers have provided evaluations and descriptions of various sexual assault prevention programs that specifically attempt to change student attitudes about gender stereotypes and sexual assault (Abbey, 1991; Baier et al., 1991; Berkowitz, 1994; Borden, Karr, & Caldwell-Colbert, 1988; Bostwick et al., 1995; Earle 1996; Foubert and Marriott, 1997; Hanson and Gidycz, 1993; Harrison et al., 1991; Holcolmb, Sarvela, Sondag, & Holcomb, 1993; Lenihan, Rawlins, Eberly, Buckley & Masters, 1992; Schaeffer and Nelson, 1993). Many of these studies utilized a pretest, educational intervention, posttest design to determine if the program was successful in achieving its outcomes, such as changing rape supportive attitudes (Lenihan et al., 1992), increasing awareness of the occurrence of sexual assault (Holcomb et al., 1993), augmenting empathy and sensitivity towards rape victims (Borden et al., 1988), and changing prevailing attitudes of university students towards rape (Harrison et al., 1991). Many of these programs focus on changing student's adherence to "rape myths", defined by Burt (1980) as "prejudicial, stereotyped, or false beliefs about rape, rape victims, and rapists" (Burt, 1980, 217).

Following in the path of previous sexual assault prevention program evaluations, this study was designed to look specifically at student-athletes' attitudes towards sexual assault including adherence to rape myths both before and after the program intervention. This study departed from previous studies by also attempting to assess the strengths within the student-athlete community and the willingness of student-athletes to intervene or confront sexually assaultive behavior. The principal investigator designed this research study to assess the impact of SCREAM Athletes on its viewers and to answer the three following major research questions:

1. Does SCREAM Athletes have a positive impact on student athletes' attitudes towards sexual violence?
2. Are there differences in the effectiveness of SCREAM Athletes based on gender, race, team membership, or knowledge of a person being assaulted?
3. Does SCREAM Athletes have a positive impact on student athletes' willingness to intervene and confront sexually assaultive behavior?

Methodology

This study used a quantitative, quasi-experimental pretest, posttest design to assess the impact of the program, to assess male and female student-athletes' attitudes about sexual assault, and specifically, to determine student-athletes' attitudes about sexual assault and their willingness to confront the issue.

Both male and female athletes were included to test whether there are significant differences in attitudes by gender. Typically, studies of student-athletes attitudes have only included male athletes in the sample. It is important to include female athletes' input, as they are also a part of "student athlete culture" and may offer important perspectives. Administration of the survey also allowed the researcher to assess whether there are significant differences among teams. Additionally, using this survey addressed a gap in previous studies that have failed to assess students' willingness to resist and confront the issue of sexual assault in their communities.

The pretest and posttest survey were identical in order to compare the data with as little interference as possible from adding items or rewording items, both of which are threats to validity. The surveys contained three inventories: two subscales from the Scale for the Identification of Acquaintance Rape Attitudes (SIARA, Humphrey and Hillenbrand-Gunn, 1996) the SCREAM Confront Scale (SCS, Duggan, 1998), and the Form A short-form version of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Marlowe-Crowne, 1960; Reynolds, 1982). Both the SIARA and SCS represent a departure from the instruments typically used to measure student attitudes about sexual assault, as they are designed specifically to address issues of acquaintance rape on a college campus (see Appendix A for instrument).

The SIARA was developed to address some of the problems identified in other measures of rape attitudes, particularly those in Burt's (1980) Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (Humphrey and Hillenbrand-Gunn, 1996). Although the authors of the SIARA concluded that the scale was best represented by a one-factor structure containing 33 items that measured attitudes towards rape, further studies using the SIARA found the existence of subscales. In their study of 2163 undergraduate students, Farmer, McMahon, and Salerno (2000) concluded that there are two subscales of the SIARA, including the Sexual Expectations subscale and the Rape Mythology subscale. The Sexual Expectations subscale measures perceptions about a woman's willingness to have sex based on her behaviors. It is similar to Burt's (1980) Victim Responsibility factor, but measures attitudes particular to acquaintance rape. The Rape Mythology subscale measures perceptions about the truthfulness of victims, incidence, and severity of sexual assault on campus. While using Burt's (1980) basic notion of rape myths, the items for this factor are particular to the occurrence of violence against women on campus. Both scales contain 6 items and are measured by a six point Likert scale from (0) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. The reliability scale coefficient alpha for the SIARA is 0.88 for females and 0.91 for males.

The SCREAM Confront Scale (SCS) was designed by Duggan (1998) to measure an individual's "perceived likelihood of confronting a friend who is planning to or who has already sexually assaulted a female..." (Duggan, 1998, 121). The SCS includes 12 items, all measured on a five-point Likert scale from (1) highest likelihood of confronting to (5) lowest likelihood of confronting (for two items) and (1) definitely to (5) definitely not (for ten items). Duggan's (1998) survey of 329 students through test/retest determined an internal reliability of 0.86 for the SCS. Her content analysis of the scale yielded four themes, including: ability to confront and not encourage sexually assaultive behavior; ability to notice sexually assaultive behavior; usefulness of confronting sexually assaultive behavior; and collusion with sexually assaultive behavior (Duggan, 1998). The inclusion of this scale in this study is especially important because past studies have concentrated only on the problem of sexual assault and no studies available have attempted to measure attitudes of perceived resistance or confrontation.

The Form A short-form version of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Reynolds, 1982) was included in this study to provide some indication of the impact of response bias that may be present and thereby strengthen the internal validity. Based on previous studies of students' attitudes about sexual assault (e.g. Farmer, McMahon, and Salerno, 2000), it is clear that social desirability may have an impact on the results. The issue of social desirability has been extensively examined by several researchers (e.g. Crowne and Marlowe, 1964; Paulhus, 1984) and applied to the measurement of similar sensitive issues such as intimate violence (Sugarman and Hotaling, 1997); HIV (Latkin and Vlahov, 1998); and sexuality (Meston et al., 1998). A consistent recommendation is for researchers examining sensitive issues to include some measure to assess social desirability tendencies. While the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (1960) has been widely used, researchers have also found it too lengthy (33 items) to include alongside a battery of other tests, and therefore several short forms have been developed. Reynolds' (1982) Form A is one of the short versions that was created and is recognized as one of the best in terms of factor structure and internal-consistency reliability (Loo and Thorpe, 2000). Form A contains 11 items and uses a true-false format. The reliability found by Reynolds (1982) in his study of 608 undergraduate students was 0.74.

Demographic information collected on the survey was minimal so as to reduce the risk of social desirability bias. Due to experience with conducting past studies on the issue of sexual assault (e.g. Farmer and McMahon, in press), the researcher has learned that students' concern with anonymity may influence their responses. Therefore, this study asked only for the respondent's team membership, gender, race, and whether the respondent knew someone who has been sexually assaulted.

Sample

The total number of male and female student athletes at Rutgers University is approximately 800. Student athletes are those who are enrolled in one of the New Brunswick undergraduate colleges and who also participate as members of one of the University's 26 intercollegiate, Division I athletic teams. The researcher aimed to administer the survey to all sophomore and junior student-athletes attending school at the New Brunswick campus of Rutgers University, approximately 350 students. This includes both male and female athletes, and represents 25 athletic teams. Sophomores and juniors were selected because they have had more time than first-year students to experience the role and culture of student-athlete. They were also selected because all sophomore and junior student athletes are mandated to attend a workshop on sexual assault, which provides a sampling frame for the purpose of this study.

Twenty-two teams were represented at the four sessions during which the study was conducted. The expected attendance for these 22 teams was 290, with 204 showing up. This pool represented 70% of the sophomore and junior student athletes from these teams, which is consistent with past attendance records indicating that about two-thirds of all sophomores and juniors actually attend the program. The actual number of participants from these 22 teams in the study was 177, which represents 61% of all sophomores and juniors on these teams. The representativeness for each team is broken down in Table 1. All of the teams except 5 had at least 50% representation, with 11 teams 75% or over and 8 teams with 100%. All teams were also reviewed with a member of the Athletic Department and labeled as a contact or non-contact sport; and individual or team sport; and a single sex or both sex sport (meaning that there is a male/female counterpart, i.e. Women's and Men's Soccer, or simply one sex, such as Football).

The final sample for the pretest included 205 subjects from 23 teams. A total of 204 sophomores and juniors attended the three mandatory programs plus a fourth make up session in December. A total of 177 participated in the study for a 98% participation rate. An additional session was held for football, and 28 sophomores and juniors were present and all participated. Therefore, the total number of possible participants from the four sessions plus football was 232, and with 205 participating, yielded an 88% participation rate overall for the pretest.

The final sample for the posttest included 120 subjects from 19 teams. A total of number of 204 sophomores and juniors from 22 teams were invited to participate in the posttest (football did not view the program so only their pretest information is included in the study). The response rate was 59%.

Data Collection

Data were collected at four SCREAM Athletes presentations that were held for sophomore and junior athletes in Fall, 2001. Pretest surveys were also

distributed and collected separately from the football team at another venue, as they did not attend any of the four SCREAM Athletes presentations.

The pretest survey was administered as soon as the athletes gathered for the SCREAM Athletes presentation, and before the topic of the program was introduced. While some athletes were aware of the general topic to be addressed by SCREAM Athletes, many simply knew that it was a mandated program and did not know the specific topic to be addressed. The survey was treated as a separate part of the program, with no explicit ties to SAS/CVA. Student-athletes were not told there was a posttest until after viewing the SCREAM Athletes program, when they were invited to take the test again.

Two student athletes from SCREAM Athletes (one current member and one graduate) were trained to administer the survey. The survey was administered at each of the four programs by one of these two student-athletes, who explained the survey, the informed consent, and issues of anonymity and confidentiality (see Appendix B for informed consent). It was made clear in the introduction by the student athletes that the survey was not an attempt to determine the incidence of sexual assault or to identify perpetrators. Instead, it was presented as an opportunity to gather information on their definitions and perceptions of the issue as well as to find out how athletes are addressing the issue and what may be working already within their community. After viewing the SCREAM Athletes presentation, the same student-athlete who administered the pretest invited the audience to participate by taking the posttest.

Upon completion of the fourth administration of the survey, the primary researcher was concerned that certain teams were not represented in the sample, including women's basketball, men and women's fencing, and football. These teams did not attend the presentation because of reported conflicts with practice and/or games. It was determined that at least including the football team in the sample was important, based on its frequent citation in the literature on sexual assault as a controversial team. Eventually, with assistance from members of the Athletic Department, the administration of the survey was arranged for one of the mandatory breakfast meetings held for the entire football team. Sophomores and juniors were identified and explained the purpose of the study, as well as the informed consent and voluntary nature of the study. Because they did not see the program, the football players were only able to complete the pretest.

Survey data analysis

All responses from the pretest and posttest surveys were entered into SPSS. Composite scores were created for each of the three scales: the SIARA, SCS, and social desirability scale. Composite scores were also created for each of the two subscales of the SIARA: the Rape Myth subscale and the Sexual Expectations subscale. In addition to the demographic information collected (gender, race, and whether you know someone sexually assaulted), variables were created to give

further description of the types of sports teams. Each team was coded as either a contact or non-contact sport, a team or individual sport, and a both-sex or single-sex team.

Frequencies and descriptives of the composite scores were run for each of the demographic variables, including the mean and standard deviation, for both the pretest and the posttest. Graphs were created to view the distribution of scores by each variable as well to determine whether the samples were normally distributed. Descriptive statistics and graphs were then produced for each individual question on the SIARA and SCS by gender to determine if there were particular items that yielded significantly different responses and to begin testing the hypothesis that males would have higher scores. In addition, a series of multiple regressions was performed to determine whether various variables contributed significantly to the variation in pretest scores.

Results

The data was carefully reviewed and cleaned prior to analysis. Total scores were computed for each individual for each of the three inventories: the SIARA, SCS and the social desirability scale. Descriptive statistics were run according to each demographic variable, and independent sample t-tests were run for both the SIARA and SCS.

The final sample used for analysis included 205 students for the pretest, and 120 students for the posttest. The demographics of the two samples are described in Table 1.

Table 1: Descriptive categories for pretest and posttest samples

	Pretest	Posttest
Gender		
Male	53.7	38.3
Female	46.3	61.7
Ethnicity		
White	79.7%	80.8%
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.0	4.2
African American	8.4	5.0
Mexican American/ Hispanic	3.4	2.5
Multiracial	6.3	6.7
Know someone who was sexually assaulted	35%	56%
Team membership		
Baseball	5.9	3.3
Basketball (m)	0.5	8.3
Crew (m)	6.4	10.8
Crew (w)	3.4	5.8
Field hockey	4.4	3.3
Football	13.8	0
Golf (m)	1.0	0
Golf (w)	1.0	1.7
Gymnastics	5.4	0.8
Lacrosse (m)	5.9	2.5
Lacrosse (w)	5.9	4.2
Soccer (m)	3.4	5.0
Soccer (w)	4.9	3.3
Softball	3.9	5.8
Swimming (m)	5.9	7.5
Swimming (w)	5.4	8.3

Tennis (m)	2.0	0
Tennis (w)	2.5	6.7
Track (m)	5.4	10.8
Track (w)	5.9	2.5
Volleyball (w)	3.0	4.2
Wrestling	3.9	3.3

Overall, the change in mean scores between the pretests and posttests indicate that SCREAM Athletes had a positive impact across the board on student athlete attitudes related to sexual violence. For the SIARA, a positive change in attitudes was indicated by a decreased score. The overall pretest mean score for the SIARA was 15.4, and after viewing SCREAM, the posttest mean decreased to 10.2. The t-test indicated that this change was significant, $p < .01$.

For the SCS scale, a positive change in attitudes was indicated by an increased total score. For the SCS, the overall pretest mean was 23.0 and the posttest was 28.2. These changes in mean scores indicate that viewing SCREAM Theater did have a positive impact on attitudes related to confronting sexual assaultive behavior. The t-test results indicate that this change was significant, $p < .01$.

Comparison of the change in means from the pretest to posttest on the SIARA and SCS by demographic variables indicates that positive changes in attitudes and behaviors occurred virtually across the board. Analysis of all categories under each demographic variable (gender, knowing someone who was sexually assaulted, and contact versus non-contact sport) indicated a positive change in attitudes as measured by the SIARA and SCS (see Table 2 -3).

Table 2: SIARA and SCS Pretest to posttest mean scores by gender

Scale	Gender	N	Pretest Mean	N	Posttest Mean
SIARA	Total	202	15.42	116	10.2
	Male	107	20.67	43	15.4
	Female	95	9.49	73	7.1
SCS	Total	201	22.95	119	28.2
	Male	106	23.50	45	26.2
	Female	95	22.34	74	29.4

Table 3: SIARA and SCS Pretest to posttest mean scores by type of sport

Scale	Type of sport	N	Mean score pretest	N	Mean score posttest
SIARA	Contact vs. non-contact sport				
	Contact	84	16.27	28	9.82
	Non-contact	116	14.46	82	10.12
SCS	Contact vs. non-contact sport				
	Contact	83	22.64	83	21.92
	Non-contact	116	23.06	30	23.30

In addition to examining the change between pretest and posttest scores, analysis was conducted on the pretest sample only to determine what types of attitudes the participants brought with them to the presentations.

A regression analysis was performed for the SIARA, the SIARA subscales (Rape Myths and Sexual Expectations) and the SCS to determine which variables contributed significantly to the variability. The results of the regression analysis indicated that for the SIARA and Rape Myth subscale, the variables that were most significant in predicting responses were gender and whether the person knows someone sexually assaulted. For the Sexual Expectations subscale, the only significant variable was gender, and for the SCS, none of the variables were significant.

Social desirability was analyzed by running bivariate correlations with each scale. Based on these results, social desirability was determined not to have a significant impact on the outcome variables (SIARA and SCS).

Discussion

The results of the pretest and posttest indicate that SCREAM Athletes did have a positive impact on student athlete attitudes related to sexual violence. After viewing a SCREAM Athletes program, participants were less likely to accept rape myths and were more likely to intervene in a situation that supports sexual violence. The positive impact applied across the board, as these results manifested even when controlling for various demographic variables such as team membership and knowing someone sexually assaulted. Therefore, on a basic and general level, this assessment supports the notion that SCREAM Athletes is an effective tool for impacting the attitudes of sophomore and junior student-athletes at Rutgers University.

One of the most consistently supported findings in this study was a difference in acceptance of violence by gender. The survey data clearly showed that gender was the most significant variable in explaining the variation in scores on the SIARA. The men's scores were higher for every question on the SIARA, with the difference in mean from women's scores proving significant. This is an important finding because it suggests that there is something about the culture of masculinity, or of male athlete culture, that may be rape supportive. The survey is limited in its ability to gather more information about the causes for the differences between men and women, but it is important to further investigate and to possibly integrate this into audience-specific programming.

The fact that those people who know someone who was sexually assaulted held lower acceptances of rape supportive attitudes and behaviors is also an interesting finding. It suggests that making the connection that this can happen to someone you know may be important. This may also suggest that programs that include personal testimony of a peer may have a positive impact on attitudes, although this is a type of programming that obviously needs to be handled in an extremely careful and protected way to avoid exploitation of victims. However, this is a finding that would serve as an important topic for further investigation.

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study that must be acknowledged and can perhaps indicate areas in which further research is needed. First, while the results from the survey are helpful in determining whether or not an impact was made on the sample by SCREAM Athletes, this method is limited in finding out more information about the issues. Qualitative methods such as focus groups and individual interviews would offer an opportunity to delve more deeply into the issues that appeared on the survey. These methods were indeed utilized as a part of a separate study, and the results can be accessed through contacting the department.

It would also be helpful to have a posttest conducted after a longer period of time after viewing SCREAM Athletes. While it is useful to know that SCREAM Athletes provides an immediate impact on participants after they see the program, it is important to determine whether this effect is long lasting.

Another limitation was sample size. A larger sample of sophomores and juniors would have been more representative, especially for the posttest. In addition, there were a handful of teams missing entirely from the sample including some high profile sports such as women's basketball, which was excused from attending the programming where the survey was administered, and football did not complete a posttest. Including their responses certainly would have enriched the findings.

Another sampling limitation was the absence of a comparison group. While some findings could clearly be labeled as unique to the student-athlete culture, other findings were more ambiguous as to whether they reflected the student-athlete culture or instead, the greater student culture. Having a group of students who were not athletes would certainly provide a rich point of comparison and ability to better define what is unique to student-athlete culture.

One recommendation for conducting future research on this issue is the development of a better quantitative tool. The skewed results of the SIARA and SCS suggest the need for a revised tool to better measure attitudes about rape and sexual violence. One of the findings of this study is that respondents are able to identify clearly stated coercive or assaultive behaviors as wrong, but it is the more subtle situations that are still in question and seem to reveal that certain rape myths and beliefs are in place. An instrument that could move towards measuring some of the more hidden myths would be more helpful.

Lastly, while the tests run on the Social Desirability scale revealed no bias, there was clearly a difference in responses that emerged during the focus groups and individual interviews. Therefore, at a minimum, it seems necessary to further explore the issue of social desirability bias for the survey. The tool itself may need to be revisited and updated to be appropriate for a college student's experience.

Scream Confront Scale (Duggan,1998)

Directions: Please think about an actual male friend of yours. Imagine that he met a female at a college party. Please answer honestly. You will not be judged by the way in which you answer. Remember, your answers are anonymous – they cannot be connected back to you personally. Please put an X before only one answer. NOTE: There are questions on the front and back of the following sheets- please respond to all.
Thank you.

1. If I were in a situation where I knew that my friend was intent on having intercourse with a female even if she was unwilling, I would...

1. Try to talk him out of it or stop him, even if it would be difficult or embarrassing.
 2. Not say or do anything because it would be too difficult or embarrassing even though I would not approve of his behavior.
 3. Not say or do anything because it is none of my business.
 4. Not say or do anything because I would not disapprove of his behavior.
 5. Encourage him or pressure him to have sex.

2. If I were in a situation where I found out that my friend already had forced sex upon a female, I would...

1. Be angry and confront him. I would possibly talk to him about changing his behavior or getting help.
 2. Be angry but I wouldn't confront him. It would be too difficult or embarrassing.
 3. Not say or do anything, it is none of my business.
 4. Not do or say anything because I don't think he did anything wrong.
 5. Be happy for him that he got sex from her.

3. I would notice comments and behaviors that would indicate that my friend was intent on having intercourse with a female even if she was unwilling.

Definitely Probably Maybe Not likely Definitely not

4. I would notice if my friend was getting ready to have intercourse with a female who was so drunk she might not be able to indicate if she was willing or not.

Definitely Probably Maybe Not likely Definitely not

5. I would know if my friend had already forced sex upon a female after the situation occurred.

Definitely Probably Maybe Not likely Definitely not

6. I believe that I could confront my friend if he was planning to have intercourse with an unwilling female.

Definitely Probably Maybe Not likely Definitely not

7. I believe that I could confront my friend if he already forced intercourse upon an unwilling female.

Definitely Probably Maybe Not likely Definitely not

8. I believe that if I confronted my friend before he had intercourse with an unwilling female, I could stop him from following through with it.

Definitely Probably Maybe Not likely Definitely not

9. I believe that if I confronted my friend after he had intercourse with an unwilling female it would stop him from doing it again.

Definitely Probably Maybe Not likely Definitely not

10. Not realizing what this might lead to, I may help my friend get a female drunk at a party to make it easier for him to get sex from her later.

Definitely Probably Maybe Not likely Definitely not

11. Not realizing what this might lead to, I may encourage or pressure my friend to get sex as often or from as many women as he can.

Definitely Probably Maybe Not likely Definitely not

12. Not realizing what this might lead to, I may make a bet with my friend about whether or not he can "score" with a particular female on a given night.

Definitely Probably Maybe Not likely Definitely not

Directions: Please read each question and choose the answer that best reflects what you believe about yourself. Please circle either True or False for each question. Thank you. (Form A, Reynolds, 1982).

- | | | |
|--|------|-------|
| 1. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work in school if I am not encouraged. | True | False |
| 2. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way. | True | False |
| 3. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener. | True | False |
| 4. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone. | True | False |
| 5. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake. | True | False |
| 6. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget. | True | False |
| 7. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable. | True | False |
| 8. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own. | True | False |
| 9. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others. | True | False |
| 10. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me. | True | False |
| 11. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings. | True | False |

Sources

Abbey, A. (1991). Acquaintance rape and alcohol consumption on college campuses: How are they linked? Journal of American College Health, 39, 1-5.

Baier, J.L., Rosenzweig, M.G., & Whipple, E.G. (1991). Patterns of sexual behavior, coercion, and victimization of university students. Journal of College Student Development, 32, 310-322.

Berkowitz, Alan D. (1994) A Model Acquaintance Rape Prevention Program for Men. New Directions for Student Services, 65, 35-42.

Borden, L.A., Karr, S.K., & Caldwell-Colbert, A.T. (1988). Effects of a university prevention program on attitudes and empathy toward rape. Journal of College Student Development, 29, 132-36.

Bostwick, R., DeLucia-Waack, J.L., & Watson, D. (1995). Perceptions of dating behaviors and reasons offered to justify date rape. NASPA Journal, 32 (2), 123-130.

Briere, J. & Malamuth, N.M. (1983). Self-reported likelihood of sexually aggressive behavior: Attitudinal versus sexual explanations. Journal of Research in Personality, 17, 315-323.

Burt, M. (1980). Cultural myths and support for rape. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2, 217-230.

Crowne, D.P. & Marlowe, D.A. (1964). The Approval Motive. New York, NY: Wiley.

Earle, J.P. (1996). Acquaintance rape workshops: Their effectiveness in changing the attitudes of first year college men. NASPA Journal, 34, 1-16.

Fisher, R. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). The sexual victimization of college women (NCJ 182369). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Foubert, J.D. and Marriot, K.A. (1997). Effects of a sexual assault peer education program on men's belief in rape myths. Sex Roles, 36, 259-268.

Hanson, Kimberly A. and Gidycz, C. A. (1993) Evaluation of a Sexual Assault Program. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 61(6), 1046-1052.

Harrison, P.J., Downes, J., & Williams, M.D. (1991). Date and acquaintance rape: Perceptions and attitude change strategies. Journal of College Student Development, 32, 131-139.

Holcomb, D.R., Sarvela, P.D., Sondag, K.A. & Holcomb, L.C. (1993). An evaluation of a mixed-gender date rape prevention workshop. Journal of American College Health, 41, 159-164.

Humphrey, C.F. & Hillenbrand-Gunn (1996). Acquaintance rape: Developing a contemporary measure of attitudes. Paper presented at the 104th annual convention of the American Psychological Association. Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Kilpatrick, D. G., Edmunds, C., & Seymour, A. (1992). Rape in America: A report to the nation. Charleston, SC: National Victim Center & the Crime Victims Research and Treatment Center, Medical University of South Carolina.

Koss, M.P., Gidycz, C.A. & Wisniewski, N. (1987) The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55 (2), 162-170.

Latkin, C. A. & Vlahov, D. (1998). Socially desirable response tendency as a correlate of accuracy of self-reported HIV serostatus for HIV seropositive injection drug users. Addiction, 93, 1191-1197.

Lenihan, G.O. , Rawlins, M.E., Eberly, C.G., Buckley, B., and Masters, B. (1992). Gender differences in rape supportive attitudes before and after a date rape education intervention. Journal of College Student Development, 33, 331-38.

Meston, C.M., Heiman, J.R., Trapnell, P.D., & Paulhus, D.L. (1998). Socially desirable responding and sexual self-reports. The Journal of Sex Research, 35 (2), 148-157.

Paulhus, D.L. (1984). Two-component models of socially desirability responding. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 46, 598-609.

Sandberg, G., Jackson, T.L., & Petretic-Jackson, P. (1987). College students' attitudes regarding sexual coercion and aggressions: Developing educational and preventative strategies. Journal of College Student Personnel, 302-311.

Schaeffer, A.M. and Nelson, E. (1993). Rape-supportive attitudes: Effects of on-campus residence and education. Journal of College Student Development, 34(3), 175-179.

Sugarman, D.B. and Hotaling, G.T. (1997). Intimate violence and social desirability: A meta-analytic review. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12(2), 275-290.