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Rape Prevention

Community and college men commit sexually aggressive acts including rape (e.g., Abbey & McAulay, 2004; Abbey et al., 2007; Thompson et al., 2010)

Sexual assault has a number of negative physical and psychological consequences for victims

Rape prevention programs are important as they may reduce sexually aggressive behaviour

Rape Prevention

O’Donohue, Yeater, and Fanetti (2003):

Purpose: evaluate rape prevention program for college/university men

Rape prevention program:
- Brief, easy to administer, cost effective
- High treatment fidelity (videos vs. treatment providers)
- Positive results from pilot work

Targets:
- Rape myths
- Victim empathy
- Identifying negative outcomes of rape

Participants:
- Pilot Study (n = 101)
  - Male undergraduate students
  - Mean age = 22 years (SD = 5.6)
- Main Study (n = 102)
  - Male undergraduate students
  - Mean age = 19.7 years (SD = 2.4)

Pilot Study:

Purpose: do rape prevention videos effect their target constructs?
- Randomly assigned
- Rape-Prevention video conditions:
  - Rape myths
  - Consequences for victims
  - Consequences for date rape perpetrators
- Demographics
- Pre and post measurement of treatment target

Results:
- Rape Myths: participants rape myth endorsement significantly decreased post treatment
- Consequences for Victims: participants victim empathy significantly increased post treatment
- Consequences for Date Rape Perpetrator: participants rated negative outcomes as more likely to occur post treatment
Rape Prevention

Main Study:
- **Rape Prevention program (n = 52):**
  - 3 videos
  - Rape myths
  - Consequences for victims
  - Consequences for date rape perpetrator
- **Control program (n = 50):**
  - Video
  - The date rape backlash (Media Education Foundation, 1994)
  - Typical rape prevention program

Rape Prevention

Main Study:
- **Measures – administered pre-treatment**
  - Hypermasculinity Scale (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984)
  - Sexual Experience Survey (Koss & Oros, 1982)
  - Motivation ratings
- **Measures administered pre – and post-treatment**
  - Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (Burt, 1980)
  - Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence (Burt, 1980)
  - Adversarial Sexual Beliefs (Burt, 1980)
  - Attraction to Sexual Aggression Scale (Malamuth, 1989)
  - Rape Empathy Scale (Deitz et al., 1982)
  - Self-Efficacy Ratings (Bandura et al., 1977)

Rape Prevention

Main Study:
- Procedure:
  - Randomly assigned
  - Completed pre-test measures
  - Watched videos in groups
  - Completed post-test measures

Rape Prevention

Results of main study:
- Groups did not differ on pre-manipulation:
  - Motivation ratings
  - Hypermasculinity scale
  - Sexually aggressive behaviour:
    - Control group: 24% unwanted sexual act, 8% attempted or completed rape
    - Experimental group: 46.2% unwanted sexual act, 3.8% attempted rape

Rape Prevention

Results of main study:
- [Graphs and tables showing changes in pre- and post-treatment measures]

Purpose

- Replicate O’Donohue, Yeater, & Fanetti (2003):
  - Different sample
  - Different measures
    - Attitudes
    - Rape-supportive cognition
    - Self-reported likelihood to rape
    - Rape Empathy
  - Moderating effects of psychopathy and past sexually aggressive behaviour
Participants

- 248 male undergraduate students
  - 53 excluded (not mutually exclusive):
    - Responded too quickly on IAT (n = 5)
    - Could read Chinese (n = 20)
    - Reported they could not understand English (n = 2)
    - Failed manipulation check (n = 17)
    - Reported homosexual or bisexual sexual orientation (n = 55)
  - Measures focus on heterosexual rape

- 195 participants
  - Median age 19 years
  - 66.2% were single

Manipulation

- Participants randomly assigned
  - Rape prevention videos (O’Donohue, Yeater, & Fanetti, 2003)
    - Rape myths video n = 48
    - Consequences for victims video n = 49
    - Consequences for date rape perpetrators video n = 50
    - Control video (nature) n = 48
  - Video groups did not significantly differ in:
    - Age
    - Relationship status
    - Past sexually coercive and aggressive behaviour
    - Psychopathy

Measures

Past sexually coercive and aggressive behaviour
- Coercive Sexuality Scale - Modified (CSS -M) – 18 items
  - Current study: α = .79

Psychopathy
- Self-Report Psychopathy Scale – version three (SPR-III; Paulhus et al., in press)
  - Current study: α = .90

Implicit attitudes toward rape
- Rape-Evaluation Implicit Association Test (RE-IAT)
  - Current study: α = .31
- Affect Misattribution Procedure (AMP)

Measures

Explicit attitudes toward rape
- Rape Outcome Expectancies (ROE)
  - Current study: α = .62

Rape supportive cognition
- RAPE scale (Bumby, 1996)
  - Current study: α = .93

Self- Reported likelihood to rape
- Likelihood to Rape (LR) (Malamuth, 1981)

Empathy
- Rapist Empathy Measure (Fernandez & Marshall, 2003)
  - Cognitive Empathy – recognition of others’ emotional states
    - Current study: α = .88
  - Affective Empathy – adoption or emotional reaction to the emotional state of another individual
    - Current study: α = .83

Demographic questions

Procedure

- Random Assignment to Video
- Explicit Attitudes Toward Rape, Rape-Supportive Cognition, Empathy
  - Counterbalanced
- Likelihood to Rape
  - Manipulation Check
- Sequential
Results

Cohen's d
- Effect size for differences between group means
  - 0.20 = small, 0.50 = medium, 0.80+ = large
- Positive Cohen's d = rape prevention group > control
- On measures of “good” constructs positive Cohen's d reflects improvement (e.g., empathy)
- On measures of “bad” constructs negative Cohen's d reflects improvement (e.g., likelihood to rape)

Results: Implicit Attitudes

Table 1. Group differences between each rape prevention group and control group on explicit attitudes toward rape, rape supportive cognition, and self-reported likelihood to rape.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Rape Myths</th>
<th>Con. Victim</th>
<th>Con. Offender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD Rape</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROE Eval.</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROE Total</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPE Scale</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rape prevention groups did not significantly differ from control group on any of the explicit cognition measures or likelihood to rape.

Results: Empathy

Fig. 1. Group differences between each video condition and control group on the RE-IAT

Fig. 2. Group differences between each video condition and control group on the AMP-RAPE

Fig. 3. Group differences between each video condition and control group on the Rapist Empathy Measure - Cognitive

Fig. 4. Group differences between each video condition and control group on the Rapist Empathy Measure - Affective
Psychopathy

- Does psychopathy moderate the effectiveness of the videos?

- Hypothesized consequences for victims would be less effective for more psychopathic participants, consequences for date rapists would be equally effective.

Sexually Aggressive Behaviour

- Does past sexually aggressive behaviour moderate the effectiveness of the videos?

- Hypothesized the videos may result in change on the outcome measures for men who have been sexually aggressive but not for men who have no history of sexual aggression.

Summary

- Generally unable to replicate O’Donohue and colleagues (2003) findings

- Consequences for victims video impacted participants’ implicit attitudes toward rape (AMP-RAPE) and empathy

- No other group differences.

Psychopathy Consequences for Victims vs. Consequences for Date Rapists:

- High SRP-Total
- Mean SRP-Total
- Low SRP-Total

Consequences for Victims vs. Consequences for Date Rapists:

- High SRP: $d = 0.42$, 95% CI [-0.60, 1.45]
- Mean SRP: $d = 0.10$, 95%CI [-0.38, 0.58]
- Low SRP: $d = -0.81$, 95% CI [-1.87, 0.24]

Sexually Aggressive Behaviour Control vs. Consequences for Date Rapists:

- Most
- Some
- None

CSS-M TRI MOST: $d = 0.75$, 95% CI [-1.10, 2.60]

CSS-M TRI SOME: $d = 0.92^*$, 95% CI [0.16, 1.68]

CSS-M TRI NONE: $d = -0.10$, 95% CI [-0.59, 0.40]

Summary

- Psychopathy moderated the effectiveness of the Consequences for date rapists video and consequences for victims video for explicit attitudes towards rape (ROE, ROE Evaluation).

- Rape-prevention may be more effective for psychopathic men when consequences for perpetrators are emphasized.

- Past sexually aggressive behaviour moderated the effectiveness of the consequences for date rapists video.

- For more sexually aggressive men, consequences for date rapists video resulted in higher Bumby RAPE scale scores than control video.

- The same pattern was not evident for less sexually aggressive men.

- Cohen’s $d$ not significant for most CSS-M group, significant for some CSS-M group.
Limitations

- Between subjects design
- Poor internal consistency for RE-IAT
- Examined videos separately
- Recommendations from review of rape prevention programs for college/university students (Vladutiu, Martin, & Macy, 2011)
  - Single gender audiences
  - Professionally facilitated
  - Multiple sessions
  - Targets: rape myths, rape attitudes, victim empathy, rape avoidance, dating communication, risk education etc.

Future Directions

- Study rape-prevention programs incorporating recommendations from Vladutiu and colleagues (2011)
  - E.g., Multiple sessions
  - Effective?
- Longitudinally examine treatment effects on self-reported sexually aggressive behaviour
- Expand to community men
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