PEER VERSUS PROFFESIONAL TRAINERS: EDUCATING FRATERNITIES

ABOUT RAPE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT

By

Melani Duvall

B.A., Eastern Kentucky University, 2009

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences of the University
of Louisville in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Sociology

University of Louisville

Louisville, Kentucky

August 2012

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

PEER VERSUS PROFFESIONAL TRAINERS: EDUCATING FRATERNITIES

ABOUT RAPE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT

Melani Duvall

July 24, 2012

Literature surrounding sexual assault prevention programs for college men debate the effectiveness of peer and professional educators. The goal of this study was to test the peer educator model against the professional educator model in a program designed to educate fraternities about rape and sexual assault. Participants completed the Bystander Efficacy Scale prior to the program, immediately after, and at a two week follow up. Results found no difference between the peer and professional educators, suggesting that peer educators may be as effective as professionals provided they are properly educated. This study adds to the growing literature on methods to use in college men's sexual assault prevention programs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Men's violence against women has played a major role in the lives of women for much of history (Brownmiller, 1975). Women have lived with laws that justify and condone this violence, societies that are supportive of it, and with a fear of men (Brownmiller, 1975; Dobash & Dobash, 1979) This fear has greatly limited women's movement in society, often times forcing them to seek protection from other men (Brownmiller, 1975).

College campuses are an area where this limited movement is visible. The college experience for women is much different than for men. Women on college campuses often take fewer night classes, go to the library less, and depend on men to escort them at night (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997). Kelly and Torres (2006) found that college women were concerned for their safety and "were not experiencing equality of educational opportunity due to fears for their personal safety" (p. 33). This fear is not without good reason. Twenty to twenty-five percent of women on college campuses have experienced rape or attempted rape (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2008). While women fear the public sphere as a place where potential rapists are lying in wait, this fear of stranger rape is unsupported by research; women are far more likely to be raped by someone they know than by a stranger (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000).

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) study of rape on college campuses found that 9 oue of 10 victims of rape or attempted rape knew their offender; the offender was likely to be a boyfriend, classmate, co-worker, ex-boyfriend, or acquaintance (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000). Women on campus are far less likely to be attacked by a stranger than someone they know.

To combat these high rates of sexual victimization, many studies have focused on the behaviors of women and how these contribute to their likelihood of being victimized (Romeo, 2004; Benson, Gohm, & Gross, 2007; Crawford, Wright, & Birchmeier, 2008; Messman-Moore, Coates, Gaffey, & Johnson, 2008). Prevention efforts targeted at women often work toward risk reduction behaviors, actions women can take to prevent sexual assault, and it is often these actions that greatly limit women's movements and freedoms on campus.

More recently, researchers have begun focusing on men and how they can work to reduce sexual victimization rates of women (Funk, 1993; Foubert, 2005; Katz, 2006; Burgess, 2007; Rothman & Silverman, 2007; Girard & Senn, 2008; Kimble, Neacsiu, Flack, & Horner, 2008; O'Byrne, Hansen, & Rapley, 2008; Stephens & George, 2008; Brown & Messman-Moore, 2009; Currier & Carlson, 2009; Chapleau & Oswald, 2010; Foubert, Godin, & Tatum, 2010; Griffith, Hart, & Brickel, 2010; Hillenbrand-Gunn, Heppner, Mauch, & Park, 2010; McMahon, 2010; Rau et al., 2010; Rich, Utley, Janke, & Moldoveanu, 2010). As Schwartz and DeKeseredy (1997) put it: "Sexual assault on the college campus will not stop until men stop sexually assaulting women" (p. 165). Among these studies are various ideas and approaches for educating men about rape and

sexual assault. As prevention programs for men are a relatively recent phenomenon, techniques and the content for the programs are still being tested and debated.

One such debate is whether peer educators are more effective than professional educators. Peer education is a popular method in educating students about sexual assault (Fennel, 1993; Simon, 1993; Lonsway, 1996; Anderson & Whiston, 2005). Peer educators are popular because they are less expensive, increase the number of students who can be reached (Fennel, 1993), peers remain in contact with students socially and academically (Stein, 2007), and put students at ease when discussing difficult issues (Simon, 1993). However, in their meta analysis of sexual assault education programs and their effectiveness, Anderson & Whiston (2005) found that peer educators were not as successful in changing attitudes as professionals. Anderson & Whiston (2005) call for more research surrounding the effectiveness of peer educators before drawing conclusions.

This study will directly address this debate in the literature by testing the peer educator model against the professional educator model in a program designed to educate fraternities about rape and sexual assault.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Rape on college campuses is shrouded by ambiguity (Kahn, 2004; Burnett et al., 2009). Many students are unclear about the definition of rape, stranger versus acquaintance rape, the role of alcohol in rape, and who is to blame for the assault (Kahn, 2004; Anderson, 2007; Burnett et al., 2009). In their study of the relationship between communication and rape culture on campuses, Burnett et al. (2009) found that students were unable to provide a clear definition of consent when discussing date rape. They also found that in instances of date rape, students placed responsibility for the rape on the victim, questioning her behavior before and during the rape (Burnett et al., 2009). Anderson (2007) found that students perceived stranger rape, perpetrated by a male on a female, as more common than acquaintance rape when asked which was typical.

These studies illustrate the uncertainty with which college students understand rape. Rape is understood as an act perpetrated by a stranger rather than someone known to the victim. When alcohol is involved, students are unclear if the experience is considered rape. Often times the responsibility is placed on the victim, who is blamed for having been so drunk or who should have said no more forcefully (Burnett et al, 2009). Women may not label their own sexual assault experience as rape, though they have clearly described a rape experience (Kahn, 2004). In his study on women labeling their sexual assault experiences as rape, Kahn (2004) found that women assaulted by a boyfriend, or when they were under the influence of alcohol or drugs, were not likely to

call their experience rape, while women who were attacked by someone other a

boyfriend were likely to call their experience rape. When asked to analyze the sexual

assault experiences, outside observers also concluded that women assaulted by a

boyfriend or while under the influence of alcohol were not victims of rape (Kahn, 2004).

These studies are troubling as college students are lacking vital knowledge about rape on

college campuses. Typical rapes are perpetrated by someone the victim knows, and often

alcohol is involved (Lawyer, Resnick, Bakanic, Burkett, & Kilpatrick, 2010). Holding

such misperceptions as these put women at risk, giving them a false sense of security

around those they know and in situations where alcohol is present. These misperceptions

are also dangerous for men. If women are unable to label their experiences as rape, how

can men be expected to know their actions meet the legal definition of rape? It is clear

that more education about this issue is needed for college students. Focusing on young

women has been one method of providing this education.

Several studies concentrate on women's role in their own sexual assault by

focusing on their behaviors and actions leading up to and during an assault, as well as

factors likely to make a woman more vulnerable to assault. (Romeo, 2004; Benson,

Gohm, & Gross, 2007; Crawford, Wright, & Birchmeier, 2008;Messman-Moore, Coates,

Gaffey, & Johnson, 2008). Messman-Moore, Coates, Gaffey, & Johnson (2008) explore

women's sexuality, personality characteristics, substance use and their relation to rape

and sexual coercion, deciding that these factors should be addressed to help women stay

away from unsafe situations. A history of sexual assault is related to risky behaviors, it is

suggested these women be provided education concerning the unique factors putting

them at risk (Crawford, Wright, & Birchmeier, 2008). Those with a prior history of

sexual assault also consume more alcohol than those without such a history, and alcohol consumption impairs women's abilities to resist sexually aggressive men or to communicate effectively (Benson, Gohm, & Gross, 2007). A relationship exists between number of sex partners and sexual assault. Benson, Gohm, & Gross (2007) theorize that increased frequency of sex with various men "increases the likelihood that a women will come in contact with an aggressive man, and thus increase her chances of becoming a victim of sexual assault" (p. 348). Other studies provide a hefty list of precautionary steps necessary to avoid sexual assault, including the following: stay with friends, avoid intoxication, no sharing or exchanging drinks, do not become isolated, be extremely alert in situations where alcohol is served, keep friends in sight in social settings, no drinking from a punch bowl, etc (Romeo, 2004).

The common denominator in this literature is the focus a woman's role in her own sexual victimization. Men's role in the perpetration is largely overlooked, as are suggestions for male prevention initiatives. A focus on the behaviors and psychological traits of those who are victimized takes the attention away from the perpetrators of the assault and places it on the risky behaviors or psychological conditions of the woman assaulted, taking away responsibility from men and placing it on women. It becomes the woman's responsibility to prevent her attack. She needs to watch how much she drinks so that she can effectively ward off an attack, she should be constantly vigilant to her environment at all times to ensure she doesn't get herself into a dangerous situation, she should be leery of males as any one of them could be a potential perpetrator. Burnett et al. (2009) suggest that "taking the precautions to prevent date rape means the individual will also need to take on the responsibility if something were to happen. In other words,

if an individual takes responsibility for the preparation to avoid date rape, then, by default, that individual must take the blame if rape occurs" (p. 476). If a woman does not or fails to follow the appropriate steps to prevent her own victimization (e.g. she gets drunk at a party, she leaves her drink unattended, gets separated from friends) one might conclude that she is blameworthy in her own victimization.

A look at the underlying assumptions present within the previous studies is telling. Focusing on the relationship between the number of sexual partners and sexual assault suggests that the more partners a woman has the more likely she is to be raped; therefore, to avoid rape a woman must not be promiscuous. This advice is limiting for young women in college, which is often times a place for sexual exploration, and is blaming to women who do engage in sex with various partners. A focus on psychological factors and victimization assumes that victims of sexual assault have psychological problems that led to their assault. Providing women a list of rules to abide by to avoid rape assumes that a woman can prevent her own assault and that it is her responsibility to do so. Suggesting that women with a prior history of sexual assault be provided special attention in regards to prevention efforts places them with an extra burden. Not only have they already been traumatized by sexual assault and/or rape, but they are also told that their subsequent actions could lead to further victimization and must be extra vigilant. This message is victim-blaming.

It would be difficult to argue that women should not be made aware of the potential threats awaiting them on college campuses, but asking for such vigilance is very limiting to their movement and freedoms on campus. Left out of this equation is the perpetrator's role in the victimization. In regards to women's prevention programs, the

11

man's role in the victimization is overlooked. Studies that focus only on women's behaviors and role in their victimization leave out a crucial element: men are almost always the perpetrators of the sexual assault of women, and thus should be the focus of efforts to reduce rape and sexual assault. Recently, numerous studies have acknowledged this by targeting prevention programs at men, looking for the elements of their personalities and behaviors that lead to the perpetration and acceptance of sexual assault.

Several authors recognize the importance of including men in efforts to prevent sexual violence against women (Funk, 1993; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997; Berkowitz, 2004; Katz, 2006). These authors recognize the limitations of focusing on women to prevent their own assault and believe it is up to men to take on this task (Funk, 1993; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997; Katz, 2006). As men overwhelmingly perpetrate the majority of violence against women, they must become involved to reduce the rates of this violence (Katz, 2006). To eliminate sexual assault, men have to stop assaulting women (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997).

Some suggest sexual assault is supported by male peer groups that include a narrow conception of masculinity, secrecy, and sexual objectification of women (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997). Efforts to include men in prevention should focus on these all male peer groups (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997; Katz, 2006). Katz's (2006) program, "Mentors in Violence Prevention" (MVP), trains men (athletes or other men with status) to speak out against men's violence against women, using their status as a platform, while approaching men as bystanders who can actively confront issues of abuse (Katz, 2006). MVP has been utilized by college athletic programs, professional sports teams, and the US Marines (Katz, 2006). Authors agree that current notions of

masculinity must be addressed in efforts to include men in prevention (Funk, 1993; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997). Deconstructing harmful aspects of masculinity is necessary in understanding why sexual assault is common and tolerated (Funk, 1993). (Current understanding of masculinity as it relates to sexual assault towards women is discussed further in the theoretical framework).

Schwartz, DeKeseredy, Katz, Berkowitz, and Funk are but a few of the many men involved in the movement to end violence against women. For them, it is not women's responsibility to prevent their own assaults because such ideas are limiting and victim-blaming. The problem is with men; therefore, the problem is theirs to tackle. They do not view all men as rapists or even potential rapists, but as having the influence and power amongst other men to bring about positive change in ending violence against women.

Educational Programs for Men

These ideas are not lost in sexual assault educational and prevention programs aimed at men. Such programs often view men as potential bystanders who are capable of having influence amongst their peers to stop and prevent rape. Many programs have targeted fraternities on campuses for sexual assault education. Anderson & Whiston (2005) found such programs to have a greater positive impact on Greeks. Foubert & Marriott (1997) worked with fraternities, citing fraternity men as more likely to endorse rape myths and have been found to have a greater likelihood of sexually coercive behaviors than other men. Wantland (2008) focused on fraternities because they are a

male peer group and aimed to empower them to create change rather than be a scapegoat for sexual violence.

Before developing a program to educate men about sexual assault, it is important to understand men's current beliefs about sexual assault and their unique role in prevention. Funk points out that as men come to understand the complexities of this issue and view their involvement as necessary, they often experience feelings of guilt, defensiveness and shame (Funk, 1993). Many men do not view sexual assault and rape toward women as an issue that is relevant to them (Funk, 1993; Katz, 2006; Rich, Utley, Janke, and Moldoveanu, 2010). Men feel that since they are not themselves rapists, attending prevention programs for men would not be beneficial (Rich, Utley, Janke, and Moldoveanu, 2010). They view rapists as vastly different from themselves and do not understand how they may contribute to rape culture or believe sexual assault prevention is their responsibility (Rich, Utley, Janke, and Moldoveanu, 2010). Their understanding of why sexual assault and rape are issues of concern for men is an important first step in their education.

Upon grasping their importance as men in sexual assault prevention, a clear understanding of what rape and sexual assault actually are is necessary. Consent is a key component to definitions of rape and sexual assault. Understanding consent, as well as ambiguities surrounding it, is necessary to fully comprehend rape and sexual assault. This can be a difficult task, however, as there is considerable confusion surrounding consent and communicating consent, especially when alcohol is involved.

A common myth regarding date rape as the result of differences in communication between men and women is found in the miscommunication model (O'Byrne, Hansen, & Rapley, 2008). This model suggests that men are unable to understand women's communication styles regarding sexual refusals or that women need to be more assertive and clear with their refusals (O'Byrne, Hansen, & Rapley, 2008). O'Byrne, Hansen, & Rapley (2008) found this to be untrue. They found that "young men also can and do display a sophisticated understanding of subtle verbal and non-verbal means of communicating sexual refusal" (O'Byrne, Hansen, & Rapley, 2008, p. 187), concluding "the miscommunication repertoire… at least, appears, in practice, to serve to rhetorically justify coercive sexual behavior, and to place the onus for the 'clear' communication of sexual refusal squarely on young women's shoulders" (p. 188). Although issues of consent are often unclear for both men and women, it appears to be a myth that men are unable to understand women's communication styles or that women need to be more assertive and clear with their sexual refusals.

While the miscommunication model may be unfounded, understanding of consent is ambiguous to both men and women (Kahn, 2004; Burnett et al., 2009; Griffith, Hart, Brickel, 2010). Kahn (2004) found that, in many instances, women did not label their own experiences with rape as such; therefore, it is unsurprising that this lack of clear understanding about consent and rape is more prominent with men (Griffith, Hart, Brickel, 2010). When alcohol enters the equation, confusion is amplified. Drinking is not uncommon to the college experience and is often a factor in sexual assault on campuses (Romeo, 2004; Benson, Gohm, & Gross, 2007; Crawford, Wright, & Birchmeier, 2008;Messman-Moore, Coates, Gaffey, & Johnson, 2008; Burnett et al.,

2009; Lawyer, Resnick, Bakanic, Burkett, & Kilpatrick, 2010). Many do not view a

sexual assault victim under the influence of alcohol as a legitimate victim (Kahn, 2004)

and many blame the victim for being too intoxicated to resist unwanted sexual advances

(Romeo, 2004; Burnett et al, 2009). Increased alcohol consumption was "associated with

beliefs that alcohol enhances sex drive, sexual affect, and vulnerability to sexual

coercion" (Benson, Gohm, & Gross, 2007, p. 348) and with beliefs that alcohol improves

sex drive and sexual experiences. Further, women may drink more to give themselves an

excuse to do things they typically would not do in sexual situations (Benson, Gohm, &

Gross, 2007). Both women and men seem unaware of alcohol's role in sexual assault;

that being under the influence of alcohol takes away one's ability to consent and sex in

this state of consciousness is legally defined as rape. For these reasons, clear

understanding of consent and of alcohol as related to sexual assault are necessary to

address.

Many authors argue for educational programs to debunk rape myths (Schwartz &

DeKeseredy, 1997; Anderson & Whiston, 2005; Foubert, 2005; Chapleau & Oswald,

2010; Rau, et al., 2010; Rich, Utley, Janke, & Moldoveanu, 2010). Lonsway &

Fitzgerald (1994) define rape myths as "attitudes and beliefs that are generally false but

are widely and persistently held, and that serve to deny and justify male sexual

aggression against women" (p. 134). They are suggested to stem from a system in which

consensual sex and power are associated (Chapleau and Oswald, 2010), and are more

accepted in students indicating intent to join a fraternity or sorority (McMahon, 2010).

Men's acceptance of rape myths has been shown to lead to rape proclivity (Chapleau &

Oswald, 2010), victim blaming (Girard & Senn, 2008), and a lesser likelihood to

intervene in a potential sexual assault (McMahon, 2010). In their meta-analysis, Anderson and Whiston (2005) observed that the most successful interventions included a discussion of rape myths and facts. Debunking rape myths and providing correct, factual information about rape, rape victims, and rapists is important to men's understanding of rape and how they can work to prevent it or intervene.

Bystander intervention is a relatively new form of rape prevention (McMahon, 2010). "The bystander approach teaches community members how to intervene safely in situations that involve sexual violence and how to care for a victim after a sexual assault" (Banyard, Moynihan, & Crossman, 2009, p. 450). Many authors advocate this technique in rape prevention programs (Katz, 2006; Brown & Messman-Moore, 2009; Foubert, Godin, & Tatum, 2010; Rau et al., 2010). Participants in this type of prevention program are viewed as potential bystanders, not victims or perpetrators (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004). Bystander behaviors include "interrupting situations that could lead to assault before it happens or during an incident, speaking out against norms that support sexual violence, and having skills to be an effective and supportive ally to survivors" (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004, p. 70). By placing the responsibility for preventing sexual assault on the community, victim-blaming ideas are reduced (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004). A focus on community responsibility also may have potential of creating new norms and broad change (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004).

While bystander intervention has been proven as a successful method in sexual assault prevention, studies have found obstacles in one's willingness to intervene (Brown & Messman-Moore, 2009; Hillenbrand-Gunn, Heppner, Mauch, & Park, 2010). Inability to identify clear acts of sexual assault or rape due to lack of knowledge as to what

constitutes sexual assault or rape leads to decreased likelihood of intervention (McMahon, 2010). People cannot intervene in situations they do not understand as wrong. McMahon (2010) also found that students are less willing to intervene in behaviors such as sexist language than a situation that is a more obvious act of violence. In addition, adherence to rape myths impacts one's willingness to intervene. As men are generally more accepting of these myths, providing factual information countering myths is necessary in bystander intervention (McMahon, 2010).

One's personal attitudes, as well as perceptions of peer attitudes regarding sexually aggressive behaviors has an impact on intervention, with perceptions of peers having a more significant impact (Brown & Messman-Moore, 2009). Men tend to believe their peers have more negative views about sexually aggressive behaviors than is actually reported by their peers (Hillenbrand-Gunn, Heppner, Mauch, & Park, 2010). This belief that their peers are supportive of sexual violence causes men to not speak out or intervene in situations of sexual violence, regardless of their personal beliefs, perpetuating the notion that it is supported (Brown & Messman-Moore, 2009). Providing factual information about these supportive beliefs may increase the likelihood of intervention (Brown & Messman-Moore, 2009).

The literature suggests that rape prevention programs targeted at men should include bystander intervention training, provide them with factual information about sexual assault and debunk commonly held rape myths. Research has also provided recommendations regarding approaches to be used in sexual assault prevention programs for men. An all male environment is the most effective method of educating men about this issue (Foubert & Marriott, 1997, Brecklin & Forde, 2001; Berkowitz, 2004). All

male programs are effective because they provide a safe space for men to discuss issues surrounding sexual assault and masculinity (Berkowtiz, 2004). Keeping with an all male environment, the facilitator should also be male (Berkowtiz, 2004). Confrontational approaches should be avoided; men should be approached as partners and allies in ending sexual assault (Lonsway, 1996; Berkowitz, 2004; Stein, 2007). Single intervention programs have had success (Foubert & Marriott, 1997; Black, Weisz, Coats, & Patterson, 2000), although many argue for long term programs (Frazier, Valtinson, & Candell, 1994; Lonsway et al., 1998; Brecklin & Forde, 2001; Anderson & Whiston, 2005).

Research on sexual assault prevention programs often discusses the need for measuring long term effects of the program (Frazier, Valtinson, & Candell, 1994; Lonsway, 1996; Brecklin & Forde, 2001). Positive changes in attitudes are often not lasting and have a tendency to fade over time (Frazier, Valtinson, & Candell, 1994; Anderson & Whiston, 2005). However, some studies have found success in creating lasting change. Foubert & Marriott (1997) and Black, Weisz, Coats, & Patterson (2000) found the positive effects of their programs to be held at a two month follow up. Lonsway et al. (1998) found changes in rape myth acceptance maintained at a two year follow up. To fully understand the effectiveness and lasting impact on sexual assault prevention programs, longevity of program effects need to be measured.

One area in which researchers have not reached consensus on best practices for a men's sexual assault prevention program is with facilitator type. Peer education has become a popular method in educating college students about sexual assault (Fennel, 1993; Simon, 1993; Lonsway, 1996; Anderson & Whiston, 2005). Peer education is the process by which students are trained to teach other students (Simon, 1993). It is not only

common in sexual assault prevention, but in a variety of areas including: alcohol education, teen smoking prevention, teen drinking and driving prevention (Simon, 1993), safe sex practices, substance abuse, birth control (Stein, 2007), and AIDS prevention education (Dunn, Ross, Caines, & Howorth, 1998). Researchers cite a number of reasons peer education is an effective method in educating students about critical issues. Peer educators put students at ease about discussions of difficult topics and hold their attention better than adults (Simon, 1993); peer educators are less expensive, increase the number of students that can be reached, and free up professionals' time to do their respective job (Fennel, 1993); peer educators remain in contact with the students they teach both socially and academically (Stein, 2007); peers can provide information in ways adults or professionals cannot (Black, Weisz, Coats, & Patterson, 2000); peers may have more credibility than professionals with students (Dunn, Ross, Caines, & Howorth, 1998). It is suggested that peer educators may be able to influence the culture on college campuses that has perpetuated sexual assault by affecting students' views and confronting peers with rape supportive attitudes (Stein, 2007). In his study of a fraternity sexual assault peer education program, Wantland (2008) found that some of the men spoke out when hearing about the mistreatment of women or sexist conversation and that the educators' "presence in their chapters became an interruption to traditional masculine relationships" (p. 70). Peer educators' sustained exposure to students beyond the program is thought to influence the attitudes and behaviors of their fellow students (Stein, 2007).

Although many are in favor of peer educators, others caution their use (Anderson & Whiston, 2005). Walker & Avis (1999) cite common reasons for peer education failure as "lack of clear aims and objective for the project, an inconsistency between the

20

project design and the external environment/constraints which should dictate the project's design, a lack of investment in peer education, a lack of adequate appreciation that peer education is a complex process to manage and requires highly skilled personnel, inadequate training and support for peer educators, a lack of clarity around boundary issues, and a failure to secure multi-agency support" (p. 574).

While there are many criticisms of peer education programs, several studies have cited success by avoiding the pitfalls by way of proper peer educator training and support. Simon's (1993) review of a successful peer educator program provided the educators with extensive training surrounding the complexities of acquaintance rape, encouraging open discussion on the various aspects such as common misconceptions and male/female relationships. Lonsway et al. (1998) and Klaw et al. (2005) provided peer educators a semester long academic course for which they received credit. Following this theme, Stein (2007) and Wantland (2008) provided peer educators with extensive training over the course of two academic semesters in which the students also received credit. Peer educators in a study by Black, Weisz, Coats, & Patterson (2000) completed 40 hours of training and worked on their presentation over an eight week time period. The authors note that the adult facilitators were available for support to the peer educators (Black, Weisz, Coats, & Patterson, 2000). It should be noted that some of the studies did not provide follow up measures to measure longevity of program success (Simon, 1993; Stein, 2007).

Some argue that research on peer educators is not definitive concerning their effectiveness and advantages (Fennell, 1993; Lonsway, 1996). In fact, a meta-analysis of rape education programs questions the efficacy of peer educators in finding professional

educators to be more successful in changing attitudes regarding rape (Anderson &

Whiston, 2005). As their findings differ from common practices concerning program

facilitators, the authors suggest that future research address criticisms of peer educators

"before any conclusions can be offered concerning the effectiveness of peer educators"

(Anderson & Whiston, 2005, p. 383).

    The goal of this study is to directly address these concerns by implementing a

rape prevention program for fraternities by directly testing the peer educator model

against the professional educator model.

CHAPTER III

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Masculinities theory explores the social construction of manhood in our society. The concept of masculinity embraced by scholars in the field has been well-documented. The effects of the masculine concept are also studied, including the potential consequences of adopting masculine theory as it contributes to instances of sexual assault and gender identity. First, it is important to understand the concept as it is defined by theorists.

R. W. Connell provides a definition of masculinity that is oft cited and was constructed by exploring varying definitions of masculinity and their basis for development. For Connell (2004), the concept of masculinity can only exist in contrast with femininity; the culture must treat men and women as two different categories. Previous definitions have followed four different strategies in defining masculinity: essentialist, positivist, normative, and semiotic (Connell, 2004). The essentialist strategy "picks a feature that defines the core of the masculine, and hangs an account of men's lives on that" (Connell, 2004, p. 31). Obviously this is problematic as the feature chosen to define masculinity is arbitrary (Connell, 2004). The positivist strategy stems from social science, using facts, and establishes "what men actually are" (Connell, 2004, p. 31), and is the basis of masculinity/femininity scales. One weakness of this strategy Connell (2004) points out is that these definitions are based on "assumptions about

gender" (p. 32). Normative strategies are found in sex role theory and media studies,

suggesting "masculinity is what men ought to be" (Connell, 2004, p. 32). Connell (2004)

says this strategy is to some extent essentialist. Lastly, the semiotic strategy defines

"masculinity through a system of symbolic difference in which masculine and feminine

places are contrasted… masculinity is, in effect, defined as not-femininity" (Connell,

2004, p. 33). For Connell, this strategy has been effective in gender analysis. It is after

this discussion of strategy that Connell offers her own definition of masculinity:

"masculinity, to the extent the term can be briefly defined at all, is simultaneously a place

in gender relations, the practices through which men and women engage that place in

gender, and the effects of these practices in bodily experience, personality and culture"

(Connell, 2004, p.33-34). With this definition, Connell elaborates on the variances

within masculinity.

Masculinity is not static; it changes over time and space, there is more than one

form, and it is socially constructed (Connell, 2004). It must be understood not only in

relation to other institutions and structures such as race, class and orientation, but also in

relation within itself. From this, Connell (2004) discusses four different types of

masculinities and the relations between them: hegemony, subordination, complicity, and

marginalization. Different types of masculinities are necessary to avoid

oversimplification and to better understand the complexities of the relationships that exist

among men (Connell, 2004). Hegemony refers to the "currently accepted" form of

masculinity that maintains the domination of men, subordination of women and is subject

to change with the times (Connell, 2004). While hegemonic masculinity is the current

dominant form, subordination refers to the group(s) of men positioned in the lower

realms of the hierarchy and men who embody characteristics that are opposite of hegemonic masculinity; for example, homosexual men. Complicity refers to the relationship with the hegemony in which men are not necessarily active participants in the hegemonic masculinity, nor do they challenge it, but they benefit from the "patriarchal dividend, the advantage men in general gain from the overall subordination of women" (Connell, 2004, p. 40). Marginalization incorporates structures outside of gender, such as race and class, and their relation to masculinities (Connell, 2004).

Brittan (2004) also argues for multiple versions of masculinity that are subject to change; however, he adds a separate element called masculinism. Masculinism is the ideology justifying male domination and masculinities are the features of male behavior that are subject to change with the times (Brittan, 2004). While acknowledging the variances that exist within masculinities, such as race and class, Brittan (2004) suggests there is the constant element of male dominance.

In his analysis of masculinity and the US Navy, Barrett (2004) defines masculinity as "embedded within an ensemble of social practices, symbols, discourses, and ideologies associated with the category of 'man'" (p. 79). He, too, acknowledges multiple masculinities but focuses on hegemonic masculinity for his purposes, defining it as "a particular idealized image of masculinity in relation to which images of femininity and other masculinities are marginalized and subordinated" (Barrett, 2004, p. 79).

Michael Kimmel (2004) describes masculinity as "a constantly changing collection of meanings that we construct through our relationships with ourselves, with each other, and with our world" (p. 266). It's socially constructed and is constantly

changing (Kimmel, 2004). He defines hegemonic masculinity as "the image of masculinity of those men who hold power, which has become the standard in psychological evaluations, sociological research, and self-help and advice literature for teaching young men how to become 'real men'" (Kimmel, 2004, p. 272). This is the standard to which all other men should strive and emulate.

While there are many versions of masculinity and varying definitions, all acknowledge multiple forms that are socially constructed and subject to change. The rest of this discussion will focus on hegemonic masculinity among young men today. What does it mean to be a man and how is this status achieved and maintained? Kimmel's *Guyland: The Perilous World Where Boys Become Men, Understanding the Critical Years Between 16 and 26* (2008) attempts to answer this question. It is a study of college age men he describes as being in "a kind of suspended animation between boyhood and manhood" (Kimmel, 2008, p. 6). He explores the world of young men while highlighting the negative and harmful aspects produced from this version of masculinity.

He begins his analysis by defining 'Guy Code' as the "the collection of attitudes, values, and traits that together compose what it means to be a man…these are the rules that govern behavior in Guyland, the criteria that will be used to evaluate whether any particular guy measures up" (2008, p. 45). The guy code states that men should never show their emotions, never admit to weakness, always appear in control, always win, and never show kindness or compassion (Kimmel, 2008). The judges of the guy code are other men; men are constantly policing one another's masculinity, making it a homosocial act. Deviation from the guy code results in ridicule and belittlement from peers by way of insults meant at questioning his manhood (Kimmel, 2008). With their

masculinity relentlessly tested, young men feel pressure to continuously prove themselves. This can be done in a variety of ways including violence, binge drinking, sex with women, hazing and sports (Kimmel, 2008). Demeaning all things feminine or homosexual, placing men in dominant positions to women and gay men, is also an important outlet for proving masculinity (Kimmel, 2008).

Men judging one another's masculinity is a homosocial act (Kimmel, 2004). Approval of their manhood does not come from women; it is constantly demonstrated and tested by men, for men. This produces a fear of being emasculated (Kimmel, 2004). In this way, homophobia factors into masculinity. Kimmel (2004) defines homophobia not as a fear of gay men, but a man's fear other men may perceive him as gay. It is the fear that other men will emasculate him and expose him as less than a real man (Kimmel, 2004). This fear fosters shame, leading to silence about many of the negative aspects of masculinity, such as violence (Kimmel, 2004). Violence is often a way of proving one's manhood and of resolving any question to one's masculinity.

Messner (2004) also found homophobia to be an important element in masculinity, but in a different way. He says that male bonds within all male peer groups are eroticized as this becomes a place where talking about sexual activity with women is an important element of status (Messner, 2004). This bond is diffused via "overt homophobia and through the displacement of the erotic toward women as objects of sexual talk and practice" (Messner, 2004, p. 258). Talking about women and exhibiting homophobia disperses the homosocial energy resulting from hanging out with men and talking about sex.

27

Adherence to the guy code is mandatory within hegemonic masculinity and is supported by cultures of entitlement, silence, and protection (Kimmel, 2008). The culture of entitlement is a sense of entitlement to power that is facilitated by a sense of male superiority (Kimmel, 2008). Even as young men may feel powerless, adherence to the guy code is supposed to be rewarded with certain privileges and entitlements. Collectively men hold the power; however, individually, men feel powerless (Kimmel, 2004). Power, as defined by hegemonic masculinity, is finite; only few will ever have it. Although few will have this power, the sense of entitlement to it is felt by all men. Kimmel suggests that masculinity is set up so that most men are excluded from this version of hegemonic masculinity by way of race, class, sexual preference, or age (Kimmel, 2004). Through these exclusionary practices men are left feeling powerless and disenfranchised (Kimmel, 2004). This feeling of powerlessness coupled with a sense of entitlement to power is a major paradox with masculinity, often leading to feelings of restlessness and anger (Kimmel, 2004).

The culture of silence is the fear of speaking up about the harmful elements such as violence towards women, towards one another, sexism, and racism (Kimmel, 2008). There is a fear of the violence being turned on one if he speaks out, the fear that he will be ostracized or bullied. With this silence is the implication that the behaviors in question are accepted and supported (Kimmel, 2008). The culture of silence that upholds the guy code is not only protection from within, but protection from the community as a whole (Kimmel, 2008). Kimmel (2008) posits that adults including parents, teachers, coaches, even young women, have a tendency to look the other way by making excuses

and having dismissive attitudes about the violence among these men. As with the culture of silence, this protection upholds and perpetuates the guy code.

Messner (2004) also discusses the pressures of conformity to this version of masculinity within the group, with non-compliance leaving a man vulnerable to ridicule and belittlement by his peers. It is important to note that to conform does not necessarily mean engaging in acts like sexually aggressive locker room talk or aggressive behaviors, but silence implies acceptance and tolerance. In this way, these attitudes towards women become acceptable and viewed as normal among men.

An important element in understanding how young men's ideas about masculinity are formed is through peer groups, such as athletic teams and fraternities. Within these all male peer groups, the guy code is often exaggerated and the rules more strictly surveilled (Kimmel, 2005). Drawing from his notion of homophobia as a fear of other men, Kimmel (2005) says that when in groups, men become more macho and misogynist. Individually and one on one with women, men may not exhibit these behaviors or attitudes, but they are on full display when in groups (Kimmel, 2005). Kimmel (2005) links this to the constant judgment by peers and need to prove oneself. These all male peer groups are also influential in men's interactions with women (Messner, 2004). Messner (2004) argues that from a young age, young men learn how to interact with women from each other. This becomes especially important when the role of women in this context is explored

Women's role in hegemonic masculinity is in a place of subordination. The very nature and definition of masculinity places women in an inferior position to men;

masculinity, after all, is defined in opposition to femininity. The standards of hegemonic masculinity are used as a means of devaluing women and reducing them to objects to be used by men (Kimmel, 2004).

A prominent characteristic of masculinity is virility and constant pronouncement of heterosexuality (Kimmel, 2008). This incessant need to prove one as sexually capable leads to the use of sex with women as a means of gaining status with other men. Intimacy or emotional attachments between the sexes is discouraged and viewed as unmanly (Messner, 2004). For many men, sex is not only about the act itself, but for bragging rights with other men (Kimmel, 2008). Kimmel (2008) found that men often had this in mind before, and even during, sex with a woman. Sex becomes a sort of competition with other men, with the perception that other men are having a lot of sex with a lot of different women, though this is often not the case (Kimmel, 2008).   In this way, women have exactly what men need to prove their manhood, positioning women as a potential boost to men's status or as a potential threat to it by refusing sexual advances (Kimmel, 2008).

Media portrayal of women as sex objects feeds into the masculinity model by fueling men's sense of entitlement to women's bodies as a result of constantly putting them on display (Kimmel, 2008). Women are often portrayed as always accessible to men, promoting the aspect of masculinity in which men must constantly prove their heterosexuality (Kimmel, 2008). It upholds and perpetuates women as sex objects, taking it one step further with the suggestion that they're always available for sex. The pressure to have an active sex life along with this perception that women are always

ready for sex can easily lead to coercive and aggressive sexual tactics, including rape (Kimmel, 2008).

Not only can this lead to dangerous sexual relations between men and women, it can lead to hostility and resentment by men towards women for refusing sex (Kimmel, 2008). If women are what men need to prove themselves and they are supposedly always ready for sex, then the refusal of a guy's sexual advances can lead to negative feelings for women in general (Kimmel, 2008). It can seem as if women are having sex with everyone but the guy who has been rejected. In this way, men, individually, feel as if they are not measuring up to their peers, and women are to blame.

Feeding into these feelings of resentment and hostility towards women for denying sex, Kimmel (2008) argues that pornography acts as a revenge fantasy for the fact that men do not think they are getting as much sex as everyone else, or as much as they are entitled to. It is their way of getting back at women who have denied them sex. In men's view, women hold all the power in regards to sex; they have the power to say no, as well as the power to compare notes about sexual partners with their friends (Kimmel, 2008). Pornography offers men an arena where women never say no, men never feel rejection and where men's authority goes unchallenged (Kimmel, 2008). Violent porn is often geared towards and consumed by younger men, with a preference for extreme pornography that often involves humiliating women (Kimmel, 2008). Pornography producers describe their target audience of young men as "angry, sexually frustrated, and eager to exact some sort of revenge on women" (Kimmel, 2008, p. 186). Kimmel (2008) says that the young men he interviewed about watching pornography often spoke of the women in the video with contempt, calling them sluts, bitches and hos.

31

Kimmel (2008) is careful to point out that viewing violent pornography does not seem to translate into these men's actual relationships with women; surprisingly, it is more about bonding with other guys. It's a common practice for young men to watch porn together and shout insults at the woman in the video (Kimmel, 2008).

While pornography does not lead directly to violence against women, it "can sexualize violence against women, make it look acceptable" (Kimmel, 2008, p. 188). In this same view, Dines (2005) suggests that pornography teaches young men to become violent by legitimizing and objectifying women as sex objects and sexualizing violence against women. It is her view that pornography perpetuates the lie that all women want to be treated in such ways and that it acts as a "major propaganda system that legitimizes men's power over women" (Dines, 2005, p. 114).

With party rape and date rape occurring in high instances on college campuses, it is easy to see how the ills of hegemonic masculinity influence the actual lived experiences of college men and women. Coercive tactics are sometimes used in men's efforts to have sex with women, for example, using alcohol to make women compliant (Kimmel, 2008). Alcohol provides a sort of plausible deniability; it creates a gray area in which no one is responsible for his or her actions (Kimmel, 2008). Women may use alcohol as an excuse for a one night stand and men can use it as a way to 'loosen' women up, lowering inhibitions about sex. This becomes problematic when discussing rape and sexual assault. Alcohol creates ambiguity surrounding the circumstances of sexual assault and rape, memories become vague and both parties may be somewhat unsure of what took place (Kimmel, 2008).

How are these behaviors perpetuated and accepted? The culture of protection and culture of secrecy keep the men involved protected since the men who have knowledge of an incident and the community surrounding them do not speak up (Kimmel, 2008). Men in these scenarios face great risk for intervening in what they know to be a potentially dangerous situation for a woman; to report such behaviors is viewed as a betrayal to one's fellow men or even as treason, consequently enabling these behaviors to continue (Kimmel, 2008). This silence and protection also hinders women from reporting because they are likely to be blamed for their behaviors while the perpetrators are protected (Kimmel, 2008).

More recently, men are being called on to help end rape. Kimmel (2008) suggests that programs targeted towards women assume the worst of men, if women are not constantly on the defense for sexual predators then men will assume their natural state of sexual aggressor and assault women. We know that most men do not commit nor support rape or sexual assault; accordingly, the focus has been on these men, the bystanders (Kimmel, 2008). The men that knowingly commit these acts do so because they are sure they will get away with it and no one will speak up; therefore, it is important to encourage men to speak out against their peers (Kimmel, 2008). These men must also be supported by their community, breaking the cultures of silence and protection that enable these behaviors (Kimmel, 2008).

While encouraging bystander intervention is important in practice, on a theoretical level, men's involvement is critical. "To ignore men, to believe that women alone will transform a rape culture, freezes men in a posture of defensiveness, defiance, and immobility" (Kimmel, 2005, p.156). Men must be included in the discussion about

stopping rape to quell the defensive nature that naturally occurs and to provide support

for their standing up for women. Dworkin (2005) agrees, arguing for men to take the

challenge of ending rape. She says for there to be any sense of real equality between men

and women, there cannot be rape as it implies the inferiority of women (Dworkin, 2005).

Men cannot have true equality or be full humans with intimacy and tenderness in a world

where rape exists, because there is no real honesty with the threat of rape that women feel

daily (Dworkin, 2005).   Along those same lines, Messner (2000) suggests that by

empowering women and denying hegemonic masculinity, along with its rewards, men

can realize their true potential as humans.

Masculinities theory is crucial to any understanding of sexual assault as it

explores the underlying causes of violence against women by examining the social

construction of masculinity and its impact on gender relations. These theorists reject

biological explanations for sexual aggressive behaviors as intrinsic to men as unfounded

(Kimmel, 2008). With their recognition of men's important role in combating sexual

violence, they have put forth applicable solutions in preventing and ending men's

violence against women.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

<u>Collaborations and Community Organizing</u>

This program was developed and administered as a collaborative effort with the

University of Louisville's Prevention, Education and Advocacy on Campus and in the

Community (PEACC) program. The PEACC program was created in 1999 after UL

received a grant from the Department of Justice, Violence against Women on Campus

Program ("History of PEACC," n.d.). Their goals include developing an integrated

campus network charged with addressing violence against women, providing advocacy to

those on campus affected by this violence, and awareness raising efforts ("History of

PEACC," n.d.). PEACC provides education on topics including domestic violence and

sexual assault, encourages healthy relationships and sexual activities, and unites students

to create safe communities ("PEACC," n.d.). Within the PEACC program is Men of

PEACC: male students trained as peer educators to spread awareness and provide

education about issues surrounding violence against women to the campus community

("Men of PEACC," n.d.).   Men of PEACC also provide counseling services and

seminars ("Men of PEACC," n.d.).

Also involved in this collaborative effort was Rus Ervin Funk who has worked to

end sexual and domestic violence for more than 25 years ("About Rus Funk," 2012).

Rus is the co-founder and Executive Director of MensWork, an author, a speaker, and trainer whose work is internationally recognized ("About Rus Funk," 2012). Rus is also active with PEACC and Men of PEACC. Created in 2007, MensWork: Eliminating Violence Against Women, INC. is a Louisville based organization that works together with men to end sexual and domestic violence by providing education and focusing on prevention ("What We Do," 2012). MensWork operates both locally in Kentucky and Indiana, as well as nationally and internationally ("What We Do," 2012). Their efforts encourage men to "be a part of the solution to sexual and domestic violence… focus(ing) on using leadership development and community organizing strategies as the main methods to mobilize men and boys" ("What We Do," 2012, para. 1).

I approached PEACC in February 2011 about partnering to develop and implement a program to educate fraternities on ULs campus about rape and sexual assault. Initially, I took on the task of recruiting fraternities to participate in the program and began approaching fraternity presidents via email in March 2011. Email addresses were obtained via the university website. As planning progressed, we decided PEACC would take over fraternity recruitment. We also decided that meetings would be held with the fraternity chapters to discuss their participation in the program and to gather input concerning their particular needs. The goals of the meetings were to explore the men's knowledge of sexual assault and its prevalence on campus, views regarding their role in prevention, and any concerns about working with PEACC. Approaching the men prior to designing the program and using their feedback to guide the creation of the curriculum was done in accordance to the principles of youth-led community organizing.

The youth-led community organizing model is the foundation from which this program was created. Community organizing unites people with common interests to address specific concerns facing their community, empowering them to develop solutions and work towards community betterment (Delgado & Staples, 2008). Youth, as defined by Delgado and Staples, are those under twenty-six (Delgado & Staples, 2008). Incorporating the principles of community organizing with empowering youth to create change within their communities, youth led community organizing allows young people to define their unique circumstances and begin creating solutions to issues facing their community (Delgado & Staples, 2008). Adults are involved in the process; however, the leadership and development of the movement lies with the youth. As youth in our society are often undervalued and portrayed as indifferent, youth community organizing aspires to empower young people to believe they are capable of making a positive difference and to take steps toward creating this change (Delgado & Staples, 2008). Young people are viewed as competent, knowledgeable and as possessing potential to create positive change. Delgado and Staples (2008) discuss the importance of moving youth away from roles of victims or perpetrators and re-establishing them as assets and contributors to their communities. Within this model is a fundamental belief that youth are experts of their own circumstances and are in the best position of speaking to their unique needs (Delgado & Staples, 2008). Although this model maintains beliefs that youth are capable of creating positive changes within their communities, it recognizes that they do not have the same experience or knowledge as adults in this field. While respecting the rights and abilities of youth, adults provide the necessary skills and knowledge base to aid young people in working toward their goal.

Employing this model Rus, along with a PEACC program coordinator named Colin O'Brien, began meeting with fraternities in September 2011. Four fraternities took part in this program. The men expressed interest in receiving advice on handling sexual assault allegations against members, education about bystander intervention, and information on becoming part of the solution to these problems. The men were often surprised when told of the prevalence of sexual assault on ULs campus. After the initial meetings, Rus and Colin began creating the curriculum for the program incorporating the feedback from the fraternities. Subsequent meetings were held with the executive committees of each fraternity in January 2012 to review the program content. Upon agreement with the executive committees, Rus and Colin finalized the curriculum.

Although this program did not task the men with developing the solutions to this issue, their involvement in creating the curriculum maintains the key elements of youth-led community organization. Requesting their input respects the men as competent to communicate their needs concerning sexual assault education and prevention. Determining their knowledge level and views surrounding sexual assault delivers a program tailored to their specific concerns, and is accompanied by necessary information to develop a basic understanding of the issue and their role in prevention. Further, this approach potentially diffuses defensive feelings as the men are recognized as allies rather than potential perpetrators.

Participants and Recruitment

This study received Institutional Review Board approval prior to implementation.

Recruitment of participants involved meetings with fraternity presidents, emailing, and word of mouth. Colin went to the Interfraternity Council (IFC) meeting to provide information about the fraternity program and recruit participants. A $200 donation to a charity of their choosing for the two fraternities with the highest participation was offered as an added incentive. The program was advertised on UofL's PEACC website with an RSVP link allowing participants to sign up prior to the program. One of the peer educators was a fraternity member and spread word of the workshop informally amongst his peers.

There were 30 participants, all were male with ages 18 to 22 with a mean age of 19 (SD: 1.25). Of those reporting grade level (n=29), 57 percent were freshman, 10 percent were sophomores, 21 percent were juniors and 10 percent were seniors. Data on race was not collected as the four fraternities participating consisted of primarily Caucasian men and information on race might have compromised the anonymity of certain survey responses. A question was included to gauge prior exposure to sexual assault education with (n=29) 57 percent answering yes and 40 percent answering no to prior education.

<center>Measure</center>

The Bystander Efficacy Scale was used in a 2005 Department of Justice (DOJ) study to evaluate a bystander intervention program (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2005). The Bystander Efficacy Scale is consists of 14 items to measure the men's confidence in engaging in bystander behaviors related to violence against women (i.e., expressing discomfort if someone says rape victims are to blame for being raped, helping

<center>39</center>

a drunk person being taken upstairs by a group of people at a party-see appendix A). Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan (2005) created this scale for their for their DOJ study based on self-efficacy literature. The items are rated using a confidence scale (0 "can't do" to 100 "very certain"). Responses were averaged to create an overall bystander intervention score with higher scores indicating greater confidence in intervening. The consistency coefficient was reported as .87 (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2005). For the present study, consistency coefficients were .78 at pretest and .86 at post-test.

<div align="center">Procedure</div>

Rus Ervin Funk was the professional educator and the two peer educators were Ben Donlon and Eric Kleppe. Ben and Eric are undergraduate students and members of Men of PEACC. Ben is also a member of a fraternity on campus. These men have received annual training from PEACC. Both men have attended multiple Green Dot Bystander Intervention trainings from the Center for Women and Families (the local shelter for victims of abuse and their children) and have watched videos on bystander intervention training from the creator of Green Dot. Rus has provided both men with informal training and mentoring concerning Men of PEACC initiatives. Ben has completed a peer education class for college credit. Thus, the level of training for the peer educators was of high quality, achieved over a relatively long period of time, compared to the training offered in previous studies (Walker & Avis, 1999).

Consistent with previous research on men's sexual assault prevention programs, this program explained the importance of men's involvement in sexual assault prevention, definitions of rape and sexual assault, information about consent, debunked rape myths,

discussed the role of alcohol in sexual assault, and provided bystander intervention techniques (see appendix B). Also, this program targeted fraternities because of their influential status on campus and approached them as allies in prevention. The presenters began by introducing the program and why fraternities were chosen to participate. They explained the importance of men's involvement in preventing and ending sexual assault and violence against women. Various definitions of sexual assault were provided and discussed, including the campus, legal, and victim-centered definitions. Next, a scenario was given in which a man does not accept a woman's "no" and keeps trying to go further sexually. This scenario was then used to highlight a typical sexual assault and that consent for many men is understood as no means try again, rather than "stop". The role of alcohol in sexual assault was discussed emphasizing that it is not an excuse for perpetrating sexual assault, nor does it make sexual assault less severe for a victim. Another scenario was put forth involving consent. The educator asked to hold a participant's backpack and, without explicit permission, began rummaging through it while talking. When the men exhibited discomfort, the instructor made comparisons between this activity and the need to clarify consent at varying levels of intimacy. The program then turned to bystander intervention, beginning with a definition of a bystander as someone who stands by and does nothing when they witness criminal activity or someone harming another person. They brainstormed reasons people might choose to not intervene. The program was concluded with a definition of an empowered bystander and ways in which men can, both individually and as a group, become empowered bystanders.

The workshops were held simultaneously in adjacent rooms in the Student

Activities Center. The fraternity members met at 6pm and were provided pizza prior to

the program. They were then randomly assigned to two groups and sent to separate

rooms. Participants were asked to sign an informed consent form prior to the beginning

of the program. Immediately following, the pre test was administered. The workshops

lasted approximately one hour with the post test administered immediately following the

presentations. Two weeks following the workshops, participants who provided an email

address then were sent a link to an anonymous online survey consisting of the follow up

test. A reminder email was sent four days after the initial email. The follow up test was

originally open for one week; however, it was extended an additional three days due to

low response. A final email reminder was sent to participants encouraging participation.

At the same time the final reminder was sent, Colin emailed the fraternity presidents

asking them to urge their members that participated in the workshops to complete the

follow up survey.

There were thirty participants total, divided evenly with fifteen men in each

group. Fourteen participants from the peer group and fifteen from the professional group

completed the pre survey. All fifteen participants completed the post survey from both

groups. As for the two week follow up survey, eleven responded from the peer group and

six responded from the professional group. A total of 76 surveys were completed for this

study.

SPSS software was used to perform accepted methods of statistical analysis on the

data to test the following hypotheses: no difference exists between peer and professional

educators teaching a sexual assault prevention program for fraternity men, and the sexual

assault prevention program has no significant effect on the participant's confidence in

engaging in bystander behaviors related to violence against women.

CHAPTER V

STATISTICAL FINDINGS

Paired samples t tests were performed to determine program success amongst each educator type. An independent samples t test was performed to determine difference in means between peer and professional educators. New variables were created using the means of questions 1-14 for the pre, post and follow up groups to form an overall bystander intervention score (prescale and postscale). Tests were run to determine the extent of missing responses within the scales using the nmiss function in SPSS; 2 cases were missing 1 response and 1 question was missing 2 responses. With so few cases missing responses, all cases were included in the mean calculation of the scores. Before conducting the t tests, assumptions were checked. The scales had normal distributions (prescale: skewness= -.046, kurtosis= -.927; postscale: skewness= -.736, kurtosis= .28). Prior to the independent samples t tests, new variables were created for the difference in means of the pre and post scores by subtracting the post score mean from the pre score mean. Assumptions for these variables were also checked to ensure normality (skewness= .52, kurtosis= -.836).

Paired samples t tests were performed to evaluate the programs by educator type using the new bystander intervention score variables previously mentioned; prescale and postscale (see Table 1). The data were put in split file by educator type prior to the test

and change score measures are not used here. Peer educators had a marginally significant effect on willingness to intervene (t=1.86, p=.085), with participants averaging 9.39 points higher on the scale after the program (m=9.39, SD=18.84). The professional educator's effect was significant compared to the pre-test (t=2.56, p=.023), with participants scoring 8.9 points higher after the program (m=8.9, SD=13.47). The program led to significant changes in participants' willingness to engage in bystander intervention behaviors.

Table 1. Paired samples T Test by Educator Type (Postscale - Prescale)

	Mean	St. Deviation	t	Sig.
Peer Educators	9.39	18.84	1.86	.085
Professional Educator	8.9	13.47	2.56	.023

An independent samples t test was performed testing the hypothesis that there is no difference between peer and professional educators using educator type as the grouping variable. The variables created to show difference in means from prescale to postscale were used as the test variables. The split file command was not in use while running this test. The independent t test showed no significant difference in the means of peer educators (m=9.39, SD=18.84) and the professional educator (m=8.9, SD=13.47), (t=.081, p=.936).

Regression analysis was run to determine if any of the variables had an effect on the pre-post scale change score when controlling for the age, educator type and the pre scale. No significant effect was found.

Due to significant attrition in the follow up responses, these measures were not used in the final analysis to determine the outcome of the thesis hypothesis. Eleven participants from the peer educator group responded while only six participants responded from the professional educator group. Although these data were not used in determining the outcome of the study, paired sample t tests and independent samples t tests were performed nonetheless. With the data in split files, paired samples t tests were run using the follow up scales. Pairing the follow up scale to the post scale for the peer educators showed no significance (t=.861, p=.41). Pairing the follow up scale to the pre scale showed significance (t=6.02, p=.000). The same was done for the professional educators. The follow up to post scales showed no significance (t=.719, p=.504). The follow up to pre scale showed some significance (t=2.42, p=.06). Independent samples t tests were also performed with the follow up scales after new variables were created in the same way previously described. The data were not in split files for this test. From post to follow up there was no significant difference between educator types (t= -.188, p= .854). From pre to follow up there was also no significant difference (t=.211, p=.836). Although the data from the follow up scales are not usable due to high attrition, it is still noteworthy to report there was no significant difference between the peer and professional educators' impact on participants' responses two weeks after the program was administered.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

The results of this study found no difference between peer and professional educators which is inconsistent with the current research on sexual assault prevention programs that has found professionals to be more successful (Anderson & Whiston, 2005) and tends to favor one type of educator over the other. The quality of the educators potentially impacted the current findings.

The peer educators chosen for this program were well trained and experienced. Their voluntary involvement with Men of PEACC shows a steady level of devotion to the issue of violence against women. This involvement has also provided them extensive training and mentoring by experts in the field on how to educate men about this issue. They have received training from the Center for Women and Families, Louisville's domestic violence shelter and rape crisis program, and have had training on bystander intervention using the Green Dot model. Rus Funk has also worked with the men in regards to Men of PEACC initiatives. These men have extensive knowledge about sexual assault and are well-versed on the subject. Due to their prior experience as peer educators, they are veterans in this field. This is likely not the case with other peer educators, who may receive limited training or have limited experience before instructing a program (Walker & Avis, 1999). That these peer educators were able to hold their own when put up against an internationally sought after men's educator is noteworthy and

their paired samples t test p value of .086 is impressive. The independent t test showed no significant difference between the peer and professional educators' impact on the participants' willingness to intervene, which is also impressive.

Previous research has attempted to address these criticisms by providing adequate training (Lonsway et al., 1998, Black, Weisz, Coats, & Patterson, 2000; Klaw et al., 2005; Stein, 2007; Wantland, 2008). Lonsway et al. (1998), Klaw et al., (2005), Stein (2007), and Wantland (2008) provided peer educators with at least a semester long course for their training. Lonsway et al. (1998), Klaw et al. (2005), and Wantland (2008) did not measure the actual program the peers facilitated, but the impact of the training the peer educators received. Black, Weisz, Coats, & Patterson (2000) provide the students with forty hours of training and eight weeks to practice their theatrical presentation. These studies provide sound models for the proper training and investment peer educators should be offered. The quality training the peer educators received in current study extends support to the need for such training if peers are to be as effective as professionals in educating men about sexual assault prevention.

The professional educator, Rus Funk, is a sought after expert in working with men to end violence against women. His extensive credentials and experience make him an ideal educator. While there are many benefits to using peer educators (Fennell, 1993; Simon, 1993; Dunn, Ross, Caines, & Howorth, 1998; Black, Weisz, Coats, & Patterson, 2000; Stein, 2007), an experienced professional in educating men about preventing violence against women, such as Rus, potentially balances the positive effects.

The popularity of peer educators found in the literature is partially supported by this study. It may be that criticisms of both peer and professional educators are not entirely founded. Previous criticisms of peer educators are primarily concerned with the lack of quality education they receive. This study shows that one educator type is not necessarily superior to the other, and peer educators can be as effective as professional educators if they are given proper training and investment.

As the research is growing regarding the elements to include in these programs, the success of this program supports and extends the existing literature on sexual assault prevention programs for college men. Using a community organizing model is a unique aspect of this study that warrants further investigation. There are many benefits to employing this model. Gauging the men's knowledge level and areas of interest in regards to sexual assault prevention is beneficial information prior to designing a program as certain aspects can be tailored to a group's specific need. Approaching the men prior to program development can diffuse tension and shows respect for their opinions. Frazier, Valtinson, & Candell (1994) used a similar method. They designed a sexual assault education program based on feedback from meetings with their target audience and recommended using this practice in future programs (Frazier, Valtinson, & Candell, 1994). Participants' investment is an important aspect in a program's success.

The current study was effective in changing participants' willingness to engage in bystander interventions, providing further support for this approach. Securing their investment in sexual assault prevention was likely a factor contributing to the program's success. The men expressed interest in learning more about bystander intervention and how to become a part of the solution. The program responded to these requests in

providing information about sexual assault and intervention techniques. The men were also interested in how to deal with sexual assault allegations against fellow members. Such advice was not offered; instead they were provided training in how to avoid situations where such allegations were likely to be made.

Encouraging bystander behaviors with men has promise to begin dismantling the culture of silence and protection that tolerates sexual assault. Silence and inaction around such behavior implies acceptance and perpetuates this violence (Kimmel, 2008). As men police each other's masculinity, speaking out against sexist language and behaviors could begin to re-shape the accepted standards of masculinity. Confronting these behaviors challenges male dominance and entitlement. Until such a culture change takes place, however, men face risk by confronting and intervening in peers' behavior. Men's masculinity is granted and regulated by other men (Messner, 2004; Kimmel, 2008). Engaging in bystander behaviors puts them at risk of emasculation and potentially confrontational situations. Replacing these norms of protection with new norms of speaking out potentially reduces the risks men face in confronting this behavior.

Changing current norms among men positively impacts women. Focusing on women to prevent their own sexual assault is disempowering as it places rigid limitations on their behavior. The burden of preventing rape falls to women, thus blaming them if they are assaulted. Placing the focus on men and on bystander intervention from peers alleviates such burdens from individual women and reduces victim blaming messages and implications. It is up to men to make these changes for women to live freely and without fear. Unfortunately, until this change occurs, women continue to need at least

some education on the legitimate dangers facing them and the lengths to which some men will go to perpetrate sexual assault.

While there are many strengths to the current study, there are also limitations worth noting. This study had a small sample size of thirty men, limiting generalizabilty, and most of the men were Caucasian. Due to significant attrition with the two week follow up survey, a definitive measure of potential rebound or lasting change was not possible. Also, two weeks may not be enough time to test for stability of change; longitudinal research is needed to understand long term program efficacy. Social desirability may have influenced the participants' responses on the post survey as it was administered immediately following the program. While the follow up measures were not used in the final analysis, paired samples t tests with these surveys showed no significant changes in attitudes from the post survey. Thus, the change from the pre survey to post survey lasted at the two week follow up. A single one hour intervention may not be effective in producing significant, lasting change in men's willingness to engage in bystander intervention. Fifty-seven percent of men answered positively to having prior sexual assault education. While details surrounding prior education were not collected, this potentially impacted the survey. Men from the initial meetings with Rus and Colin prior to designing the program were not excluded from participating due to the potential of low turnout. It is not known if any of those men were involved in the actual program. The overall goal of any sexual assault prevention program is to reduce the number of actual sexual assaults. It has been noted throughout the research that attitude change does not necessarily lead to behavior change (Lonsway, 1996; Foubert & Marriott, 1997; Brecklin & Forde, 2001). Further research examining this relationship is

51

needed. Results of this study are noteworthy; however, they are not definitive on the topic of peer and professional effectiveness. Replication of the study would permit more concrete findings in this area.

The findings of this study have many implications for future research. Researchers developing sexual assault prevention programs may have more options and flexibility when choosing an educator type as this study demonstrates that, provided the educator is experienced and knowledgeable on sexual assault issues, peer and professional educators may be similarly effective.   Further research is necessary due to generalizabilty issues of the current study. At the very least, this study suggests that one educator type is not definitively superior to the other and that peer educators can be as effective as a professional provided they receive adequate training.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

The goal of this study was to compare the effectiveness of peer educators versus a

professional educator in a sexual assault prevention program for fraternity men. The

findings show little difference between the two educators. This adds to the research on

effective approaches for men's sexual assault prevention programs that are still being

developed and debated. This study furthers the literature supporting men's involvement

in preventing and ending violence against women and supports the bystander intervention

approach. Made clear is the need for further testing concerning the status of the

facilitator due to the current findings that, provided they receive proper investment and

quality training, peers educators can be used as effectively as a professional educator in

educating students about sexual assault prevention.

As masculinity is constantly changing and socially constructed, it is reasonable

that current norms surrounding men's violence against women are capable of change.

The culture allowing these behaviors must be altered to create a safer environment and

more equitable college experience for women. Men's interventions in other men's sexual

aggression or coercion towards women are necessary to create such an environment.

Providing men the necessary tools in bystander intervention is a step towards creating a

campus free of sexual assault.

REFERENCES

About Rus Funk. (2012). Retrieved July 3, 2012 from
        http://mensworkinc.com/blog/author/rus/

Anderson, I. (2007). What is a typical tape? Effects of victim and participant gender in
        female and male rape perception. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 46,* 225-
        245.

Anderson, L. A., & Whiston, S. C. (2005). Sexual assault education programs: A meta-
        analytic examination of their effectiveness. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 29,*
        374-388.

Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2004). Bystander education: Bringing
        a broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention. *Journal of
        Community Psychology, 32,* (1), 61-79.

Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2005). Rape prevention through
        bystander education: Bringing a broader community perspective to sexual
        violence prevention. (208701). Retrieved July 10, 2011, from
        https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/208701.pdf

Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., & Crossman, M. T. (2009). Reducing sexual violence
        on campus: the role of student leaders as empowered bystanders. *Journal of
        College Student Development, 50,* (4), 446-457.

Barrett, F. J. (2004). The organizational construction of hegemonic masculinity: The case
        of the US Navy. In S. M. Whitehead & F. J. Barrett (Eds.), *The Masculinities
        Reader* (pp. 77-99). Maldon, MA: Polity Press.

Benson, B. J., Gohm, C. L., & Gross, A. M. (2007). College women and sexual assault:
        The role of sex-related alcohol expectancies. *Journal of Family Violence, 22,* 341-
        351.

Berkowitz, A. D. (2004). Working with men to prevent violence against women: An
        overview. Retrieved from http://www.vawnet.org/applied-research-
        papers/?type=Prevention

Black, B., Weisz, A., Coats, S., & Patterson, D. (2000). Evaluating a psychoeducational
        sexual assault prevention program incorporating theatrical presentation, peer
        education, and social work. *Research on Social Work Practice, 10,* (5), 589-606.

Brecklin, L. R., & Forde, D. R. (2001). A meta-analysis of rape education programs. *Violence and Victims, 16,* (3), 303-321.

Brittan, A. (2004).Masculinities and masculinism. In S. M. Whitehead & F. J. Barrett (Eds.), *The Masculinities Reader* (pp. 51-56). Maldon, MA: Polity Press.

Brown, A. L., & Messman-Moore, T. L. (2009). Personal and perceived peer attitudes supporting sexual aggression as predictors of male college students' willingness to intervene against sexual aggression. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25,* (3), 503-517.

Brownmiller, S. (1975). Against our will: Men, women, and rape. NY: The Random House Publishing Group.

Burgess, G. H. (2007). Assessment of rape-supportive attitudes and beliefs in college men: Development, reliability, and validity of the rape attitudes and beliefs scale. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 22,* (8), 973-991.

Burnett, A., Mattern J. L., Herakova, L. L., Kahl Jr., D. H., Tobola C., & Bornsen, S. E. (2009). Communicating/muting date rape: A co-cultural theoretical analysis of communication factors related to rape culture on a college campus. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 37,* (4), 465-485.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2008). *Sexual Violence.* Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/sexualviolence/index.html

Chapleau, K. M., & Oswald, D. L. (2010). Power, sex, and rape myth acceptance: Testing two models of rape proclivity. *Journal of Sex Research, 47,* (1), 66-78.

Connell, R.W. (2004). The social organization of masculinity. In S. M. Whitehead & F. J. Barrett (Eds.), *The Masculinities Reader* (pp. 30-50). Maldon, MA: Polity Press.

Crawford, E., O'Dougherty Wright, M., & Birchmeier, Z. (2008). Drug-facilitated sexual assault: College women's risk perception and behavioral choices. *Journal of American College Health, 57*, (3), 261-272.

Currier, D. M., & Carlson, J. H. (2009). Creating attitudinal change through teaching: How a course on "women and violence" changes students' attitudes about violence against women." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24,* (10), 1735-1754.

Dines, G. (2005). Unmasking the pornography industry: From fantasy to reality. In E. Buchwald, P. R. Fletcher, & M. Roth (Eds.), *Transforming a Rape Culture* (pp. 107-115). Minneapolis, MN: Milkweed Editions.

Delgado, M., & Staples, L. (2008). *Youth-Led community organizing.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Dobash, R. E. & Dobash, R. (1979). *Violence against women: A case against patriarchy.* New York, NY: The Free Press.

Dunn, L., Ross, B., Caines, T., & Howorth, P. (1998). A school-based HIV/AIDS prevnetion education program: Outcomes of peer-led versus community health nurse-led interventions. *The Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality, 7,* (4), 339-345.

Dworkin, A. (2005). I want a twenty-four-hour truce during which there is no rape. In E. Buchwald, P. R. Fletcher, & M. Roth (Eds.), *Transforming a Rape Culture* (pp. 13-21). Minneapolis, MN: Milkweed Editions.

Fennell, R. (1993). A review of evaluations of peer education programs. *Journal of American College Health, 41,* (6), 251-253.

Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). The sexual victimization of college women. (NCJ 182369). Retrieved March 6, 2011 from http://www.nij.gov/pubs-sum/182369.htm.

Foubert, J. D., & Marriott, K. A. (1997). Effects of a sexual assault peer education program on men's belief in rape myths. *Sex Roles, 36 ,* (3/4), 259-268.

Foubert, J. D. (2005). *The men's program: A peer education guide to rape prevention third edition.* New York, NY: Brunner-Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Foubert, J. D. , Godin, E. E., & Tatum, J. L. (2010). In their own words: Sophomore college men describe attitude and behavior changes resulting from a rape prevention program 2 years after their participation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25,* (12), 2237-2257.

Frazier, P., Valtinson, G., & Candell, S. (1994). Evaluation of a coeducational interactive rape prevention program. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 73,* 153-158.

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

Girard, A. L., & Senn, C. Y. (2008). The role of the new "date rape drugs" in attributions about date rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 23,* (1), 3-20.

Griffith, J. D., Hart, C. L., & Brickel, M. (2010). Using vignettes to change knowledge and attitudes about rape. *College Student Journal, 44,* (2), 515-527.

Hillenbrand-Gunn, T. L., Heppner, M. J., Mauch, P. A., & Park H. (2010). Men as allies: The efficacy of a high school rape prevention program. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 88,* 43-51

History of PEACC. (n.d.) Retrieved July 3, 2012 from https://louisville.edu/peacc/education/history-of-peacc.html

Kahn, A. S. (2004). 2003 Carolyn Sherif award address: What college women do and do not experience as rape." *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 28,* 9-15.

Katz, J. (2006). *The macho paradox.* Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks, Inc.

Kelly, B. T., & Torres, A. (2006). Campus safety: Perceptions and experiences of women students. *Journal of College Student Development, 47,* (1), 20-36.

Kimble, M., Neacsiu, A. D., Flack Jr, W. F., & Horner, J. (2008). "Risk of Unwanted Sex for College Women: Evidence for a Red Zone." *Journal of American College Health, 57,* (3), 331-337.

Kimmel, M. S. (2004). Masculinity as homophobia: Fear, shame, and silence in the construction of gender identity. In S. M. Whitehead & F. J. Barrett (Eds.), *The Masculinities Reader* (pp. 266-287). Maldon, MA: Polity Press.

Kimmel, M. (2005). Men, masculinity, and the rape culture. In E. Buchwald, P. R. Fletcher, & M. Roth (Eds.), *Transforming a Rape Culture* (pp. 141-157). Minneapolis, MN: Milkweed Editions.

Kimmel, M. (2008). *Guyland.* New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers.

Klaw, E. L., Lonsway, K. A., Berg, D. R., Waldo, C. R., Kothari, C., Mazurek, C. J., & Hegeman, K. E. (2005). Challenging rape culture: Awareness, emotion and action through campus acquaintance rape education. *Women & Therapy, 28*, (2), 47-63.

Lawyer, S., Resnick, H., Bakanic, V., Burkett, T., & Kilpatrick, D. (2010). Forcible, drug-facilitated, and incapacitated rape and sexual assault among undergraduate women. *Journal of American College Health, 58,* (5), 453-460.

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

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

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

Men of PEACC. (n.d.) Retrieved July 3, 2012 from https://louisville.edu/peacc/get-involved/men-of-peacc.html

McMahon, S. (2010). Rape myth beliefs and bystander attitudes among incoming college students. *Journal of American College Health, 59,* (1), 3-11.

Messman-Moore, T. L., Coates, A. A., Gaffey, K. J., & Johnson, C. F. (2008). Sexuality, substance use, and susceptibility to victimization: Risk for rape and sexual coercion in a prospective study of college women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 23,* (12), 1730-1746.

Messner, M. A. (2000). *Politics of masculinities: Men in Movement.* Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.

Messner, M. A. (2004). Friendship, intimacy, and sexuality. In S. M. Whitehead & F. J. Barrett (Eds.), *The Masculinities Reader* (pp. 253-265). Maldon, MA: Polity Press.

O'Byrne, R., Hansen, S., & Rapley, M. (2008). "If a girl doesn't say 'no'…": Young men, rape and claims of 'insufficient knowledge. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 18,* 168-193.

PEACC. (n.d.) Retrieved July 3, 2012 from https://louisville.edu/peacc/

Rau, T. J., Merrill, L. L., McWhorter, S. K., Stander, V. A., Thomsen, C. J., Dyslin, C. W., . . Milner, J. S. (2010). Evaluation of a sexual assault education/prevention program for male U.S. Navy personnel. *Military Medicine, 175,* (6), 429-434.

Rich, M. D., Utley, E. A., Janke, K., & Moldoveanu, M. (2010). "'I'd rather be doing something else:" Male resistance to rape prevention programs. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 18,* (3), 268-288.

Romeo, F. F. (2004). Acquaintance rape on college and university campus. *College Student Journal, 38,* (1), 61-65.

Rothman, E. & Silverman, J. (2007). The effect of a college sexual assault prevention program on first-year students' victimization rates. *Journal of American College Health, 55,* (5), 283-290.

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

Simon, T. (1993). Complex issues for sexual assault peer education programs. *Journal of American College Health, 41,* (6), 289-291.

Stein, J. L. (2007). Peer educators and close friends as predictors of male college students' willingness to prevent rape. *Journal of College Student Development, 48,* (1), 75-89.

Stephens, K. A. & George, W. H. (2008). Rape prevention with college men: Evaluating risk status. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24,* (6), 996-1013.

Walker, S. A., & Avis, M. (1999). Common reasons why peer education fails. *Journal of Adolescence, 22,* 573-577.

Wantland, R. A. (2008). Our brotherhood and your sister: Building anti-rape community in the fraternity. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in The Community, 36,* (1/2), 57-73.

What We Do. (2012). Retrieved July 3, 2010 from http://mensworkinc.com/what-we-do/

APPENDIX A

Please read each of the following behaviors. Indicate in the column *Confidence* **how confident you are that you could do them. Rate your degree of confidence by recording a number from 0 to 100 using the scale given below:**

0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100

| can't do | quite uncertain | | | | moderately certain | | | | | very certain |

	Confidence
1. Express my discomfort if someone makes a joke about a woman's body.	_____%
2. Express my discomfort if someone says that rape victims are to blame for being raped.	_____%
3. Call for help (i.e. call 911) if I hear someone in my dorm yelling "help."	_____%
4. Talk to a friend who I suspect has been sexually assaulted.	_____%
5. Get help and resources for a friend who tells me they have been raped.	_____%
6. Ask a stranger who looks very upset at a party if they are ok or need help.	_____%
7. Ask a friend if they need to be walked home from a party.	_____%
8. Ask a stranger if they need to be walked home from a party.	_____%
9. Speak up in class if a professor is providing missing information about sexual assault.	_____%
10. Criticize a friend who tells me that they had sex with someone who was passed out or who didn't give consent.	_____%
11. Do something to help a very drunk person who is being brought upstairs to a bedroom by a group of people at a party.	_____%
12. Do something if I see a woman surrounded by a group of men at a party who looks very uncomfortable.	_____%
13. Get help if I hear of an abusive relationship in my dorm or apartment.	_____%
14. Tell an RA or other campus authority about information I have that might help in a sexual assault case even if pressured by my peers to stay silent.	_____%

Demographics

Age: _____

Year in School:

       Freshman: ____

       Sophomore: ____

       Junior: ____

       Senior: ____

Before this presentation, have you received any education about sexual assault?

       Yes: ____   No: ____

APPENDIX B

Fraternity Education Project

MensWork

Men of PEACC

1) Intro to MensWork/Men of PEACC (since this will be 2 separate presentations, the facilitators are asked to introduce the organization that they are speaking for. Since this is occurring on campus, MensWork will provide information about PEACC and MOP).
   Hello, I am _____ from Men of PEACC. Men of PEACC is a project of the PEACC project on campus and works to engage men to end rape, dating and domestic violence and stalking on campus. PEACC is our campus-based project that provides support for women or men who have been victimized, advocates for changes on campus, and works to prevent violence at U of L.

2) Why we're here and talking with you
   a) As leaders (both individually and collectively) on the campus community you have an opportunity to positively impact the campus as a whole in terms of rape/sexual assault. We're here with you today to talk with you about rape sexual assault and how you can be a part of preventing it on the U of L Campus.
      The role of fraternities on any campus is to help develop you as leaders on campus and to be in leadership positions once you graduate. Ending violence against women requires men taking some leadership in these prevention efforts. Men of PEACC is focused on those efforts across the campus. Because of your role as leaders on this campus, you have a powerful opportunity to positively impact on our efforts to prevent rape/sexual assault here at U of L.
   b) We're here because (personal reflection about why we're involved in this work, and why we think it's important)

3) Rape/Sexual Assault – definitions
   a) The campus definition of sexual assault is:
      "Intentionally engaging in sexual conduct with another person without the consent of that person."
      "Sexual conduct" is defined in the Code of Student Conduct as "sexual intercourse, anal intercourse, fellatio, cunnilingus, touching of the genitals, breast, buttocks, or inner thighs or any other physical conduct or touching of a sexual nature."
      "Consent" is defined as "freely given agreement by a competent person. A person is deemed incompetent to give consent when that person is under such an

incapacitation that he or she does not appreciate the nature of the consent, or if the person is a minor."

"Intentionally" is defined as "a conscious objective to engage in the described conduct; intoxication is not a defense to a charge of intentional misconduct."

b) Legal definition: -- sexual contact resulting from the use or threat of use of a weapon, or when the victim is incapacitated and unable to give consent, or when there is a significant age difference between victim and offender

c) Victim-centered definition – "any forced or unwanted sexual contact"
EX: a women and man are making out and are really getting into it – caressing each other, sharing tongue, moaning and groaning… He touches her breast. She stops him and says that she really likes kissing and wants to keep doing that, but doesn't want to go any further than that. They start kissing again and he touches her breast again…
Is this a sexual assault (based on a victim-centered definition)?
How many times does he have to touch her breast after she has said no I don't want to do that before it would be considered by you all as a sexual assault?
What if it wasn't her breast but her vagina?
What if it wasn't his finger or hand but his penis?
We're not going to come to agreement today, and I'm not sure it's really necessary that we do. What's important about this exercise is two key things: 1) most sexual assault that occurs (especially on college campuses) looks much more like this scenario than more traditional understandings of force or violence, and 2) how consent, for many of us as men, has come to mean "no means try again in a few moments" rather than no! As you all have reacted, this kind of behavior by us, as men, is pretty normal (as an aside, another work for normal is a social norm). We, and probably most women, don't necessarily think twice about this kind of behavior. But sometimes it can hurt people.
You, as leaders in this community, can have an impact on shifting this norm to a new norm of being more respectful of the women we're dating.

What we're focusing on today is a victim-centered definition which admittedly is much broader than the other definitions. The reason we focus on that definition is because there are ways that women (and men) are harmed which do not necessarily violate state law or campus policy. Our focus is to prevent the ways that people are harmed. When we can effectively prevent rape/sexual assault from a victim-centered definition, we'll by definition also be preventing rape/sexual assault as defined by campus policy and state law.

d) Impact of alcohol
Alcohol does have an impact on sexual assault – women and men who are drunk are more likely to be raped, and men who use alcohol or other drugs are more likely to perpetrate sexual assault. Being drunk does not mean that a woman or man cannot be raped, and it is not an excuse for perpetrating sexual assault.

4) Elements of Consent

a) Examining Consent
   I usually say something like -- "how d you know when you have consent?" Most
           of the time, men will say a lot of things that revolve around the premise
   that they think they have consent until she (or he if they're bi or gay, but I'm
   assuming given your context that isn't likely to come up) say's "no".
   "It's interesting to me how clear we (as men) are in terms of consent in all other
   situations but lose it when it comes to sex. In general, we know that we do not
   have consent until we get it explicitly and clearly. Sexually, we seem to assume
   that we have it until it's taken away. For example, we all know that we do not
   have consent to go into someone else's home until they explicitly say come into
   my home.   Even if you see them all the time in the neighborhood and you talk
   frequently. Even if they leave their doors wide open and you see other folks go in
   and out of their home apparently freely. Until we are explicitly told "welcome
   into my home" we know we aren't free to go in.
   When we are invited in, we know that we aren't free to put our feet on their coffee
   table, grab the remote and start switching channels, take a shower, go upstairs
   and take a nap on their bed, etc. until they give us explicit consent to do those
   things.
   Why is it we seem to think that we can get away with a different set of rules when
   it comes to being sexual with someone?"

b) Clarifying Consent (this goes along with the handout you received)
   I start by asking "what's the first thing you need in order to have sex?" (they
   blunder and answer and have all kinds of questions but never say consent -- which
   is, of   course, the answer you're looking for)
   Then I just start talking to be talking about the need for consent and why it's
   important and it's more complicated than it needs. I clearly fumble around with it
   a bit (if I have a co-facilitator, this helps, I ask them to take over for a moment, if
   not, just wing it). I ask if I can hold (that word is important) one of the men's
   backpack, book bag, brief case, something. (someone generally volunteers and if
   it was open, will carefully close it before handing it to me) As soon as they give it
   to me, I open it and start looking through it. I keep an eye on the group to notice
   their reactions. Usually someone will say something but if not there is a visible
   reaction that I have crossed a line.
   "What's the problem?"
   "He said I could "hold it" didn't he? What do y'all think i was really just going to
           stand up here and hold it? Clearly I was going to use his book bag to
   make a point about what I'm talking about..."
   This then leads into the discussion where you can go through the various points of
   the handout (see attached).

Compare grooming with rapists and getting a person to go on a 2nd date.

5) From Bystander to "Empowered Bystander"
   An episode of "what would you do"

a) A bystander is someone who "stands by" while others engage in criminal behavior or harm others. They have the opportunity to intervene and provide support to the person being harmed, and choose to do nothing.
Why people choose to stand by (brainstorm with the men as to why the coach at U Penn may have decided to stand by)
1) Not define what is going on as problematic
2) Not knowing how to intervene or what to do
3) Fear of reprisal
4) Diffusion of responsibility
5) Attribution of responsibility (who's to blame)
6) Social norms (is there a "norm" for folks to step up)
b) Why *men* may stand by?
We have another choice as to who to stand-by once we've agreed that there is a need to intervene and we know how to.

c) An empowered bystander is one who, when given the opportunity, intervenes to stop the behavior, interrupts the situation, or provides support.
d) How Men Can become empowered bystanders
i) As men, we may not see a lot of situations in which other men are actively perpetrating a sexual assault, but we are likely to see both high risk situations, and we certainly are in positions with other men in which men talk about women the ways that men talk about women when women aren't in the room. There are multiple opportunities when we, as men, have the opportunity to "stand by" or to set up. I want to encourage you all to become a fraternity that steps up…
ii) What you can do as individuals
iii) What you can do as a group
(1) Create a norm in this fraternity for stepping up.
(2) Become a rape-free fraternity
(3) Get more educated/trained from MOP
(4) Organize an event to raise more awareness amongst men
(5) Design a t-shirt or other awareness-raising thing and wear it one day a month for the entire year
(6) Organize a fund-raiser for PEACC or the Center for Women and Families
iv) What you can do individually
(1) Interrupt comments that you hear that denigrate women
(2) Challenge rape jokes
(3) Join Men of PEACC
v) What would support your more active involvement?

6) Thank-you!

ELEMENTS OF CONSENT

Both Partners…
…with relatively equal power…

agree…

…to the same thing…

…with the full understanding of all the consequences (positive and negative) thereof…

…uninhibited by drugs or alcohol, or age or developmental differences…

…with **full** faith that any change of mind will also be fully respected.

Without all of these elements, there is no consent.