

---

## Contemporary Journal of Anthropology and Sociology

---

### Peer Versus Professional Trainers: Educating Fraternities About Rape and Sexual Assault

Melanie DuVall, MA

Patricia Gagne, PhD\*<sup>1</sup>

&

Ryan Schroeder, PhD  
Department of Sociology  
University of Louisville

---

**Abstract:** Literature surrounding sexual assault prevention programs for college men debate the effectiveness of peer and professional educators. The goal of this study is 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 show little 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.

---

---

<sup>1</sup> Department of Sociology, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY 40292. [gagne@louisville.edu](mailto:gagne@louisville.edu) / 502-852-8014

The Authors would like to thank UofL's PEACC and Men of PEACC program for their support and participation in this study. Specifically, thanks to Sharon LaRue, Colin O'Brien, Rus Ervin Funk, Ben Donlon, and Eric Kleppe. Without their support and participation, this study would not have been possible. Thanks also to the anonymous reviewers of the *Contemporary Journal of Anthropology and Sociology*. This article is much stronger because of their close attention to detail and invaluable comments.

## **INTRODUCTION**

Twenty to 25 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 lie in wait, concerns about stranger rape may be exaggerated because nine of ten female victims of rape or attempted rape on college campuses knew their attackers (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000). Prevention efforts targeted at women often work to reduce risky behaviors, and it is often these actions that greatly limit women's movement and freedom on campus. More recently, researchers have focused on men and how they can work to reduce the sexual victimization of women, with various approaches for educating men (e.g., Funk, 1993; Foubert, 2005; Katz, 2006; Burgess, 2007; Rothman & Silverman, 2007; Girard & Senn, 2008; Brown & Messman-Moore, 2009; Chapleau & Oswald, 2010; Foubert, Godin, & Tatum, 2010; McMahan, 2010). Prevention programs for men are a relatively recent phenomenon with techniques and content still being tested and debated.

One such debate is whether peer educators are more effective than professionals. Peer education is a popular method in educating students about sexual assault (Fennel, 1993; Simon, 1993; Lonsway, 1996; Anderson & Whiston, 2005) because it is less expensive and increases 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). Still, Anderson & Whiston (2005) found that peer educators were not as successful in changing attitudes as professionals, and they call for more research before drawing conclusions. This study will address this debate by comparing peer educators with professionals in a

program designed to educate men about rape and sexual assault.

## **RAPE AND RAPE EDUCATION ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES**

Many students are unclear about the definition of rape, stranger versus acquaintance rape, the role of alcohol in rape, who is to blame, and what constitutes consent in sexual activity (Kahn, 2004; Anderson, 2007; Burnett et al., 2009). Students mistakenly think that male-on-female stranger rape is more common than acquaintance rape and they understand rape to be an act perpetrated by a stranger, not someone known to the victim (Anderson, 2007). When alcohol is involved, students are unclear if the experience is considered rape, and responsibility is commonly placed on the victim, who is blamed for having been drunk or who should have said no more forcefully (Burnett et al., 2009). Women may not label their experiences as rape, particularly if attacked by a boyfriend or while under the influence of alcohol, even if they have described a rape experience (Kahn, 2004). Such beliefs put women at risk, giving them a false sense of security around those they know, especially when alcohol is present, and are dangerous for men, who may believe consent is implied if a woman is too drunk to say no.

Efforts to reduce rape on college campuses have long focused on women (Romeo, 2004; Benson, Gohm, & Gross, 2007; Crawford, et al., 2008; Messman-Moore, Coates, & Gaffey, 2008). Educators have provided hefty lists of precautionary steps to avoid sexual assault, including the following: stay with friends, avoid intoxication, do not share or exchange drinks, be extremely alert in situations where alcohol is served, and do not drink from a punch bowl (Romeo, 2004). A focus on those who are victimized deflects attention from perpetrators (see Burnet, et

al., 2009) and bystanders who could intervene but do not. Efforts to educate women about rape and sexual assault prevention, while laudatory, often do as much to limit their freedom as to prevent assaults.

Starting in the early 1990s, scholars recognized the importance of including men in efforts to prevent violence against women (Funk, 1993; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997; Berkowitz, 2004; Katz, 2006). To eliminate rape, men must learn to intervene in situations that could lead to rape (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997). Some argue that sexual assault is supported by male peer groups that include narrow conceptions of masculinity, secrecy, and the sexual objectification of women (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997; Kimmel, 2008). Scholars argue that efforts to include men in prevention should focus on all male peer groups (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997; Katz, 2006), with notions of masculinity that support violence against women challenged in educational programs (Funk, 1993; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997).

Many men do not view sexual assault as an issue relevant to them, do not believe prevention programs will benefit them, and fail to understand how they may contribute to rape culture or how sexual assault prevention is their responsibility (Funk, 1993; Katz, 2006; Rich, Utley, Janke, and Moldoveanu, 2010). Teaching men why sexual assault and rape are issues of concern to them is an important first step. The literature suggests that rape prevention programs targeted at men should include bystander intervention training, provide men with factual information about sexual assault, and debunk commonly held rape myths (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997; Anderson & Whiston, 2005; Foubert, 2005; Chapleau & Oswald, 2010; Rau, et al., 2010; Rich, et al., 2010). Curricula should include definitions of consent (Kahn, 2004;

O'Byrne, Hansen, & Rapley, 2008; Burnett et al., 2009; Griffith, Hart, Brickel, 2010), the role of alcohol in sexual assault (Benson, et al., 2007), and peers' lack of support for rape and sexual assault (Brown & Messman-Moore, 2009; Hillenbrand-Gunn, Heppner, Mauch, & Park 2010), and rape myths (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994 p. 134). Information provided in an all-male environment by male educators is the most effective method of educating men (Foubert & Marriott, 1997, Brecklin & Forde, 2001; Berkowitz, 2004). 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 further discusses the need for measuring long-term program effects (Frazier, et al., 1994; Lonsway, 1996; Brecklin & Forde, 2001). Some research shows that new attitudes have a tendency to fade over time (Frazier, et al., 1994; Anderson & Whiston, 2005) while other studies show that long-term attitudinal changes are possible (Foubert & Marriott, 1997; Lonsway, 1998; and Black, et al., (2000).

Many programs have targeted fraternities on campus for sexual assault education, citing Greek men as holding potential leadership roles on campus and being more likely to endorse rape myths and engage in sexually coercive behaviors than other men (Foubert & Marriott, 1997). Male peer groups are the focus of programs aimed to empower men to create change (Wantland, 2008) and have been found to have a positive impact on Greeks (Anderson & Whiston, 2005).

Bystander intervention is a relatively new form of rape prevention (McMahon, 2010) that teaches men and women how to intervene in situations that involve or could lead to sexual assault (Banyard, Moynihan, & Crossman, 2009). Many scholars advocate this method of rape prevention (Katz, 2006; Brown & Messman-Moore, 2009; Foubert, Godin, & Tatum, 2010; Rau et al., 2010). Participants 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 has the potential to create new norms and broad social change (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004).

While bystander intervention has been shown to be a successful method in sexual assault prevention, studies have found obstacles in bystanders' willingness to intervene (Brown & Messman-Moore, 2009; Hillenbrand-Gunn, Heppner, Mauch, & Park, 2010). A lack of knowledge as to what constitutes rape or sexual assault is correlated with a decreased likelihood of intervention (McMahon, 2010). People cannot intervene in situations they do not understand as wrong. Moreover, students are less willing to intervene in behaviors such as sexist language than a situation that is a more obvious act of violence, and adherence to rape myths impacts willingness to intervene (McMahon, 2010). As men are generally more accepting of rape myths, providing factual information countering

them is necessary in bystander intervention (McMahon, 2010).

Personal attitudes, as well as perceptions of peer attitudes regarding sexually aggressive behavior, have an impact on intervention, with perceptions of peers having a more significant impact (Brown & Messman-Moore, 2009). Men tend to believe their peers support sexually aggressive behaviors more than they actually do (Hillenbrand-Gunn, Heppner, Mauch, & Park, 2010) causing men to be reluctant to speak out or intervene in situations of sexual violence. This dynamic further perpetuates the notion that sexual violence is condoned (Brown & Messman-Moore, 2009). Providing factual information about these supportive beliefs may increase the likelihood of peer intervention (Brown & Messman-Moore, 2009).

Peer education, in which students are trained by professionals to teach other students, has become a popular method in educating college students about sexual assault (Fennel, 1993; Simon, 1993; Lonsway, 1996; Anderson & Whiston, 2005). Peer educators have been found to put students at ease about difficult topics and to hold their attention better than adults (Simon, 1993). They are less expensive than professional educators and increase the number of students who can be reached (Fennel, 1993). Peer educators remain in social and academic contact with the students they teach (Stein, 2007), can provide information in ways adults or professionals cannot (Black, et al., 2000), and may have more credibility with students (Dunn, Ross, Caines, & Howorth, 1998). The sustained exposure students have to peer educators helps them influence campus culture by challenging rape supportive attitudes (Stein, 2007).

Although many favor peer educators, others caution against their use (Anderson &

Whiston, 2005). Walker & Avis (1999) cite common reasons for peer education failure, including a lack of clear objectives, inconsistency between project design and environment, a lack of investment and appreciation of peer education as a complex process, inadequate training of peer educators, lack of clarity regarding roles and boundaries, and failure to secure support from all agencies involved. Nonetheless, several studies have cited success by avoiding these pitfalls with proper training and support (Simon, 1993; Lonsway, et al, 1998; Black, et al., 2000; Klaw, et al., 2005; Stein, 2007; Wantland 2008).

A meta-analysis of rape education programs questioned the efficacy of peer educators and found 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 conclusions are drawn (Anderson & Whiston, 2005). The goal of this study is to address these concerns by implementing a rape prevention program for fraternities and testing the effectiveness of peer vs. professional educators.

## **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

Masculinity is a socially constructed aspect of being male that exists in contrast to femininity (Connell, 2004; Kimmel, 2004). It changes over time and space and there is more than one form (Barrett, 2004; Connell, 2004; Kimmel 2004). Hegemonic masculinity refers to ideals of manhood that maintain male dominance and female subordination (Barrett, 2004; Connell, 2004; see also Brittan, 2004 on masculinism). Subordinate masculinities exist in contrast to the hegemonic form and are exhibited by men who do not or cannot dominate women. Subordinate men are not active participants

in hegemonic masculinity, but by not challenging it, they benefit from the “patriarchal dividend, the advantage men in general gain from the overall subordination of women” (Connell, 2004, p. 40). The question then becomes how hegemonic masculinity is achieved by individual men and how it is sustained as a cultural standard.

Young men live according to a ‘Guy Code’, a “the collection of attitudes, values, and traits that together compose what it means to be a man...the criteria that will be used to evaluate whether any particular guy measures up” (Kimmel, 2008, p. 45). Accordingly, men should never show emotion, admit weakness, or show kindness or compassion and they must always win and appear in control. Under the guy code, young men constantly police one another’s masculinity, with the effect exacerbated in all-male groups, such as athletic teams or fraternities. Deviation from the guy code results in ridicule (Kimmel, 2008). With their masculinity relentlessly tested, young men feel pressure to prove themselves through violence, binge drinking, sex with women, hazing, sports, demeaning all things feminine or homosexual (Kimmel, 2008), and bragging about sexual activity with women (Messner, 2004). This constant surveillance and pressure produces a fear of being emasculated, fostering shame which leads to silence about many of the negative aspects of masculinity (Kimmel, 2004; Messner, 2004). Powerlessness coupled with a sense of entitlement to power is a major paradox of masculinity, often leading to feelings of restlessness and anger (Kimmel, 2004). A culture of silence results from men’s fear of speaking up about violence or objecting to sexist, racist, or homophobic acts or comments that implies acceptance and support of such behaviors (Kimmel, 2008).

A prominent characteristic of masculinity is a constant pronouncement of heterosexuality (Kimmel, 2008). The need to prove one's virility leads men to use women to gain status with other men. Intimacy or emotional attachments between the sexes is discouraged by the guy code and is viewed as unmanly (Kimmel, 2008; Messner, 2004). Sex is a means of competing with other men, fostering the erroneous perception that other men are having more sex. Women have what men need to prove their manhood, positioning women as a potential boost or threat to men's status. Not only can this lead to dangerous sexual relations between men and women, it can result in hostility and resentment by men toward women (Kimmel, 2008). Men who sexually assault women are protected because the men who have knowledge of an incident do not speak up (Kimmel, 2008). Bystanders face great risk for intervening in what they know to be a potentially dangerous situation. Reporting such behaviors is viewed as a betrayal of one's fellow men and fosters a culture of silence that hinders women from reporting because they lack witnesses to support them (Kimmel, 2008).

The focus of recent educational efforts has been on empowering bystanders to intervene, speak up, and support victims (Kimmel, 2008). Men who rape do so because they are sure no one will talk, making it imperative to break the culture of silence (Kimmel, 2008). Bystander intervention is important in practice and theory. Men must be included in the discussion about stopping rape to quell defensiveness and provide support for standing up for women. Empowering men to challenge hegemonic masculinity will help men realize their true potential as humans (Messner, 2000).

## **METHODS**

The educational program for this study was a collaborative effort with the University of Louisville's Prevention, Education and Advocacy on Campus and in the Community (PEACC) program. PEACC provides education on topics including domestic violence and sexual assault, encourages healthy relationships, and unites students to create safe communities ("PEACC," n.d.). Part of the program is Men of PEACC – male students trained as peer educators to educate the campus community about violence against women and to provide counseling ("Men of PEACC," n.d.). Also involved was Rus Ervin Funk, an internationally recognized author, speaker, and trainer ("About Rus Funk," 2012). Rus served as the professional educator and co-organizer of the educational portion of this study.

The youth-led community organizing model was used in developing the educational program. Community organizing unites people with common interests to address specific concerns, empowering them to define their unique circumstances, develop solutions, and work toward community betterment (Delgado & Staples, 2008). This model is similar to feminist research methods, which is ". . . not research about women but research for women to be used in transforming their sexist society" (Cook and Fonow, 1986, p. 13). Community organizing diffuses defensive feelings as participants are recognized as allies rather than potential perpetrators. Rus, along with PEACC program coordinator Colin O'Bryan, began meeting with fraternities in September 2011. Recruitment involved meetings with fraternity presidents, e-mailing, word of mouth, and meetings with the Interfraternity Council (IFC). At initial meetings, fraternity representatives expressed interest in receiving advice on handling sexual assault allegations, bystander intervention,

and information on becoming part of the solution to these problems. After these meetings, Rus and Colin created the curriculum, incorporating 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 proposed curriculum, Rus and Colin finalized it.

Four fraternities agreed to participate in the program. The sample consists of 30 fraternity members whose ages ranged from 18 to 22 with a mean age of 19 (SD: 1.25). Of those reporting grade level ( $n=29$ ), 16 were freshman, 3 were sophomores, 7 were juniors, and 3 were seniors. Data on race was not collected as the 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.

### **Measurement**

The Bystander Efficacy Scale (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2005) was the primary measurement of the effectiveness of the program in changing men's attitudes toward intervening in potential or actual cases of sexual assault. The scale consists of 14 items that measure confidence in intervening in violent behaviors against women (See Appendix A). Items are rated using a confidence scale (0 "can't do" to 100 "very certain"). Responses are averaged to create an overall bystander intervention score with higher scores indicating greater confidence in intervening. The consistency coefficient was reported as .87 (Banyard, et al., 2005). For the present study, consistency coefficients were .78 at pre-test and .86 at post-test.

### **Procedure**

Rus 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. Both are in their early twenties. They received annual training from PEACC, 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 watched videos produced by Green Dot. Rus has provided both men with informal training and mentoring concerning Men of PEACC initiatives. As part of his undergraduate studies, Ben completed a peer education class for college credit. Eric had not opted to take that class. These men were chosen as peer educators for this program due to their voluntary, extensive training in educating college students about sexual assault. They required little additional training to serve as peer educators for this program as the level of training they had previously received was of high quality and achieved throughout their college careers. Their involvement indicates a high level of commitment.

The peer and professional educators worked together to design the content of the program and the manner it was to be presented, resulting in a detailed outline of the program. This was done in an effort to keep both workshops as uniform as possible. As the program was not scripted, the overall delivery of the materials was left to the individual presenters. The potential impact of the presenters' interactions with their audience is the focus of the current study; the groups were kept as identical as possible with the only exceptions being the type of presenter (peer or professional) and the number of presenters per room. In the beginning stages of developing this study, a male graduate student was to be present during both workshops to provide

qualitative feedback regarding the educators and their relationship with the participants. An outside observer would have potentially given a more in-depth understanding of the atmosphere within the individual workshops that cannot be expressed solely through quantitative data. Unfortunately, we were not able to hire a graduate student due to budgetary concerns.

Consistent with previous research, the program explained the importance of men's involvement in sexual assault prevention, definitions of rape and sexual assault, and information about consent. It debunked rape myths, discussed the role of alcohol in sexual assault, and explained bystander intervention techniques. The presenters explained the importance of men's involvement in preventing sexual assault and violence against women. Various definitions of sexual assault, including campus, legal, and victim-centered, were provided. A scenario in which a man does not accept a woman's "no" and keeps trying to go further sexually was discussed. An exercise was presented in which 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 was concluded with a definition of an empowered bystander and ways in which men can achieve that status.

The workshops were held simultaneously in adjacent rooms in a neutral location on campus. Immediately after completing the pre-test, fraternity members were randomly assigned to one of two groups and sent to separate rooms. We did not analyze the data at that time. Participants were asked to sign an informed consent form and take a pre-test survey prior to the beginning of the program. The

workshops lasted approximately one hour with the post-test administered immediately following the presentations. Two weeks later, participants who provided an email address were sent a link to an anonymous on-line survey consisting of the follow-up test. Three reminder e-mails were sent. 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. Eleven responded to the follow-up survey from the peer group and six responded from the professional group. A total of 76 surveys were completed for this study. Low response rates to the follow-up survey are likely due to its timing, during finals week.

Accepted methods of statistical analysis were performed on the data to test the following null hypotheses: 1) No difference exists between peer and professional educators teaching a sexual assault prevention program for fraternity men, and 2) The program has no significant effect on the participant's confidence in engaging in bystander behaviors related to violence against women.

## **FINDINGS**

The men assigned to the peer educator group (N=14) had a mean age of 19.64 (range 18-22). Five were freshmen, two sophomores, six juniors, and one was a senior. Eight reported having had prior education and six had none. Those assigned to the professional educator group had a mean age of 19.07 (range 18-22). Eleven were freshmen, one was a sophomore, one a junior, and two were seniors. Nine reported having had previous rape education and six had none. Those in the professional group were younger with a higher representation of

underclassmen and those with nor prior rape education.

Paired samples t-tests were performed to determine program success by 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 (pre-scale and post-scale). Tests were run to determine the extent of missing responses within the scales using the nmiss function in SPSS. Two cases were missing one response and one question was missing two responses. With so few cases missing responses, all cases were included in the mean calculation of scores. Before conducting the t-tests, assumptions were checked. The scales had normal distributions (pre-scale: skewness= -.046, kurtosis= -.927; post-scale: 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: pre-scale and post-scale (see Table 1). The data were analyzed separately 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. Given the small sample size, we interpret the data for the peer educators as marginally significant and significant for the professional educator. 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 the difference in means from pre-scale to post-scale were used as the test variables. Data were not separated by educator type 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 ( $m=8.9, SD=13.47$ ), ( $t=.081, p=.936$ ), consistent with the null hypothesis. 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, previous exposure to sexual assault education and the pre scale. No significant effect was found.

**Table 1.** Paired Samples T-Test by Educator Type (Post-Scale - Pre-Scale)

	Pre-scaleMean	Post-scaleMean	ChangeMean	St. Dev.	t	Sig
Peers Educ	71.07	80.46	9.39	18.84	1.86	0.085
Prof. Educ	71.3	80.2	8.9	13.47	2.56	0.023

Due to significant attrition in follow-up responses, these measures were not used in the final analysis to test hypotheses, but paired sample t-tests and independent samples t-tests were performed nonetheless. Analyzing the data separately by educator type, 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 educator. 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 analyzed separately 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 noteworthy to report that there was no significant difference between the peer and professional educators' impact on participants' responses two weeks after the program.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study show little 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). The quality of the educators and the younger age, lower class representation, and lack of prior rape education in the professional educator group potentially impacted the current findings. The peer educators chosen for this program were well

trained and are veterans in this field. This is not always the case with peer educators, who may receive limited training or have little experience before leading a program (Walker & Avis, 1999). Previous research has attempted to address these criticisms by providing adequate training (Lonsway, Klaw, Berg, Waldo, Kothari, Mazurek, & Hegeman, 1998, Black, et al., 2000; Klaw et al., 2005; Stein, 2007; Wantland, 2008). The quality of training the peer educators received in current study extends support to the need for such education if peers are to be as effective as professionals. Quality of training, degree of mentoring by professional educators, and level experience need to be addressed in peer educational efforts and controlled for in future research.

The success of the current program supports and extends 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 this model. Gauging the men's knowledge level and areas of interest regarding sexual assault prevention is necessary information prior to designing a program as certain aspects can be tailored to a group's specific needs. Approaching the men before program development can diffuse tension and shows respect for their opinions. 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.

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 violence (Kimmel, 2008). As men police one

another's masculinity, speaking out against sexist language and behaviors could begin to challenge male dominance and entitlement. Until such a culture change takes place, however, men face risk by confronting and intervening in peers' behavior. Replacing the culture of silence with norms of speaking out potentially reduces the risks men face in confronting this behavior.

While there are many strengths to the current study, there are also limitations. This study had a small sample size of thirty mostly Caucasian men, limiting generalizability. Due to significant attrition with the two week follow-up survey, a definitive measure of potential rebound or lasting change was not possible. Two weeks may not be enough time to test for stability of change, so 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 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. The change from the pre-survey to post-survey appears to have carried over to 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 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. A notable critique

of rape education programs in meta-analysis literature is with the link between attitudinal and behavioral change, and the reliance upon outcome measures that only gauge attitude change amongst participants (Lonsway, 1996; Foubert & Marriott, 1997; Brecklin & Forde, 2001). Lonsway (1996) acknowledges the link between "rape-supportive ideology and sexually aggressive behavior" (p. 242), but that "such evidence only reveals associations, rather than causality, and therefore does not bear directly on the question of whether attitude change can actually reduce either sexual aggression or other rape-supportive behavior" (p.242-246). While Lonsway (1996) calls for no longer relying on outcome measures that are exclusively attitudinal, the author acknowledges their importance in the field. Brecklin & Forde (2001) cite similar concerns; however, state that at the very least "changing people's rape-supportive attitudes may create a social climate that is less hostile to rape victims" (p. 304).

While these critiques are largely concerned with attitudinal measures, Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan (2005) argue that focusing on bystander behaviors fosters one's "sense of responsibility for intervening" (p. 28). In their study, the authors found "the strong correlations between knowledge, attitudes, and actual behaviors helps to address critiques that changes in attitudes and knowledge through prevention programs does not necessarily contribute to behavior change" (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2005, p. 137). Foubert & Marriott (1997) responded to such criticisms with literature that suggests lasting changes in attitude and behavior are possible if the participants are viewed positively. The authors suggest that their particular approach of identifying opportunities for men to help survivors is promising as they are not treated as potential

rapists, but as potential helpers (Foubert & Marriott, 1997).

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 educators, as this study demonstrates that, provided the educator is experienced and knowledgeable, peer and professional educators may be similarly effective. 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.

As masculinity is constantly changing, 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 experiences for women. Men's interventions in other men's sexual aggression or coercion 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).

Anderson, I. (2007). What is a typical rape? 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).

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.

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.
- 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*.
- 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.
- Cook, J. & Fonow, M.M. 1986. Knowledge and women's interests: Issues of epistemology and methodology in feminist sociological research. *Sociological Inquiry 56*(4): 2-29.
- 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.
- Delgado, M., & Staples, L. (2008). *Youth-Led community organizing*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- 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.
- Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). The sexual victimization of college women. (NCJ 182369).
- 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
- 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.
- 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. (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.
- 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.)
- 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.)
- 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.
- 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.

## 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.	_____ %