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ABSTRACT

Date Rape Attitudes Intervention:
A Controlled Outcome Study
by
Shera Deanne Beadner

Dr. Bradley Donohue, Examination Committee Chair
Professor of Psychology
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Date rape is a widespread problem; however, there is a paucity of methodologically sound intervention studies available. The research that does exist has found contradictory results regarding the effectiveness of different types of intervention programs. This study attempted to address some of the short-comings of previous research and build upon the existing information. A date rape intervention targeting date rape attitudes was evaluated in 88 undergraduate students. The intervention was compared to an equivalent control group. A repeated measures 2 (intervention, control) x 3 (pre-test, post-test, follow-up) MANOVA (multivariate analysis of variance) was used to analyze the data. The MANOVA was significant for the effect of time, F(4, 83) = 2.27, p < .05. Both conditions reported a greater sensitivity to rape-related attitudes over time. Implications for future research are discussed.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Date rape, unwanted sexual contact by someone you are acquainted with, is a serious problem in our society. For the purposes of this paper date rape and acquaintance rape will be used interchangeably. In the largest national study involving over 6,000 college students, Koss and colleagues reported that 12% of their sample of women had experienced sexual coercion, 12% experienced an attempted rape, and 15% of women had experienced a completed rape (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987). In a study involving 380 women, 21% reported experiencing rape and 78% of these women reported incidences of sexual aggression (Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987). Consequently studies have found similar prevalence rates; one study found that 27.5% of the women sampled reported unwanted sexual contact (Larimer, Lydum, Anderson, & Turner, 1999). In addition fifteen percent of 294 men reported raping a woman. Multiple victimization was also evident as a total of 353 rapes were reported by 207 women (Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987).

Although date rape is clearly a widespread problem, there have been relatively few methodologically sound interventions. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to review date rape intervention studies, and to develop and evaluate a date rape intervention program.
Programs Aimed At Men

Gilbert, Heesacker, and Gannon (1991) evaluated a psychoeducational intervention in the improvement of sexual aggression supportive attitudes in men. The final sample consisted of 61 men. The authors based the intervention on elaboration likelihood model (ELM) central-route attitude change tactics (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986; as cited in Gilbert, Heesacker, & Gannon, 1991). To achieve this type of attitude change the authors included three components in their intervention. The first is motivation to think about the topic which they attempted through the subjects viewing role-played vignettes and the presenters communicating directly with the audience. Secondly, the ability to think about the topic was accomplished through use of vocabulary and messages that were suitably complex for a general adult audience, key points were repeated throughout the presentation, and the content was summarized at the end. Lastly, favorability of resulting thoughts about the topic was addressed by discussing the negative consequences of accepting interpersonal violence, rape myths, adversarial sexual beliefs, male-dominance ideology, and the social sanctions associated with accepting these beliefs.

Subjects were randomly assigned to the aforementioned psychoeducational group or the no-treatment control group. During the first session subjects completed the pre-test and were dismissed. After the second intervention session, subjects immediately completed post-test measures, and control group subjects completed the post-test only. Results indicated that intervention subjects changed their attitudes more in the desired direction (e.g., less endorsement of rape myths) than the control group.
One limitation in the study is that the control condition did not account for attention. Another limitation is the small sample, which can inhibit generalizability and power.

In another study that addressed cognitions, Schewe and O’Donohue (1996) evaluated a short-term prevention program with 74 high-risk college males. The researchers randomly assigned subjects to one of three conditions, Victim Empathy/Outcome Expectancies (VE/OE), Rape Supportive Cognitions (RSC), or a no-treatment control group. Twenty-two subjects were randomly assigned to participate in the VE/OE group. The VE/OE group viewed a 50 minute video designed to facilitate empathy toward rape victims and to point out negative consequences for men who choose to rape. Participants were instructed to imagine how a woman might feel before, during, and after a rape. Finally, the group participated in a behavioral exercise; they were instructed to convince a hypothetical man, who believes he can force sex upon women, to change his behavior. The RSC group consisted of 26 subjects who viewed a 50 minute video that discussed the importance of cognitions in preventing sexual assault, the role that they play in sexual assaults, and finally, the RSC group engaged in the same behavioral exercise as the VE/OE group. The no-treatment control group consisted of 26 subjects. Subjects were pre-tested and then given a post-test two weeks following the intervention.

The subjects in the RSC group had a significantly lower likelihood of committing acts of sexual aggression, they endorsed fewer rape myths, less adversarial sexual beliefs, and less acceptance of interpersonal violence at post-test as compared to pre-test. Compared to pre-test, the VE/OE group endorsed less acceptance of
interpersonal violence, and less likelihood to commit acts of sexual aggression at post-test; furthermore, this group evidenced more empathy at post-test.

The results of this study are encouraging. However, only RSC subjects improved on lowering their endorsement of rape myths, and less adversarial sexual beliefs, and only the VE/OE group improved on empathy scores. This may indicate the need to include both components in an intervention.

Both of the intervention studies aimed at men as an audience found significant change in attitudes and cognitions, although the intervention designs were quite different; one was purely psychoeducational and one included a behavioral exercise. Only Schewe and O’Donohue found a change in empathy (1996).

Programs Aimed At Women

Hanson and Gidycz (1993) evaluated a sexual assault prevention program targeting women. Three hundred and sixty college women were assigned on a non-random basis to intervention or control group conditions. Subjects in the control group completed baseline assessment measures, but did not receive the intervention before being assessed nine weeks later. In the intervention program subjects initially received statistical information about the pervasiveness of sexual assault on college campuses, then completed a myth and fact sheet containing statements about rape. After completing the worksheet, subjects watched a video that depicted a scenario of events leading up to an acquaintance rape. Next, the presenter asked the participants a series of questions regarding protective measures to avoid acquaintance rape. The women then saw a second video in which the actors modeled protective behaviors. Lastly,
subjects received information about prevention strategies, and names and telephone numbers of local agencies that could provide additional assistance.

The researchers used a measure to assess victimization history of subjects. At pre-test, researchers instructed subjects to respond to the measure by recording events that took place from the time the subject was 14 years of age up to the time of the study; at post-test, the subjects responded to the same measure from the completion of the study to post-test. Women who reported a history of victimization were significantly more likely to report being victimized again during the nine weeks between pre-test and post-test than those without a history of sexual assault.

Researchers also divided subjects into three groups based on the reported level of victimization. Those who reported no victimization and participated in the intervention group were significantly less likely to report victimization than the control group. There were no differences among subjects who reported moderate victimization (fondling, kissing) or severe victimization (rape, attempted rape).

Researchers also developed a dating behavior survey to assess situational variables related to acquaintance rape. At Time 2 (with scores at Time 1 as the covariate), the intervention group reported significantly fewer situational factors associated with acquaintance rape. There were no differences between the two groups on a sexual communication survey, an instrument the authors developed to assess subjects' perception of their own accuracy and clarity of their communication. Finally, the intervention group scored significantly higher than the control group on a sexual assault awareness survey, suggesting a better overall awareness of sexual assault.
The study described above had several limitations. One is that receiving attention was not accounted for with the control group; they were dismissed immediately after completing the pre-test measures. Additionally, the study included only women, and most were freshmen or sophomores in colleges; thus the generalizability of the results suffers. In addition, the three instruments developed by the authors failed to show acceptable psychometric properties. Finally, only women who had no prior victimization history appeared to benefit from the intervention; further reducing generalizability and integrity of the findings.

In a study also designed to reduce risk-taking behavior, and increase the perception of vulnerability, 70 women participated in an experiment that evaluated differences in intervention outcome between a personalized and non-personalized date rape prevention program (Gray, Lesser, Quinn, & Bounds, 1990). Subjects were enrolled in six social science classes and were randomly assigned by class to a control group (non-personalized) or an experimental group (personalized). The authors differentiated personalized from non-personalized by including local examples and statistics for the personalized group and national examples and statistics for the non-personalized group. The experimental program included information, discussion and role-playing regarding the following topics: rape myths, risk-taking behaviors that increase vulnerability to date rape, nonverbal messages and how the opposite sex views them, expectations, and communication. Researchers pre-tested and post-tested subjects.

The results revealed that the personalized group reduced risk-taking behavior intent, and increased perception of vulnerability as compared to the non-personalized
group. These results should be interpreted cautiously, however. Classes, as opposed to, individual subjects were randomly assigned, and validity or reliability data for the measures were not reported. The study evaluated only women (although men were present during the presentations to keep the classes intact). It is possible the presence of men could have affected how women responded. Finally, the number of subjects that participated was relatively low, and the experimental group had 18 more subjects than did the control group.

The two studies reviewed regarding interventions aimed at women both concentrated on reducing situational factors and risk-taking behaviors and both interventions were successful. Additionally, both studies seemed to focus on a variety of intervention techniques, including: providing information about rape and rape prevention, using videos or role-plays, and incorporating discussion sessions.

Programs Aimed At Mixed-Gender Audiences

The majority of studies have been aimed at mixed-gender audiences. Holcomb, Sarvela, Sondag, and Hatton Holcomb (1993) evaluated the effectiveness of a mixed-gender date rape prevention workshop in a sample of 331 subjects. The researchers utilized a post-test only design and examined the students' responses to a date rape attitudes survey. The workshop consisted of a male and female facilitator team presenting, to a class of students, a hypothetical scenario of a male and female on a first date. Researchers asked the students to determine when, and how, consent to have sex takes place and gave them suggestions to prevent date rape. The workshop lasted approximately 35 minutes.
The results showed that experimental group subjects were significantly less tolerant of date rape than subjects in the control group. Overall, men had significantly more tolerance of date rape than women. The researchers also found that the experimental program had greater effects for men than for women. This study, however, did not utilize a pre-test, nor did the researchers conduct a follow-up assessment. Also, researchers did not randomly assign individual students to the intervention conditions; rather entire classes of students were randomly assigned.

In a study designed to examine differences in date rape supportive attitudes before and after a date rape education intervention program, Lenihan and colleagues used 821 students from university health courses (Lenihan, Rawlins, Eberly, Buckley, & Masters, 1992). The experimental program consisted of a 50-minute session which included: discussion of the effects of rape, definitions and statistics of rape, cultural reasons for date rape, characteristics of offenders, why people do not identify forced sex as rape, prevention strategies, and sources for help. Following the lecture, students watched a video that included two scenarios: the first depicted a male and female college student after a party, and the second offered two perceptions of the same situation (the female perceived the situation as date rape and the male as seduction). Videos were utilized as aids to bring about discussion on the elements necessary for rape to occur, the attitudes of offenders, and issues regarding consent.

Students were randomly assigned to one of four experimental conditions by their respective health course section. Two groups saw the program, although only one of them was pre-tested and post-tested; the other group was post-tested only. The researchers used two control groups; one group was pre-tested and post-tested, while
the other was post-tested only. Results indicated that the women who were pre-tested (regardless of whether these subjects saw the program) had lower acceptance of rape myths and adversarial sexual relations than men. These same women also lowered their acceptance of rape myths and adversarial sexual relations from pre-test to post-test. In other words, the control group changed along with the intervention group. No changes in the men were observed. The major limitation of this study is that subjects were randomly assigned in sections, and not as individuals.

Borden, Karr, and Caldwell-Colbert (1988) attempted to increase empathy and sensitivity toward rape victims. One hundred subjects (50 men and 50 women) participated in the prevention program. The intervention group (50 subjects) listened to a 45 minute seminar on rape awareness and prevention given by the university rape and sexual assault program coordinator. She discussed legal terms relating to rape, a description of a “typical” rapist, rape trauma syndrome, prevention strategies, and the type of assistance available for rape victims. Students were pre-tested and then post-tested four weeks following the seminar. The control group did not receive intervention.

The program was unsuccessful in changing attitudes and empathy. This study had several limitations including a lack of random assignment of subjects, attention was not accounted for with the control group, and a small number of subjects participated.

Fonow, Richardson, and Wemmerus (1992) evaluated a feminist rape education program. The researchers randomly assigned 14 sections of introductory sociology classes (N = 582) to three conditions: a 25-minute video presentation, a 25-minute live presentation, and a no treatment control group. For each condition, one group was pre-
tested and one group was not pre-tested. A post-test was administered three weeks later. Both the live and the video presentation used the same presenter and the same content, which included a critique of rape myths based on a hypothetical scenario, statistics, and a reconceptualization of rape (e.g., "Rape is an act of violence").

All students who received education, live or video, had lower rape myth acceptance than the control group or those students who were pre-tested only. The live presentation and the video were equally effective. This study had two major limitations, which include a lack of random assignment by subject, and a no treatment control group, which did not receive any attention.

Dallager and Rosen (1993) evaluated the effects of a human sexuality course on attitudes toward rape. One hundred and forty-five students participated in this non-randomized experiment. The Human Sexuality class met 29 times during the semester and consisted of 97 students who were presented with such topics as: intimacy, identity, conception and pregnancy, sexual dysfunctions, AIDS, and two class meetings on sexual oppression and sexual misuse and abuse. The main component the authors were interested in was the nonconfrontational approach, i.e., not directly attempting to change attitudes, but rather changing attitudes gradually and over time with increasing knowledge about human sexuality. The non-equivalent control group was an Education course that had 48 students; no material on sexuality, sex education, or rape was presented. The researchers pre-tested subjects at the beginning of the semester and then post-tested them at the end of the semester. Due to the non-equivalent, non-random assignment design of the experiment, the researchers used pre-test differences as covariates, although this method does not control for the methodological problems.
The human sexuality class endorsed less acceptance of rape myths at post-test than the Education class, although the results should be interpreted cautiously. As mentioned, the groups were not equal, and the subjects were not randomly assigned. In addition, the sample size was small and the sample was largely Caucasian, which limits generalizability.

In another attempt to evaluate a long-term intervention, Lonsway and colleagues evaluated an intensive long-term training program for peer educators to determine if the program changed participants' beliefs and attitudes regarding rape and related issues (Lonsway, Klaw, Berg, Waldo, Kothari, Mazurek, & Hegeman, 1998). Seventy-four, mostly third and fourth year college students participated in the semester long training called Campus Acquaintance Rape Education (CARE). The class met twice a week for ninety-minutes and focused on: exploring societal contributions to rape, rape myths, increasing understanding of oppression and its relationship to sexual assault, understanding rape trauma syndrome, learning about resources, and learning skills to present workshops. The comparison group was a human sexuality course consisting of 96 students who ranged from freshman to seniors.

Students completed a series of questionnaires at the beginning of the semester, at the end of the semester and then they were mailed follow-up questionnaires (43 CARE students and 21 human sexuality students completed the follow-up). At pre-test CARE students endorsed more supportive attitudes toward the feminist movement than human sexuality students. At post-test CARE students supported less rape myths, less adversarial sexual beliefs, and were more supportive of the feminist movement.
Follow-up results indicated only one difference; CARE students maintained less rape myth endorsement than human sexuality students.

The study was unique with respect to the longevity, and the intensity, of intervention. Additionally, the follow-up was longer than most intervention outcome studies in this area. However, only 43% of CARE students, and 35% of human Sexuality students completed the follow-up.

In a sample of 96 subjects, Harrison, Downes, and Williams (1991) evaluated the effectiveness of a program designed to produce changes in perceptions and attitudes about date rape. Five sections of Speech Communications classes were selected for participation at random from a total of 16 sections. One class was non-randomly assigned as the control group, while the remaining four were randomly assigned to intervention. There were two interventions: both included viewing a videotape on issues of date and acquaintance rape, but only one group participated in a facilitated instruction session after the video. The seven-minute video presented clips from advertising using sexual themes to sell the product, following the clips a couple that go on a date to a bar is presented. The scene ends as the man kisses the woman and puts his hand on her buttock, at which point she strongly protests. The facilitated discussion group analyzed issues related to date rape, discussed facts related to date rape, and had an open discussion period. The five intervention groups were composed as follows: group one was pre-tested and post-tested only; group two was pre-tested, saw the video, and was post-tested; group three was pre-tested, saw the video, participated in the discussion, and was post-tested; group four saw the video only and was post-tested only; group five saw the video, participated in the discussion, and was post-tested.
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Men in the pooled intervention groups demonstrated less blame and less endorsement of rape myths at post-test than men in the control group. Women, however, did not show any significant reductions. There were no differences between the video and the video plus discussion groups. Women endorsed less victim blame than men at post-test, but men had a greater change magnitude from pre-test to post-test than women. There were a couple of limitations; the cell sizes were quite small for some of the comparisons, and individual subjects were not randomly assigned to intervention conditions.

In a study designed to improve attitudes regarding date rape, 436 incoming students were randomly assigned to a control group or an intervention group (Lanier, Elliott, Martin, & Kapadia, 1998). Students in the intervention group viewed a play in which student-actors modeled desirable behaviors such as: listening to and supporting a survivor of sexual assault, protesting unwanted sexual behavior, communicating in relationships, and demonstrating that men are concerned about the issue of rape. Students in the control group viewed a play that addressed multicultural issues. The researchers found that the students in the intervention condition had significantly more desirable responses, such as less rape-tolerant attitudes and less endorsement of rape myths than those students in the control group at post-test. No differences were found between male and female participants. Students who scored the lowest on the pre-test (i.e., the bottom quartile) were examined separately in order to determine if the intervention was effective for those students who were in most need of date rape prevention. Again, those students in the intervention condition had less rape tolerant
attitudes, than those in the control group at post-test. One limitation to this study was the lack of follow-up.

Pinzone-Glover, Gidycz, and Jacobs (1998) evaluated an acquaintance rape prevention program using a controlled, randomized design in 152 subjects. Approximately 15 to 20 participants comprised each experimental program group consisting of a mixed gender of subjects. A male and female facilitator team led each group. The experimental program included the following components: subjects received statistical information regarding sexual assault, the subjects completed a myth and fact sheet and then participated in a discussion regarding the myths and facts. Facilitators identified behavioral characteristics and attitudes of rapists, described how women can increase their personal safety and how men could avoid situations that could lead to the perpetration of rape, and lastly, subjects received a list of agencies that could assist victims of sexual assault. The program lasted approximately 50 minutes. The comparison group was a sexually transmitted disease awareness program, in which subjects learned about prevalence and other relevant statistics, symptoms, complications and interventions for STDs, myths and facts, prevention strategies, and agencies that provide services to people with STDs.

The researchers told participants that they were participating in two separate experiments, one regarding judgments and attitudes of various issues and one regarding an evaluation of either a rape-awareness program, or a sexually transmitted diseases education program. The first “experiment” consisted of the participants completing pre-test measures and several distracter tasks. The pre-test assessments included measures that assess empathy toward a perpetrator or victim, attitude towards women,
and degree of acceptance with established rape myths. Participants were randomly assigned to either the intervention, or the control group. One week later, subjects returned to complete the same measures they completed in the pre-test session.

Following the post-test session, experimenters asked participants what they thought was the intent of the experiment (only 2% indicated that they had some knowledge of the true intent).

Both groups scored the same on the empathy measure at pre-test. However, at post-test subjects in the rape prevention condition demonstrated more empathy toward the rape victim. Men in the prevention group also demonstrated less traditional attitudes than men in the comparison group at post-test; however, women did not significantly change their attitudes toward women. Men in the prevention group changed more over time in their attitudes toward women than the women in the prevention group from pre-test to post-test. There were no differences found between the experimental and control group subjects in the degree of acceptance to rape myths. The experimenters also used three scenarios that met the legal definition for rape. Men in the rape prevention group were significantly more likely to define the scenarios as rape than men in the comparison group. Additionally men in the prevention group were more accurate in their definitions at post-test. There were no differences among the women between the two conditions. Thus, the program worked for men, but not for women. This study attempted to address the problem of demand characteristics, which appears successful. However, the follow-up time was brief, only one week.

Two hundred and fifty-eight randomly assigned subjects participated in a rape prevention program that examined differences among interventions (Heppner,
Humphrey, Hillenbrand-Gunn, & DeBord, 1995). A male and female pair of co-facilitators led the interactive drama group in which a pair of actors enacted a scene of a date that ends in rape. The actors then elicited responses from the audience as to how to prevent the rape. They then enacted a second scene incorporating the suggestions from the audience and prevented the rape from happening. The second group watched a didactic video that presented prevalence and statistical information, definitions of rape, and resources for the students. Additionally, the video contained survivors of rape speaking about the impact of their experience. Following the video, the audience participated in a question and answer session. The control group participated in a stress management workshop. Subjects participated in the groups five to seven days after a pre-test. Immediately following the group they were post-tested. They were then tested three additional times: five weeks after pre-test, four months after pre-test, and five months and one week after the pre-test.

The investigators did not find any differences among the intervention groups regarding rape myth acceptance, with one exception. The men in the didactic video group endorsed rape myths less than the men in the control group did. This study, although innovative in its conception and design, was disappointing in its results. The researchers did not describe the type of suggestions given by the audience; however, one possible problem is that the subjects themselves addressed issues that were more behavioral in nature, and this prevented the intervention from eliciting attitudes and beliefs regarding rape myths.

In conclusion, the studies reviewed generally had very different approaches to date rape intervention. Several components from these programs were chosen for the
current study, with some modification. The facilitators in Gilbert's intervention role-played vignettes and communicated directly with the participants which helped to reduce the participants' acceptance of rape myths (Gilbert et al., 1991). This aspect was incorporated in the current study. Schewe and O'Donohue instructed participants to imagine, while they watched a video of a victim describing her experiences, how a woman might feel before, during, and after and date rape. Following this exercise consequences of rape were discussed (1996). This resulted in the participants reporting more victim empathy. A modification of this exercise was included in the current study. Participants enacted a role-play in which one participant was instructed to resist the advances of another participant. The goal of this exercise was to facilitate increased victim empathy.

The majority of the studies reviewed used large groups of participants with some success; however one study used smaller groups of participants and also had success in decreasing traditional attitudes, and increasing empathy. The current study also used small groups of participants, so as to evaluate the effectiveness of this technique and to increase the communication and interaction between participants and facilitators.

Social psychology theories of attitude change propose that change occurs through cognitive dissonance. Cognitive dissonance is created by the presentation of two inconsistent ideas. This inconsistency creates discomfort for the individual who attempts to reduce the discomfort by choosing one of the ideas (Kimble, 1990). By exposing participants to ideas and attitudes that are antagonistic towards rape, cognitive dissonance may occur and thus forcing the participant to choose one idea over the
other. Further, Kelman proposes that what actually occurs is moral dissonance; a person's actions may clash with his or her sense of morality (1974; as cited in Kimble, 1990). Thus, the expectation is that the participant will choose attitudes that are consistent with societal moral beliefs about date rape (i.e., rape intolerance). Although the literature on the extent to which attitude change actually effects behavior change is mixed, it seems intuitive, that attitude may be necessary though perhaps not sufficient for behavior change.

After reviewing previous studies, the current study attempted to address the methodological flaws of some of the previous studies by including a control group which received attention, randomly assigning subjects to the two conditions (intervention and control), conducting pre-test, post-test and follow-up assessments with subjects. Secondly, this study attempted to build upon current interventions that have been shown effective.

In order to evaluate a date rape attitude intervention program the current study used randomly assigned participants to intervention and control conditions. Several hypotheses were tested to evaluate the effectiveness of this program. The first hypothesis was that the intervention group would have less endorsement of rape myths, rape attitudes, and rape behaviors, and more victim empathy than the control group at post-test and at follow-up. The intervention attempted, through discussion and role-play, to prompt participants to re-examine their own beliefs and attitudes and to debunk certain rape myths. Also, the goal of the role-play is to help participants increase empathy.
Secondly, the intervention group will be more satisfied with the intervention than the control group at post-test. Since the discussion control group will receive attention only, it is expected that the intervention activities will appeal to the participants more and they will feel like they learned more.
CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Participants

One hundred and two college students were initially recruited in this study. Fourteen subjects (seven from each condition) were excluded from the analyses because they did not return for the follow-up. Subjects who completed the study were no different with regards to pre-test scores, or demographic data, than subjects who did not complete the follow-up. The students were recruited by a subject sign-up board in the Psychology Department; Psychology 101 students must complete three hours of research participation of which the participants received all three provided they completed the follow-up. The sample demographics were: 60% Caucasian, 9% African-American, 8% Hispanic, 18% Asian, and 5% Other. The sample consisted of 43 women and 45 men. The average age of participants was 19.5 with a range from 17-39. Fifty-seven percent of subjects were freshman, 26% sophomores, 13% juniors, and 5% seniors. Most subjects were single (99%).

Measures

Rape Myth Acceptance Scale

The Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (RMAS; Burt, 1980) assesses acceptance or rejection of myths about rape (see Appendix I). The RMAS is a 19-item instrument; items are rated on a seven-point scale from 1 ("Disagree Strongly") to 7 ("Agree..."
Strongly”). The RMAS has good internal consistency (alpha coefficient = .88; Burt, 1980) and test-retest reliability (correlation = .84; Schewe & O’Donohue, 1995; as cited in Schewe & O’Donohue, 1996).

**Rape Supportive Attitude Scale**

The Rape Supportive Attitude Scale (RSAS; Lottes, 1988) consists of 20 questions that assess opinions about rape (see Appendix II). The items are rated on a five-point scale from 1 (“Strongly Agree”) to 5 (“Strongly Disagree”). No published data on psychometric properties were available for this measure.

**Rape Empathy Scale**

The Rape Empathy Scale (RES; Deitz, Tiemann Blackwell, Danley, & Bentley, 1982) is a 19-item scale designed to assess empathy toward rape victims and perpetrators (see Appendix III). Users of the scale choose between two statements, a victim-empathetic statement and a perpetrator-empathetic statement. After choosing which statement the person agrees with, he/she then rates the extent of agreement on a 7-point scale. Total RES scores range from 19, indicating extreme empathy with the rapist, to 133, indicating extreme empathy with the rape victim (Deitz & Byrnes, 1981). Item-total correlations for the RES range from .18-.52. Deitz and colleagues (1982) reported an alpha coefficient of .84, which indicates good internal consistency. Convergent and discriminant validity have also been demonstrated.

**Sexual Experiences Survey**

The Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss & Oros, 1982) identifies “hidden” victims and perpetrators of sexual assault (see Appendix IV). The scale is composed of ten dichotomously scored items. Internal consistency for the items has been reported,
using Cronbach's alpha, as .74 for women and .89 for men (Koss & Gidycz, 1985).

Additionally, Koss and Gidycz (1985) reported a 93% item agreement rate between two administrations.

Men and women were classified into one of four categories: coercion, attempted rape, rape, or none. If the subject answered yes to at least one question from each category then that subject was classified under all the appropriate levels of victimization/victimizing history. Subjects were additionally described by one variable, victimization status, the higher victimization category that the subject responded to was recorded in the status category (e.g., a subject answered yes to coercion and to rape, the subject would be classified as rape).

**College Date Rape Attitude and Behavior Survey**

The College Date Rape Attitude and Behavior Survey (CDRABS; Lanier & Elliott, 1997) consists of 20 items which were designed to measure attitudes toward rape and seven items which were designed to measure rape-related behavior (see Appendix V). The items are rated on a five-point scale from 1 (“Strongly Agree”) to 5 (“Strongly Disagree”). Scores range from 27 to 135, with higher scores being more desirable, that is, anti-rape. Internal consistency for the attitudes portion of the scale has been reported, using Cronbach's alpha, as .86 and .67 for the behaviors portion. Test-retest reliability coefficients for the attitudes have been reported as .94 and .89 for the behaviors portion. Some preliminary evidence for construct and criterion related validity has also been reported.
**Consumer Satisfaction Questionnaire**

Participants completed a consumer satisfaction questionnaire to determine how satisfied they were with the intervention, how much they felt they learned, whether they would recommend the intervention to others, how relevant the information was to them, how uncomfortable the intervention made them feel, and a space to provide other comments (see Appendix VI). The items were rated using a Likert-type scale from 1 (Not at all relevant to me or Not at all) to 5 (Extremely relevant to me or Tremendously relevant to me).

**Experimental Design**

Prior to the intervention, participants provided informed consent (see Appendix VII), a demographics questionnaire and the five measures listed above. Those participants who chose not to give consent to be audio taped were given full credit and were dismissed from the experiment. Participants were assigned an identification number. This identification number was placed on the questionnaires and an envelope. Participants were instructed to place the questionnaires in the coded envelope to ensure confidentiality. After their questionnaires were sealed, participants were matched by gender and age and then randomly assigned to either a date rape intervention condition (N=48), or a control condition (N=40). For both conditions (intervention and control), four group sessions were conducted with all female participants (N=29), three were conducted with all male participants (N=30), and three were conducted with half male and half female participants (N=29). Each group session lasted approximately 45 minutes. Two leaders, one male and one female, facilitated each group. Group
facilitators consisted of trained upper-division undergraduate students, and graduate students enrolled in a Clinical Psychology Master's Program.

Immediately after completing their respective experimental condition, participants completed the five questionnaires and the consumer satisfaction questionnaire. Participants also scheduled a follow-up (the average follow-up time was 14.6 days with a range of 9-31 days). Eighty-six percent of participants returned for the follow-up. Follow-up consisted of the participants completing the aforementioned five questionnaires.

Experimental Conditions

Non-directive Dating Discussion

Facilitators asked the participants several questions, from a protocol form, regarding dating relationships in the campus community (see Appendix VIII). Questions were asked until the facilitators ran out of time (i.e., 45 minutes). Subjects were not guided in any specific way by the co-facilitators. The co-facilitators listened carefully and reflected the responses given by the participants. Facilitators also stimulated discussion, based on the questions on the protocol form, when needed. This format allowed for an equivalent control group who received equal attention from facilitators.

Directive Role-Play

The experimental group leaders provided specific instructions to participants, utilizing a protocol form to ensure accuracy in delivering the intervention (see Appendix IX). First, the co-facilitators enacted a situation in which a male and a
female college student are in a situation that could potentially lead to date rape. Participants were asked to raise their hand during the role-play when they judged the actions by either one of the persons to be inappropriate, e.g., the male will call the female facilitator a tease. After the enactment, group leaders asked the participants questions from the protocol form (e.g., “why they felt the situation to be inappropriate,” “what the consequences for the male and female could be should the situation continue,” “how one might prevent such a situation from occurring”). Group leaders elicited potential consequences of the enacted scenario (feelings, thoughts, and behaviors).

The second part of the experimental group consisted of the participants enacting a role-play with one of the other subjects in the group. The group leaders designated one person as the “conviner” and one as the “resistor.” The conviner attempted to convince the resistor to engage in sexual activity. The resistor attempted to resist sexual advances. Following the participants’ role-plays, the leaders provided discussion questions regarding the participants’ thoughts and feelings during the role-play (e.g., how it felt to be either the resistor or the conviner).

Protocol Adherence

The groups were audio-taped in order to ensure that the leaders followed intervention protocol. In each experimental condition a prompting checklist specifying intervention strategies was used by facilitators. Two undergraduate students, who were blind as to the nature of the experiment, reviewed session audio tapes to determine
whether group leaders followed the protocol forms. They used the same protocol checklist the facilitators used to determine whether the facilitators followed protocol. Agreement was accomplished when both the raters ascertain that the facilitator said what they were supposed to say. Six tapes were randomly selected for review, one intervention and one control audio-tape from the all-female group, the all-male group, and the mixed-gender group.
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RESULTS

Protocol Adherence

Interrater percentage agreement was computed by calculating the quotient of number of items agreed on and number of items possible to agree on. The quotient was then multiplied by 100 to achieve a percentage. The two raters, blind to the study, had an interrater percentage agreement for the control condition of 83. For the intervention condition, the interrater percentage agreement was 93. This shows that most of the time the facilitators followed protocol; thus the interventions were given similarly to the different groups of subjects.

Pre-Test Differences

Subjects in the two experimental conditions did not differ on age and gender, as they were matched for these sociodemographic variables. There were also no differences with regards to race [$\chi^2(4, N = 88) = 2.50, p > .05$]. Subjects did not differ between the two conditions, with regards to pre-test scores on the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (RMAS), the Rape Empathy Scale (RES), the Rape Supportive Attitudes Scale (RSAS), or the College Date Rape Attitudes and Behavior Scale (CDRABS)(see Table 1).
Table 1

Pre-Test Scores in the Intervention and Control Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=48</td>
<td>N=40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMAS</td>
<td>44.14 18.31</td>
<td>41.75 12.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>109.67 12.34</td>
<td>107.81 13.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSAS</td>
<td>77.43 12.49</td>
<td>78.53 10.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDRABS</td>
<td>102.33 975</td>
<td>105.0 10.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p > .05

There were no pre-test differences between the groups with regards to prior victimization/victimizing history (as assessed by the Sexual Experiences Survey, Koss & Oros, 1982)(Table 2). Sixty-five percent of men and women in the intervention condition reported victimizing or being victimized compared to 38% in the control condition.

A 3 (Time; pre/post/follow-up) x 2 (Condition; intervention/control) Repeated-Measure Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was performed using four dependent variables (i.e., RMAS, RSAS, RES, CDRABS).
Table 2

Prevalence (%) of Victimization Among Women & Victimizing Among Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victimization/Victimizing</th>
<th>Intervention (n = 22)</th>
<th>Control (n = 21)</th>
<th>χ² (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coerced</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Rape</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raped</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>(n = 26)</td>
<td>(n = 19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who Coerced</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who Attempted Rape</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who Raped</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men &amp; Women Who</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimized or Were</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimized, Respectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show only one effect for time that was significant (Tables 3 & 4).

That is, both groups changed their rape-related attitudes, in the direction of showing a greater sensitivity to the issue over time, from pre-test to post-test to follow-up. More specifically, rape supportive attitudes decreased, belief in rape myths decreased, and
college date rape supportive attitudes and behaviors decreased, and empathy increased for both groups. There was no main effect for condition (intervention, control).

Table 3

Mean Scores and Standard Error for Date Rape Measures as a Function of Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Date Rape Measure</th>
<th>RMAS M</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>RES M</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>RSAS M</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>CDRABS M</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>44.14</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>109.67</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>77.43</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>102.33</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>41.75</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>107.81</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>78.53</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>105.00</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>41.68</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>110.63</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>80.31</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>104.23</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>40.18</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>107.32</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>80.18</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>104.20</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>38.84</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>109.67</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>79.90</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>106.74</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>39.98</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>110.35</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>81.55</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>106.74</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

**Multivariate and Univariate Analyses of Time for Date Rape Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MANOVA</th>
<th>RMAS</th>
<th>RSAS</th>
<th>RES</th>
<th>CDRABS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time (T)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F(4, 83)</td>
<td>F(1, 86)</td>
<td>F(1, 86)</td>
<td>F(1, 86)</td>
<td>F(1, 86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention (I)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T X I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Multivariate F ratios were generated from Wilks' Lambda. MANOVA = Multivariate Analysis of Variance. ANOVA = Analysis of Variance.

* p < .05.

**Consumer Satisfaction**

T-tests were performed to determine if any differences existed between the two conditions with regards to consumer satisfaction. The two conditions differed significantly on only one of the consumer satisfaction questions, "How much did this intervention make you feel uncomfortable?" The intervention condition reported feeling more uncomfortable than the control condition (Table 5).
Table 5

**Consumer Satisfaction Differences Between Intervention and Control Conditions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of Information</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeliness to Recommend Intervention to Others</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthiness of Topic</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncomfortableness</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.65*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-0.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Much Learned</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-0.208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .01.
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DISCUSSION

At the outset of this paper there were had two hypotheses. The first was that the intervention condition would have less endorsement of rape myths, rape attitudes, and rape behaviors, and more victim empathy than the control condition at post-test and at follow-up. Secondly, we hypothesized that the intervention condition would be more satisfied with the intervention than the control group at post-test. Neither of the stated hypotheses were supported in this study. Results indicated that attitudes did not significantly change as a function of intervention. Both conditions experienced an improvement as a function of time. This is a similar result to one found by Lenihan and colleagues (1992), although their intervention was more didactic in nature.

The fact that the intervention condition in this study did not produce more of a change than the control group may be attributed to several causes. First, the intervention was relatively short, only about 45 minutes. Changing beliefs and attitudes of a college student may take a lengthier intervention. Perhaps extending the sessions, or alternatively, providing more sessions would be appropriate. Secondly, all participants in this study were pre-tested. Past studies have shown that the very pre-testing of participants, without the benefit of intervention, has changed attitudes and beliefs (Fonow et al., 1992; Lenihan et al., 1992). The mere exposure to questionnaires that make participants think about, and evaluate, their attitudes may have had a sensitizing effect all on its own.
This presents an interesting methodological dilemma for research. How are we to test effectiveness of treatment if pre-testing has a "treatment" effect? Fonow and Lenihan used the randomizing Solomon four-group design to address this issue (Campbell & Stanley, 1963; as cited in Fonow et al., 1992). The design consists of having a pre-tested group and a non pre-tested group for each intervention condition. In other words, in the current study, half of the subjects in the intervention and control conditions would not have completed a pre-test, rather they would have participated in the intervention and then been post-tested only. This design may control for the sensitizing effects of pre-tests. However, this type of design was not feasible in the current study due to the small sample size. Future research may want to strive to use this type of design to control for these types of effects.

Because we did not have significant effects in this study, it is difficult to posit what role in victimization/victimizing history may play. However, it does raise the issue of testing for victimization/victimizing history. Overall, the literature has not shown that victimization history has been taken into account when evaluating date rape intervention programs. However, one study did assess for victimization history and found only those participants with no previous victimization history benefited from the intervention (Hanson & Gidycz, 1993). This result may lead one to believe that this is an important variable to examine when conducting intervention programs. The experiences of people who have been sexually assaulted, or who have sexually assaulted, are different from those who have not. This may affect the responses on instruments designed to measure attitudes and beliefs regarding date rape. For this reason it is important to examine whether participants in different intervention
conditions vary regarding their past victimization/victimizing histories before proceeding with evaluation of programs addressing the issue of date rape.

Another methodological issue of significance is the assumption that women are victims and men are the victimizers. Although, this is generally the case, it is not true in all cases. Thus this study could be missing important victimization/victimizing information in several areas: men victimizing men, women victimizing women, or women victimizing men. This issue could be important for future research to examine and to address in interventions.

Gender differences bring up another interesting direction for future studies. The skills and ideas that researchers have attempted to teach men and women regarding date rape may need to be more specifically geared towards a certain gender. Women may need to learn different skills than men, such as, being assertive with her communication regarding sexual experiences. Whereas men may need to learn how distorted cognitions play a role in date rape and how to avoid situations that could lead to date rape. The implication of this is that interventions may need to be tailored to each gender and perhaps only combining the genders to teach things such as victim empathy.

Another possible explanation for the lack of results was the fact that perhaps this intervention did not address issues raised in the pre-test directly enough. The approach used in this study was geared towards a “nonconfrontational” approach. Dallager and Rosen evaluated a similar method in changing rape supportive attitudes and beliefs (1993). Their rationale for using a nonconfrontational approach was that a previous study evaluated a date rape attitude intervention using a more confrontational approach and a nonconfrontational approach (Winkel, 1984; as cited in Dallager &
Rosen, 1993). The results were that the subjects exposed to the confrontational approach actually had a "boomerang effect;" the subjects saw the offender’s behavior as more acceptable rather than less acceptable. The current study apparently did not have either effect, but it may raise the question that an approach somewhere between confrontational and nonconfrontational for altering rape attitudes may be worth investigating.

Several parts of this intervention could be altered in the future. For example, more role-plays between the subjects may improve victim empathy. In addition, a rape myth debunking session could be added, during which facilitators could elicit rape myths from the subjects and then discussion could follow. Two studies that included a discussion of rape myths and facts found that participants’ attitudes changed in the desired direction (Fonow et al., 1992; Pinzone-Glover et al., 1998). Gilbert and colleagues utilized a discussion of negative consequences of sexual assault in their intervention which was successful in changing date rape attitudes (1991). In addition, a discussion of the importance of cognitions in preventing sexual assault and the role that they play in sexual assaults could be added, as Schewe and O’Donohue did successfully (1996). Lanier and colleagues found that having the subjects view a play in which actors modeled desirable behaviors had a positive affect on the subjects’ attitudes regarding date rape. Finally, an idea that has not been evaluated in the literature would include the subjects completing an attitude survey and then discussing during the group session. Even further, participants could complete the assessment anonymously and then hand it in to the facilitator; the facilitator could then randomly return the
assessment to a different participant. In this way, the participants could talk about the responses actually given by the group, but the responses would remain anonymous.

An additional limitation in this study is that social desirability was not assessed. Participants in both groups may have presented themselves in a more positive light due to social desirability, creating a ceiling effect that the intervention could not overcome. In the future, a measure of social desirability could be added to potentially avoid such an issue. Another problem may have been the demand characteristics of the study. It could be argued that all participants felt it was expected that they would improve their attitudes regarding date rape.

Lastly, the consumer satisfaction questionnaire showed generally that participants rated the information in the intervention as relevant to them, they would be likely to recommend the intervention to other students, they considered it a very worthy topic, they enjoyed the intervention, and felt they learned some information. The subjects in the intervention condition reported feeling more uncomfortable (i.e., they reported feeling a little uncomfortable as compared with the control group who reported feeling not at all uncomfortable) with the intervention than did the subjects in the control condition. This result is to be expected, and one could go as far as to say desirable. Subjects in the control condition discussed topics centering on dating, which to most people would seem an innocuous topic. However, subjects in the intervention condition spent their group time talking about rape and the consequences of rape, which can be an emotional topic. One might hope for participants to feel more uncomfortable talking about date rape because it is an uncomfortable issue. Additionally, if participants are questioning their attitudes and beliefs they might feel uncomfortable,
this could be what one would want if one hopes to change attitudes and beliefs. Alternatively, the intervention should not make participants feel excessively uncomfortable because then they may be more resistant to change and to the information in general. In a broader sense, if clients are too uncomfortable with the intervention being provided to them, they may not come back for the treatment. A final consideration for the difference in comfort level is that this difference could be an indication of treatment integrity. This could show that, although there were no differences between the two conditions, the two conditions were in fact different interventions.

Overall, the evaluation of this intervention showed that it did not produce any differences between the groups, and after including victimization history, there were no differences within the groups either. However, one important direction for future research would include examining the effects of victimization history on the outcome results of such interventions. Additionally, future research may examine the effect of longer intervention sessions, or of a more long-term intervention. Despite the challenges of doing intervention research in this difficult area, it is imperative that we continue refining our interventions to impact on this growing problem.
APPENDIX I
RAPE MYTH ACCEPTANCE SCALE

For the statements which follow, please circle the number that best indicates your opinion—what you believe. 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>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Neutral slightly</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Agree somewhat</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Any female can get raped.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) One reason that women falsely report a rape is that they frequently have a need to call attention to themselves.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Any healthy woman can successfully resist a rapist if she really wants to.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) When women go around braless or wearing short skirts or tight tops, they are just asking for trouble.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Women who get raped while hitchhiking get what they deserve.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Many women have the unconscious wish to be raped, and may then unconsciously set up a situation in which they are likely to be attacked.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

10) In the majority of rapes the victim is promiscuous or has a bad reputation.

11) If a girl engages in necking or petting and she lets things get out of hand, it is her own fault if her partner forces sex on her.

Please use the following key to answer the next two questions.

Circle the number that shows what fraction you believe to be true.

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?
**Please use the following key to answer the next question.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Half the time</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</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>
</tbody>
</table>

14) A person comes to you and claims they were raped. How likely would you be to believe their statement if the person were:

- Your best friend? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- An Indian woman? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- A neighborhood woman? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- A young boy? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- A black woman? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- A white woman? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
APPENDIX II

RAPE SUPPORTIVE ATTITUDE SCALE

For the statements which follow, please circle the number that best indicates your opinion—what you believe. Indicate whether you strongly agree (1), agree (2), are undecided or have no opinion (3), disagree (4), or strongly disagree (5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Being roughed up is sexually stimulating to many women.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) A man has some justification in forcing a female to have sex with him when she led him to believe she would go to bed with him.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The degree of a woman’s resistance should be the major factor in determining if a rape has occurred.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) The reason most rapists commit rape is for sex.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) If a girl engages in necking or petting and she lets things get out of hand, it is her fault if her partner forces sex on her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Many women falsely report that they have been raped because they are pregnant and want to protect their reputation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) A man has some justification in forcing a woman to have sex with him if she allowed herself to be picked up.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td>Sometimes the only way a man can get a cold woman turned on is to use force.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)</td>
<td>A charge of rape two days after the act has occurred is probably not rape.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10)</td>
<td>A raped woman is a less desirable woman.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11)</td>
<td>A man is somewhat justified in forcing a woman to have sex with him if he has had sex with her in the past.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12)</td>
<td>In order to protect the male, it should be difficult to prove that a rape has occurred.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13)</td>
<td>Many times a woman will pretend she doesn't want to have intercourse because she doesn't want to seem loose, but she's really hoping the man will force her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14)</td>
<td>A woman who is stuck-up and thinks she is too good to talk to guys deserves to be taught a lesson.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15)</td>
<td>One reason that women falsely report rape is that they frequently have a need to call attention to themselves.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16)</td>
<td>In the majority of rapes the victim is promiscuous or has a bad reputation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18)</td>
<td>Rape is the expression of an uncontrollable desire for sex.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19) A man is somewhat justified in forcing a woman to have sex with him if they have dated for a long time.

20) Rape of a woman by a man she knows can be defined as "a woman who changed her mind afterwards."
APPENDIX III

RAPE EMPATHY SCALE

Directions: For each item circle the statement you prefer and indicate the degree of preference for one statement over the other. Mark preference using the following code:

Strong preference Neutral No preference
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1. a) I feel that the situation in which a man compels a woman to submit to sexual intercourse against her will is an unjustifiable act under any circumstances.

b) I feel that the situation in which a man compels a woman to submit to sexual intercourse against her will is a justifiable act under certain circumstances.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. a) In deciding the matter of guilt or innocence in a rape case, it is more important to know about the past sexual activity of the alleged rape victim than the past sexual activity of the alleged rapist.

b) It is more important to know about the past sexual activity of the alleged rapist than the past sexual activity of the alleged rape victim in deciding the matter of guilt or innocence in a rape case.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. a) In general, I feel that rape is an act that is provoked by the rape victim.

b) In general, I feel that rape is an act that is not provoked by the rape victim.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. a) I would find it easier to imagine how a rapist might feel during an actual rape than how a rape victim might feel.

b) I would find it easier to imagine how a rape victim might feel during an actual rape than how a rapist might feel.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. a) Under certain circumstances, I can understand why a man would use force to obtain sexual relations with a woman.
   b) I cannot understand why a man would use force to obtain sexual relations with a woman under any circumstances.

6. a) In a court of law, I feel that the rapist must be held accountable for his behavior during the rape.
   b) In a court of law, I feel that the rape victim must be held accountable for her behavior during the rape.

7. a) When a woman dresses in a sexually attractive way, she must be willing to accept the consequences of her behavior, whatever they are, since she is signaling her interest in having sexual relations.
   b) A woman has the right to dress in a sexually attractive way whether she is really interested in having sexual relations or not.

8. a) I would find it easier to empathize with the shame and humiliation a rapist might feel during a trial for rape than with the feelings a rape victim might have during the trial.
   b) I would find it easier to empathize with the shame and humiliation a rape victim might feel during a trial to prove rape than with the feelings a rapist might have during the trial.

9. a) If a man rapes a sexually active woman, he would probably be justified in his actions by the fact that she chooses to have sexual relations with other men.
   b) If a man rapes a sexually active woman, his actions would not be justified by the fact that she chooses to have sexual relations with other men.

10. a) I believe that all women secretly want to be raped.
    b) I don't believe that any women secretly want to be raped.

11. a) In deciding whether a rape has occurred or not, the burden of proof should rest with the woman, who must prove that a rape has actually occurred.
    b) In deciding whether a rape has occurred or not, the burden of proof should rest with the man who must prove that a rape has not actually occurred.
12. a) After a rape has occurred, I think the woman would suffer more emotional torment in dealing
with the police than the man would.

b) After a rape has occurred, I think the man would suffer more emotional torment in dealing with
the police that the woman would.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. a) I feel it is impossible for a man to rape a woman unless she is willing.

b) I feel it is possible for a man to rape a woman against her will.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. a) If a rape trial were publicized in the press, I feel the rape victim would suffer more emotional
trauma from the publicity than the rapist.

b) If a rape trial were publicized in the press, I feel the rapist would suffer more emotional trauma
from the publicity than the rape victim.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. a) Once a couple has had sexual intercourse, then that issue is resolved and it is no longer possible
for that man to rape than woman.

b) Even if a couple has had sexual intercourse before, if the man forces the woman to have sexual
intercourse with him against her will, this should be considered rape.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. a) I can understand a wife’s humiliation and anger if her husband forced her to have sexual
relations with him.

b) A husband has every right to determine when sexual relations with his wife occur, even if it
means forcing her to have sex with him.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. a) If I were a member of the jury in a rape trial, I would probably be more likely to believe the
woman’s testimony than the man’s, since it takes a lot of courage on the woman’s part to accuse the
man of rape.

b) If I were a member of the jury in a rape trial, I would probably be more likely to believe the
man’s testimony than the woman’s, since rape is a charge that is difficult to defend against,
even if the man is innocent.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
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18. a) I can understand a wife's humiliation and anger if her husband forced her to have sexual relations with him.

b) A husband has every right to determine when sexual relations with his wife occur, even if it means forcing her to have sex with him.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. a) If I were a member of the jury in a rape trial, I would probably be more likely to believe the woman's testimony than the man's, since it takes a lot of courage on the woman's part to accuse the man of rape.

b) If I were a member of the jury in a rape trial, I would probably be more likely to believe the man's testimony than the woman's, since rape is a charge that is difficult to defend against, even if the man is innocent.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
APPENDIX IV

SEXUAL EXPERIENCES SURVEY

Have you ever:

1. Had sexual intercourse with a man (woman) when you both wanted to? YES  NO

2. Had a man (woman) misinterpret the level of sexual intimacy you desired? YES  NO

3. Been in a situation where a man (you) became so sexually aroused that you felt it was useless to stop him even though you did not want to have sexual intercourse? (could not stop yourself even though the woman didn’t want to?) YES  NO

4. Had sexual intercourse with a man (woman) even though you (she) didn’t really want to because he (you) threatened to end your relationship otherwise? YES  NO

5. Had sexual intercourse with a man (woman) when you (she) didn’t really want to because you (she) felt pressured by his (your) continual argument? YES  NO

6. Found out that a man had obtained sexual intercourse with you by saying things that he didn’t really mean? (Obtained sexual intercourse by saying things you didn’t really mean?) YES  NO

7. Been in a situation where a man (you) used some degree of physical force (twisting your [her] arm, holding you [her] down, etc.) to try to make you (a woman) engage in kissing or petting when you (she) didn’t want to? YES  NO

8. Been in a situation where a man (you) tried to get sexual intercourse with you (a woman) when you (she) didn’t want to by threatening to use physical force (twisting your [her] arm, holding you [her] down, etc.) if you (she) didn’t cooperate, but for various reasons sexual intercourse did not occur? YES  NO

9. Been in a situation where a man (you) used some degree of physical force (twisting your [her] arm, holding you [her] down, etc.) to try to get you (a woman) to have sexual intercourse with him (you) when you (she) didn’t want to, but for various reasons sexual intercourse did not occur? YES  NO
10. Had sexual intercourse with a man (woman) when you (she) didn’t want to because he (you) threatened to use physical force (twisting your [her] arm, holding you [her] down, etc.) if you (she) didn’t cooperate? YES NO

11. Had sexual intercourse with a man (woman) when you (she) didn’t want to because he (you) used some degree of physical force (twisting your [her] arm, holding you [her] down, etc.)? YES NO

12. Been in a situation where a man (you) obtained sexual acts with you (a woman) such as anal or oral intercourse when you (she) didn’t want to by using threats or physical force (twisting your [her] arm, holding you [her] down, etc.)? YES NO

13. Have you ever been raped (raped a woman)? YES NO
APPENDIX V

COLLEGE DATE RAPE ATTITUDE AND BEHAVIOR SURVEY

For the statements which follow, please circle the number that best indicates your opinion—what you believe. Indicate whether you *strongly agree* (1), *agree* (2), are *neutral* (3), *disagree* (4), or *strongly disagree* (5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Males and females should share the expenses of a date.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I believe that talking about sex destroys the romance of that particular moment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Most women enjoy being submissive in sexual relations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I stop the first time my date says “no” to sexual activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If a woman dresses in a sexy dress she is asking for sex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If a woman asks a man out on a date then she is definitely interested in having sex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I have sex when I am intoxicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. In the majority of date rapes the victim is promiscuous or has a bad reputation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A man is entitled to intercourse if his partner had agreed to it but at the last moment changed her mind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Many women pretend they don’t want to have sex because they don’t want to appear “easy.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I have sex when my partner is intoxicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. A man can control his behavior no matter how sexually aroused he feels.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. When I want to touch someone sexually I try it and see how they react.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I believe that alcohol and other drugs affect my sexual decision making.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The degree of a woman’s resistance should be a major factor in determining if a rape has occurred.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. When a woman says “no” to sex what she really means is “maybe.”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. If a woman lets a man buy her dinner or pay for a movie or drinks, she owes him sex.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I won’t stop sexual activity when asked to if I am already sexually aroused.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Women provoke rape by their behavior.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Women often lie about being raped to get back at their dates.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I make out in remotely parked cars.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. It is okay to pressure a date to drink alcohol in order to improve one’s chances of getting one’s date to have sex.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. When a woman asks her date back to her place, I expect that something sexual will take place.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. When I hear a sexist comment I indicate my displeasure.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Date rapists are usually motivated by overwhelming, unfulfilled sexual desire.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. In most cases when a woman was raped she was asking for it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. When a woman fondles a man’s genitals it means she has consented to sexual intercourse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX VI

CONSUMER SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer the following questions according to the 1 to 5 scale.

1. The information that I learned was:
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not at all relevant</th>
<th>a little relevant</th>
<th>relevant</th>
<th>very relevant</th>
<th>extremely relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to me</td>
<td>to me</td>
<td>to me</td>
<td>to me</td>
<td>to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How likely are you to recommend this intervention to other students:
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>a little</th>
<th>somewhat</th>
<th>a lot</th>
<th>tremendously</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How much do you consider this a worthy topic:
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>a little</th>
<th>somewhat</th>
<th>a lot</th>
<th>tremendously</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How much did the intervention make you feel uncomfortable:
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>a little</th>
<th>somewhat</th>
<th>a lot</th>
<th>tremendously</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How much did you enjoy this intervention:
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>a little</th>
<th>somewhat</th>
<th>a lot</th>
<th>tremendously</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. How much do you feel you learned:
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nothing</th>
<th>a little</th>
<th>some</th>
<th>a lot</th>
<th>tremendous amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. What did you like the least:

   ____________________________________________________________

8. What did you like the most:

   ____________________________________________________________

9. What would you add:

   ____________________________________________________________

10. Are there any other comments you would like to add:

   ____________________________________________________________
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APPENDIX VII

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Shera Beadner, a graduate student in psychology at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas is interested in evaluating the effectiveness of two groups with regard to the effect it may have on attitudes college students have about sexual activity. Dr. Donohue, an assistant professor in the psychology department at UNLV will be supervising the study.

You will be randomly assigned to one of two groups. Then you will be asked to fill out five short questionnaires, which consist of questions regarding attitudes about sexual activity. You will then be asked to participate in a group, and then complete five questionnaires. This will take approximately 1 and ½ to 2 hours and you will receive two hours or research credit hours. Additionally, you will be asked to complete a short follow-up interview in one month for which you will receive an additional one-hour of research credit.

All data obtained in this study is confidential, and will be available only to authorized staff members of the study. Participant records will be destroyed in three years, and reports to others will not include any information that identifies who participated in the study. Subject names will not be listed on any study questionnaires.

Discussion of some sensitive topics may take place in the groups; however, no student will be required to disclose anything if that student feels uncomfortable. If you should desire to discuss sensitive issues following the study, you could contact Student Psychological Services at 702-895-3627. Should any problems or questions arise, contact Dr. Donohue at 702-895-0181, Shera Beadner at 702-895-2468, or the Office of Sponsored Projects at 702-895-1357.

Audio Consent

The University of Nevada, Las Vegas is committed to the training of its students who wish to pursue mental health professions. Faculty, staff, and counselors may audio tape sessions for the purpose of supervision, and research with the expressed written consent of study participants. We would therefore appreciate your cooperation and authorization in allowing us to audio-tape your sessions. This consent may be revoked, in writing, at any time.

The subject authorizes the audio taping of her/his participation for supervisory and research purposes. The tapes may be reviewed by staff and/or supervisors to
ensure quality service, and the tapes will be erased in three years. The subject further authorizes audio taping of her/his participation for professional education, evaluation, training, and research purposes. Tapes may be reviewed by University of Nevada, Las Vegas faculty and students in educational settings but identifying information will be omitted and confidentiality will be strictly maintained.

I do consent to have my study participation audio taped:

__________________________
Signature of Subject

I do not consent to have my study participation audio taped:

__________________________
Signature of Subject

Note: Denying consent to be audio taped will in no way affect subject participation in this study.

I have been given an opportunity to ask questions about the project, and am satisfied I understand what is expected of me. I understand that I can withdraw from participation at any time without penalty.

I _______________________ have read this Informed Consent Form on_____________ and fully understand the information above.

(today’s date)

Participant ___________________________ Date ___________________

Experimenter ___________________________ Date ___________________

(signature)
APPENDIX VIII

CONTROL GROUP PROTOCOL CHECKLIST

Introductions

First researcher ⇒ “Hello, my name is ______.”
Second researcher ⇒ “And my name is ________. We are going to be facilitating the group today.”

“Today we are going to talk about dating in college. We will begin the discussion and have several topics for which we can talk—we would like everyone to contribute.”

“Are there any questions?”

I. Questions

1. “What is the definition of a date?”
2. “What is the purpose of dates?”
3. “What are the expectations from each person on a date?” e.g., who should pay, decide where to go
4. “How is dating in college different from dating in high school?”
5. “Where do college students go to meet a dating partner?”
6. “Where do college students go on dates?”
7. “What do college students do on dates?”
8. “Is it ok to date friends?”
9. “What do you think of having sex with friends?”
10. “Is it ok to have sex on the first date?”
11. “What do you think of one-night stands?”
12. “What are important characteristics/traits in a mate?”
13. “When does “just dating” turn into a relationship?”
14. “What do you think of dating several people at the same time?”
15. “What about having multiple sexual partner?”
16. “What’s the best way to end a date?”
17. “What are some things that you normally wouldn’t do just to get a date?”
18. “How do you break off dating relationships?”
19. “What do you think about dating a friend’s ex-boyfriend/girlfriend?”
20. “If it is ok, are there certain “rules?” Such as, how good a friend the person is, how serious the relationship, etc.
21. “Do you feel there are any restrictions on dating partners?” e.g., race, religion, educational background, etc.
22. “How long should people date before they consider marriage?”
23. “What do you think about living together before marriage/engagement?”
APPENDIX IX

INTERVENTION GROUP PROTOCOL CHECKLIST

I. Introductions-READ DIRECTIONS SLOWLY

First researcher ⇒ “Hello, my name is ________.”
Second researcher ⇒ “And my name is ________. We are going to be facilitating the group today.”

“This group will have several components-first, we (the co-facilitators) will model a role-play of an interaction between a college student male and female. Then we will discuss that role-play. Following the discussion, we will ask you to split up into groups and try a role-play. Again, we will come together and discuss certain aspects about your role-plays.”

“The goal of this exercise is to increase awareness into certain issues that may come up when in date situations; additionally, we hope that everyone will learn something they did not know before.”

Any questions?

II. “In a moment we’re going to enact a situation that occurs in college campuses across the country. We will first read you some background information about the scenario. Then we will enact the situation. The situation may be judged to be appropriate or inappropriate. If you think it is inappropriate, we want you to raise your hand as soon as you think it is, and keep it raised. We will continue to act out the situation until time runs out. Remember to raise your hand if you think the enactment is inappropriate, and keep it down if the situation is appropriate.”

“Are there any questions?”

III. Read Scenario-female researcher

“James/Howard and I are at my apartment. My roommate is out of town. We met earlier in the evening at a party. It was my first college part and I got very buzzed. I flirted with James/Howard at the party and told James/Howard that we should go back to my place for a couple of drinks where it would be more quiet and we could get to know one another better. We were laughing and having a good time watching tv on my sofa. Then James/Howard and I began kissing and he put his hand on my breast. I moved away from him and he said.........”
IV. Enact role-play
   A. Male facilitator should:
      1. ask what is wrong
      2. mention how attractive/sexy she is
      3. how he'd been watching her all night
      4. persist in attempts for sexual interaction
      5. attempt a massage
      6. call her a tease
      7. say she shouldn't have brought him to her apartment if she didn't want to have sex

   B. Female facilitator should:
      1. passively resist
      2. echo his sentiments, e.g., I find you attractive too, but...
      3. persist in telling him she does not want sexual activity
      4. alternate between looks of anger and fear
      5. become increasingly upset and firm in her resistance

V. Discussion questions
   A. “Why did some of you want to stop the enactment early?”
   B. “In other situations similar to this one-what other cues could indicate that the other person does not want the sexual activity to proceed?”
   C. “What do you think the consequences for (male) would have been if the situation were to continue?”
      Elicit feeling, thought, & behavioral consequences
   D. “What do you think the consequences for (female) would have been if the situation were to continue?”
      Elicit feeling, thought & behavioral consequences

VI. Pair the students in preparation for their role-play component & designate the resistor and the person wanting the sexual encounter

VII. Read instructions
    “The person who is trying to convince the other to engage in sexual activity will try to convince the resistor to have sex. They have both agreed to talk a long evening walk in a remote part of campus after attending a party. The resistor says that it's getting late and that they should go home. The other person starts to force a kiss on the other person.”

    Instruct the resistor to resist the advances and the other person to persist.

VIII. Discussion
    A. Ask each resistor “What were you thinking about in that situation?”
“How did you feel during the interaction?”

B. Ask each aggressor “What were you thinking during the role-play?”

C. “Any other thoughts/feelings?”
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