INFORMING PREVENTION PRACTICES:

A CASE STUDY EXPLORATION OF A UNIVERSITY'S SEXUAL VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAMMING

by

Rachael Schilling

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the University of Delaware in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Criminology

Summer 2023

INFORMING PREVENTION PRACTICES:

A CASE STUDY EXPLORATION OF A UNIVERSITY'S SEXUAL VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAMMING

by

Rachael Schilling

Approved: _____

Eric Rise, Ph.D.
Chair of the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice

Approved: _____

John Pelesko, Ph.D.
Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences

Approved: _____

Louis F. Rossi, Ph.D.
Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Education and
Dean of the Graduate College

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Signed: _____

Christy Visher, Ph.D.
Professor in charge of dissertation

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Signed: _____

Susan Miller, Ph.D.
Member of dissertation committee

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Signed: _____

Eric Rise, Ph.D.
Member of dissertation committee

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Signed: _____

Angela Hattery, Ph.D.
Member of dissertation committee

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, a huge thank you to my dissertation committee chair, Christy Visher. I couldn't have finished this without your encouragement, understanding, and help navigating this process from developing the idea to finally defending. I would like to also thank my dissertation committee members Susan Miller, Eric Rise, and Angela Hattery for their patience and suggestions that made my final product better.

Next, thank you to my friend, Wenjin Wang, for her constant advice and willingness to listen to me vent whenever I needed it. I've never met anyone with such similar taste in books and media as me, and whether we're sharing an office or 12 time zones apart, I'm grateful that I'll always have her in my corner. Someday we'll get through all the books we've recommended to each other… maybe.

Shout out to all my colleagues at CDHS, especially the survey team and RPE team. The center was one of my support systems the last few years, and I'm grateful to have gotten to work with so many talented and kind people. I had so much fun during my time at CDHS, and the experience I gained has helped me jumpstart my career.

I would also like to thank my family for their support throughout my whole graduate school career, and you're welcome for moving back home!

Last, I want to thank my husband, Ryan, for his never-ending belief in me and his unwavering support for all of my endeavors, from this PhD to the library he helped me build to house my book collection. Ryan, I could never have done this without you at my side to read drafts, make me espresso, make sure I don't forget to eat, and remind me it's okay to take breaks when I need them. In the past 12 months we've bought a house, moved states, gotten new jobs, and I've finished this degree – I can't wait to see what comes next.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

Prevention of sexual violence is of vital importance, especially on university campuses where sexual violence occurs at particularly high rates. Universities are federally required to implement prevention programming, but little is known about retention over time. In addition, research has not analyzed the relationship between sexual violence prevention programming and the campus culture at a particular university. Using a mixed methodology that utilizes survey data, qualitative interviews, and content analysis, this dissertation explores four research questions through a case study at an American university. First, the role of theory in current sexual violence prevention programming is determined – specifically, social learning theory, situational crime prevention, and the elaboration likelihood model of attitude change. Next, differences in retention of key program concepts between groups are explored. Then, participant understanding and use of consent is compared to university policy. Last, current programming strategies are compared to student perceptions of university dating and party culture. This dissertation concludes with recommendations for sexual violence prevention programming at this university and beyond moving forward.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Prevention of sexual violence is of vital importance. About one in five women report being raped at some point in their lives, with about half of the perpetrators being an intimate partner or acquaintance to the survivor (Black et al., 2010). Sexual violence and the threat of violence is ever present in women's lives, underscored by images in the media, rape jokes made by close friends who are otherwise allies, and the endurance of rape myths in western culture. All of these are a direct result of a rape culture that encourages sexual aggression in men and sexual passivity in women (Burt, 1980; Johnson & Johnson, 2021). Prevention efforts must do more than mitigate risk factors of potential victims of sexual violence. Instead, in order to create lasting change, they must target the underlying societal structures that uphold the ideologies supportive of a rape culture and sexual violence.

Sexual and dating violence are especially prevalent in university life. It is well established by survey research that sexual violence rates on college campuses are high, with studies reporting prevalence rates varying from about one in ten women experiencing sexual violence (Krebs et al., 2016) to one in five (Krebs et al., 2009). A recent review of the literature of different types of violence found college women report completed rape at rates ranging from 0.5% to 8.4%, and unwanted sexual

contact at rates ranging from 1.8% to 34% (Fedina et al., 2018). Among college men, these rates are lower but still concerning - 0.6% to 0.7% for completed rape and 4.8% to 31% for unwanted sexual contact (Fedina et al., 2018). There are a variety of factors that contribute to such high rates, including the concentration of risky behaviors (e.g. binge drinking, hookup culture, partying), but they are all underscored by rape culture (Hackman et al., 2017; Hockett e al., 2016; Jozkowski & Wiersma-Mosley, 2017).

1.1 University response: Prevention

In response, college campuses have implemented a variety of sexual violence prevention programs and tactics to combat the problem. While originally the focus of university prevention programs was on reducing the risk of potential victims through measures such as self-defense and staying in a group, more recent efforts have been focused on potential perpetrators and the systems that support victimization (Messner, 2016; Casey & Lindhorst, 2009).

Toward this aim, there are a slate of prevention programs typically offered by universities that are meant to shift not only individual behavior, but campus norms. Some of the most popular are bystander intervention (Gidycz et al., 2011 and consent-oriented programs (Beres, 2014). Bystander intervention encourages participants to contribute to a shift in campus culture by creating new norms of looking out for each other and having the confidence to intervene in potentially dangerous situations. Programs built around consent not only clarify what consent looks like, but also discuss healthy relationships and provide strategies for how to be sure an encounter is

consensual (Beres, 2014). Universities also tend to make changes to the environment itself, such as increased lighting or providing safe transportation options at night, to increase safety and deter crime.

1.2 Study aims

Despite the heavy utilization of these programs – indeed, it is a requirement of the *Campus SaVE Act* for all students to be offered some sexual violence prevention programming – little is known about students' retention, especially over time (Katz & Moore, 2013; Campus SaVE Act, 2014). In addition, even less is known about the interaction between programs meant to prevent sexual violence and campus culture. Both of these components of prevention programs – retention and relatability – can impact the effectiveness of prevention efforts in changing individual behavior, campus culture, and prevalence of sexual violence. In this vein, the current study asks the following research questions, which will be answered through an exploratory analysis of a single campus and its sexual violence programming.

1) *How well have students retained the lessons and skills taught in prevention programming?*

    a) *Are there demographic differences, especially in terms of gender, in learning, retention, and confidence in using skills?*

    b) *Are there differences in program retention between freshmen and all other students?*

c) *What is the impact of participating in multiple programs on student learning, retention, and confidence in using skills?*

2) *What is the current campus dating and party culture as described by students?*

a) *How do programming and situational crime prevention strategies address the reality of the campus dating and party cultures as perceived by students?*

3) *How does the student understanding of consent compare to the university policy?*

a) *Do students practice the university policy of consent in sexual encounters?*

4) *What is the relationship between current prevention programming practices and theory, specifically situational crime prevention, social learning theory, and the elaboration likelihood model?*

These research questions will be explored through a case study of a four-year university located in a Mid-Atlantic state in the United States. This university offers a variety of sexual violence prevention programming to students, including mandatory online modules and seminars, several optional programs that are available upon request by professors and student organization leaders, and programs specifically for high-risk populations. In addition, there are ongoing efforts by those at the university involved with prevention to adapt and update programs as needs change, with a focus on being both effective and comprehensive.

The data for this dissertation comes from four sources. The first is qualitative data derived from key informant interviews with professionals across campus involved with sexual violence. Key informants from the Student Health Department and

Campus Safety Department were interviewed, as well as peer educators who lead programs for other students. To support the information learned from key informants, university documents related to prevention were analyzed. These documents were drawn from university websites and provided by key informants, and provided additional information about program offerings and the campus context. The third data source is mixed methods survey data collected from students designed specifically for the present study. The Student Survey includes demographic questions, as well as questions about exposure to prevention programs, expected outcomes from these programs, and opinions about campus culture. The Student Survey is supplemented with a fourth data source- the Campus Survey. This is a yearly survey at the study site that asks students questions about violence, substance use, and other risky behaviors.

1.3 Study contributions

While this dissertation is a case study of a single university setting, it addresses larger issues that are relevant for all college campuses grappling with how to best prevent sexual violence. There is prior research examining the best practices or which programs are effective at changing attitudes or behavior, but there is a lack of research exploring the relationship between prevention efforts and student experiences. In addition, prior research tends to focus on evaluation of specific programs. While it is important to understand the impact of prevention efforts individually, this approach does not take into account the way students experience programming, especially multiple programs in a relatively short time period (i.e., freshman year). By taking a

more comprehensive and inclusive approach, this study examines students' attitudes after programming and retention of program materials, as well as the relationship between program content and lived student experiences at their particular university.

1.4 Dissertation outline

This dissertation is organized as follows: Chapter two outlines literature relevant to the above research questions, including what is known about campus culture related to sexual violence, the current state of literature related to university sexual violence prevention efforts, and theories used to understand prevention implementation and outcomes. Chapter three describes the methodology used in investigating these questions. Chapter four describes the study site, including a theoretical analysis of current programming practices. Chapters five and six explore the research findings; chapter five focuses on programming-related outcomes and student knowledge, while chapter six compares student descriptions of campus culture to the programming meant to address that culture. Chapter seven concludes with researcher and student suggestions for expanding programming, as well as a discussion of theoretical perspectives that can help guide future efforts.

Chapter 2

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES TO ADDRESS SEXUAL VIOLENCE ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES

2.1 Chapter overview

This chapter will provide an overview of the theoretical perspectives used in the analysis of sexual violence prevention programming on a college campus, and describe the ways they have been applied to sexual violence prevention efforts in past research. Next, literature describing the connections between correlates of sexual violence, like rape myth acceptance and rape culture, and the university culture will be described. Last, common prevention programs used at universities will be described with a brief theoretical analysis.

2.1.1 Situational crime prevention

Ecological theories, a criminological body of theory that focuses on how the built environment impacts the commission of crime by influencing how potential victims, offenders, and guardians interact with each other in a given space, are useful when a particular environment is under study. Situational crime prevention, one type of ecological theory, describes how a space can be changed to prevent crime (Eck & Clarke, 2019; Lee et al., 2017). For example, hotspots prevention is the idea that crimes are not randomly placed in space. Instead, they concentrate where a high volume of routine activities (i.e., daily actions, such as shopping, working, leisure

activities, etc.) overlap between potential victims and offenders with varying levels of guardianship (Wilcox & Cullen, 2018; Cohen & Felson, 1979). On a college campus, this includes bars and fraternity houses - both spaces characterized by alcohol use and a lack of external guardianship. Models of situational crime prevention focus on specific crime types in a particular setting or committed by a particular type of offender - in this case, sexual violence committed by college students on campus (Eck & Clarke, 2019). In addition, Eck and Clarke (2019) explain that the *why* of crime, or motivation, is not nearly as important as the *how*. If the process of how perpetrators commit a crime is understood, including target selection, adjustments to the environment can be made to disrupt that process.

The environment can be altered in ways that influence criminal motivation as well as opportunity (Tillyer & Eck, 2011). For example, some universities have engaged in poster campaigns. In an evaluation of a university poster campaign to promote bystander intervention behaviors, Potter and colleagues (2009) found that the majority of surveyed students both remembered the posters and reported increased awareness of bystander intervention techniques. Other environmental changes, such as blue lights placed around campus (i.e., lights which indicate the locations of buttons that alert campus police if a person feels in danger), can make students feel safer and at the same time deter violence. However, target hardening in this way only has limited effectiveness in preventing sexual violence when most perpetrators are known to the victim and most assaults typically do not fit the "stranger jumping out of the bushes" stereotype (Linder & Lacy, 2020). Altering the environment to promote long-

term behavior change and reinforce programming messaging, such as community disapproval of violent or coercive behaviors in dating contexts, may be more likely to result in a decrease of sexual violence on college campuses.

Opportunities for decision-making, including the decision process for committing a crime, are distributed across time and space, but clustered around those whom potential offenders view as suitable victims (Brantingham & Brantingham, 1993; Cornish & Clarke, 1987; Tillyer & Eck, 2011). It is the role of prevention programs and policies to change opportunity by acting as handlers – both in how potential perpetrators might evaluate a given environment, and whether they evaluate it at all. Handlers, or people who prevent crime by intervening in the behavior of potential offenders, can provide knowledge that impacts the cost-benefit analysis of potential offenders through programming that is also consistent with a social learning model (Felson, 1986; Tillyer & Eck, 2011). Tillyer and Eck's (2011) model of what handler effectiveness can look like is not unlike a model of bystander intervention. Their model includes the level of a handler's social closeness to a perpetrator, their willingness to intervene in relation to their investment in the situation, their opportunity in terms of access to the perpetrator, and their knowledge of how to intervene in the particular situation - all components that programs of bystander intervention address. However, ecological theorists typically are not focused on altering the offender as much as how they interact with the environment.

2.1.2 Social learning theory

Social learning theory (SLT) has been applied to a variety of deviant behaviors, including sexual violence, and is useful for the analysis of sexual violence prevention efforts on college campuses (e.g., Powers et al., 2020; Cochran et al., 2017). Akers and Burgess developed SLT by combining components of both Sutherland's (1947) differential association theory of criminological behavior, and behavioral psychological theory (see Akers, 1998). After multiple iterations, SLT now includes four components. The first is differential association, or the idea that the people one spends time or identifies with will have a sizable impact on their own norms, beliefs, and values. Next is imitation, or mimicking the beliefs or behaviors of role models. The third component of social learning theory is differential reinforcement, or actual and anticipated rewards or punishments that are learned consequences of behavior (Akers & Jennings, 2015; Pratt et al., 2010). The last component, and the one most relevant to later analysis, is definitions. Definitions, described in greater detail below, are techniques and beliefs that can aid in crime. These interrelated components work in tandem to orient one toward either normative behavior or criminal behavior. Importantly, they also operate in a sort of reciprocal feedback loop. As one engages in criminal behavior and is rewarded for it (or not punished), antisocial definitions will be reinforced and they will be more likely to commit this behavior again (Akers, 1998).

Definitions refer to beliefs, skills, attitudes, and knowledge that assist in carrying out criminal behavior, and can be the focus of prevention. Definitions do not

necessarily have to be something inherently criminal or learned with the intention of committing a crime to help orient one toward crime. For example, computer coding and accounting skills that are learned in the course of a prosocial job can be used to commit fraud. However, crime is more likely when definitions, especially values and norms, are more favorable toward crime. Definitions also include interpretations of the law as a rule that should be followed, or something that is okay to break either all the time or under certain circumstances. In terms of sexual violence on college campuses, the most prevalent definitions may be rape myths that function as techniques of neutralization (Burt, 1980; Sykes & Matza, 1957). Techniques of neutralization are a way for a perpetrator to deny responsibility for a crime, both externally to avoid consequences associated with punishment and internally to avoid seeing themselves as having done something wrong (Sykes & Matza, 1957). When these techniques are used, a perpetrator may claim that no one was really hurt – such as by claiming a victim of sexual violence is lying about a sexual encounter being forced – or deny responsibility – such as blaming substance use or miscommunication. Sykes and Matza (1957) initially conceptualized techniques of neutralization as performed by juveniles, but they have since been applied to an array of crimes and demographics.

While tests of social learning theory typically do not measure the full model, choosing instead to focus on only a couple of components and analyzing their effects individually, findings have been supportive (Akers, 1989; Cochran et al., 2017). For example, Boeringer et al. (1991) tested the applicability of SLT for explaining the sexual aggression of fraternity members. They found social learning variables

mediated the relationship between fraternity membership and sexual aggression, suggesting members are exposed to a culture that not only approves of violence against women, but rewards it. Definitions and differential association in particular have been linked to criminal behavior (Pratt et al., 2010). In a full test of the theory, Cochran et al. (2017) found strong support for SLT's ability to predict past and current intimate partner violence perpetration, though some of the effects are indirect through other components. For example, the authors found the effect of differential association was mediated through differential reinforcement when used to predict intimate partner violence perpetrated against a current partner. SLT has also been applied to victimization. Powers et al. (2020) explored the impact of gender on victimization and found the components of SLT worked differently for females and males. For example, the authors found differential association is a significant and direct predictor of intimate partner violence victimization for women but not for men. This suggests that the ideas about violence against women in intimate partner relationships is more widely acknowledged, and in some situations accepted, than violence against men. However, while situational crime prevention and social learning theory help explain the characteristics of environments or the transmission of beliefs that drive behavior, they are less helpful in explaining how to best deliver programming content or other types of interventions to shift behavior.

2.1.3 Elaboration likelihood model of attitude change

The elaboration likelihood model (ELM) of attitude change explains the conditions under which individuals best absorb new material and attitude change can occur (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). This model is useful for understanding why a program may or may not achieve long-term change, especially for a particular audience. There are two routes through which learning can happen. The first is the peripheral route, characterized by a lack of motivation and personal investment in the material. This results in the content becoming secondary to the other details such as the setting because the audience member is not properly invested or engaged, thus learning is less likely to become long term. The presenter in particular is likely to become more important than the message - specifically the presenter's perceived expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness (Heppner et al., 1995; Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). The second way individuals can learn is through the central route, where the audience member is invested and engaged in the material, considering the ideas as they are presented rather than lesser details in the room, thus learning is more likely to be long term. The central route is characterized by a personal investment in what is being taught, and an intrinsic motivation in wanting to learn it. The message is much more likely to be retained over time if it is learned via the central route rather than the peripheral route. Gilbert et al. (1991) explain that for central route processing and attitude change (i.e., long-term attitude change) to occur, an audience member must have both the motivation and ability to engage with the material, as well as see it in a positive light as a result of engagement (i.e., thought favorability; p. 198).

ELM has been applied to sexual violence prevention in only a handful of studies. Gilbert et al (1991) tested the outcomes of a sexual violence prevention program designed based on an ELM framework. To foster motivation and buy-in, the presenters role-played vignettes. To promote audience understanding of the program material and help ensure the audience would be able to understand key takeaways, presenters repeated the most important components throughout the program and summarized it at the end while avoiding jargon. Last, in an effort to help the audience think about the material in a more favorable way, multiple perspectives on issues such as rape myths and adversarial sexual beliefs likely to be held by participants were presented and addressed. For example, presenters addressed the negative outcomes of holding these beliefs. Gilbert et al. (1991) found the ELM-based prevention programming to be effective in changing attitudes related to rape myth acceptance and other correlates of sexual violence, and that this change remained at least up to one month.

Building on Gilbert et al. (1991), Heppner and colleagues (1995) tested the efficacy of a typical sexual violence prevention program through an ELM lens. The program consisted of statistics and information about sexual violence, a video, and a question-and-answer session. Focusing largely on sex differences, the researchers found that prevention program content is more important to women – thus, they were more likely to have inherent motivation to pay attention and retain the information. The traits of the presenter, including attractiveness, trustworthiness, and expertness,

were more important for men. This suggests they processed the material through the peripheral route rather than the central route.

The Men's Program, a sexual violence prevention program based on ELM in addition to other theory, is an interactive workshop presented only to men (Foubert & Newberry, 2006). Prevention programming presented to men in single-gender groups has been found to be more effective than when presented in mixed gender groups, and can be more specifically catered to that group (Brecklin & Forde, 2001). The goal of The Men's Program is to foster empathy for survivors of sexual violence by showing videos of male survivors recounting their experience. Past research has shown that this tactic is much more likely to achieve attitude change in participants compared to showing videos of female survivors. In fact, the latter may have the opposite effect of making male participants feel attacked or protective over their partners, inducing defensiveness and reinforcing rape myths (Foubert & Newberry, 2006; see also Gilbert et al., 1995). To combat this, The Men's Program encourages discussion that sexual violence is about power and control, and ends the program with a summary of the material. In separate five-month and two-year follow-ups, evaluators found most respondents reported attitudinal and/or behavioral change that they attributed to the program (Foubert et al., 2010; Foubert & Perry, 2007). Common changes were increased empathy for and awareness of survivors of sexual assault, looking out for female friends who are in vulnerable situations and male friends who are engaging in risky or aggressive behavior (e.g., drinking too much), and monitoring their own behavior when navigating intimate situations.

Focusing on potential victims rather than potential perpetrators, Gidycz et al. (2006) incorporated ELM into their framework when developing a sexual assault self-defense course for college women. Specifically, they used survivors' stories and local statistics to make the programming more personally relevant to the participants and walked them through scenarios that may be familiar to them. Additionally, the program ended with a review of the material and was followed by booster sessions. After 6 months, the program participants were significantly more likely to use self-protective and assertive behaviors than the control group. However, there was no difference between the program participants and the control group in terms of reported sexual victimization.

2.2 Rape culture on college campuses

It is well documented that college campuses perpetuate rape culture, particularly among certain university subcultures (Jozkowski, 2015; Canan et al., 2018; Murnen & Kohlman, 2007). Rape culture is a term used to refer to an environment that is permissive to, and even supportive of, sexual violence (Canan et al., 2018). One of the ways rape culture is upheld and transmitted is through the endorsement of rape myths (Burt, 1980). These are a set of ideologies that legitimize sexual violence against women by assigning blame to victims, often women, and excusing the actions of perpetrators, often men. Consistent with social learning theory, rape myths also function as definitions favorable to crime and as techniques of neutralization. They allowing perpetrators to deny the victim (e.g., women deserve

sexual assault if they are wearing provocative clothing); deny injury (e.g., token resistance, or the idea that if a woman says "no" to sex she really wants to say yes and is waiting to be convinced; see Koss & Harvey, 1991); or deny responsibility (e.g., the belief that if a man pays for dinner he is owed sex; Burt, 1980). Past research has found strong connections between rape myth acceptance and sexual violence perpetration (Mouilso & Calhoun, 2013; Trottier et al., 2021), related correlates such as rape proclivity (Bohner et al., 2006; Eyssel et al., 2006), and other problematic behaviors, including sexism, sexual coercion, and sexual harassment (Lutz-Zois et al., 2015; Suarez & Gadella, 2010; Yapp & Quayle, 2018; Trottier et al., 2021; Warren et al., 2015).

One way rape myths impact individuals is through perceptions of victims and offenders, such as who is given the legitimate victim status after experiencing crime or violence. For example, Christie (1986) describes the societal belief of an "ideal victim" as having five characteristics. According to Christie, the ideal victim is weak- this can mean they are old, young, sick, or otherwise not capable of protecting themselves. Next, when they are victimized they are engaged in a legitimate activity and are in a legitimate space. In other words, they are not doing something that can be construed as contributing to their own victimization (e.g., drinking alcohol in a bar). Regarding the offender, the ideal victim is victimized by someone unknown to them and who is "big and bad" (Christie, 1986, p. 19). Christie (1986) notes this image of an ideal victim is not necessarily what all victims look like, nor are all people with these characteristics destined for experiencing victimization. Rather, it is a societally

constructed image that results in some victims of crime and violence being able to claim the "victim" status, while others are denied it, and are thus treated as complicit in their own victimization. In an update of this conceptualization of an ideal victim, Bosma et al. (2018) argue that even if there is a prior relationship between a victim and offender, the victim can still be perceived as innocent. However, for this to occur there must be some sort of unequal power dynamic and an effort on the part of the victim toward "noncompliance" (Bosma et al., 2018, p. 32). Bosma et al. (2018) also complicate Christie's (1986) ideal victim a bit, adding that the perception of victim characteristics depends on both the context and needs of the observer. For example, an observer may need to make themselves feel safe from sexual violence by blaming the victim – including their behavior, environment, or the circumstances of their assault - in some way that differentiates them from that of the victim.

An increase in awareness and conversation around issues such as sexual violence has resulted in myths shifting to become more subtle, but no less strongly held. For example, overt victim blaming is no longer acceptable. More subtle myths, including victim culpability related to alcohol/drug use and behavior or beliefs about the frequency of false allegations made by women, remain strong (McMahon & Farmer, 2011). Another rape myth, the belief that most sexual violence is perpetrated by a stranger "jumping out of the bushes," also remains pervasive. Although university programming attempts to subvert this belief with statistics and research that show most sexual victimization occurs between people who know each other, this myth remains strongly held to the point of changing the behavior of college women to

avoid victimization from strangers (e.g., not studying late at night away from home; Linder & Lacy, 2020; Cantor et al., 2019). It also serves to deny the victim or injury when a survivor comes forward to report their victimization and the situation does not fit what is see as the "typical" story.

Despite becoming less explicit, rape myths are still culturally pervasive and are embedded throughout societal structures, such as law, institutional policy, and conventional social norms. Consequently, rape culture and myths are regularly reinforced, especially by those in power. This is evident in how universities have historically responded to reports of sexual violence, especially in highly visible cases. It is not uncommon for perpetrators of sexual violence to face very few consequences from their university, sending the message that the behavior is acceptable or that the perpetrator was not the one at fault (Jozkowski, 2015). This perception can ripple out and shape university culture and perceptions that sexual violence is permissible (McMahon et al., 2021).

Unfortunately, university administrators not taking sexual violence seriously is not the only example of rape culture on college campuses. In a qualitative study exploring beliefs of college-aged students, Hackman et al. (2019) found college women tend to ascribe to the belief that only certain women who engage in risky sexual behaviors are assaulted. In addition, college students in general view excessive alcohol use as an excuse to participate in hookup culture without being culpable for actions. These beliefs serve to justify sexual violence when it happens through victim blaming. Rape culture on college campuses is particularly prevalent in the Greek life

subculture (Martin, 2016; Jozkowski & Wiersma-Mosley, 2017). Past research has noted that there are higher rates of rape myth acceptance among fraternity members than non-Greek students, with some researchers suggesting male students that endorse rape myths and are accepting of sexual violence may be more attracted to fraternity culture (Canan et al., 2018; Seabrook et al., 2018; Hockett et al., 2016; O'Connor, 2021). Rape myths have also been found to be held at higher rates among athletes (Sawyer et al., 2002; Murnen & Kohlman, 2007). Rape culture, and resulting behavior such as sexual violence, can be seen most clearly in two facets of college life: party culture and dating culture (Wade, 2017).

2.2.1 Party culture

While the specifics of party culture vary based on nuances of the campus setting, it is typically characterized by binge drinking, music and dancing, and exploring one's sexuality (e.g., hooking up; Jozkowski & Wiersma-Mosley, 2017; Kuperberg & Padgett, 2015). Partying is seen by many as a central and expected aspect of the typical college experience (Porta et al., 2021; Clapp et al., 2008; Armstrong & Hamilton, 2013). One reason for this is drinking. Alcohol consumption, especially for those younger than the legal drinking age of 21, is a significant driver for parties on college campuses. Numerous studies examining drinking motivations have found social pressures to be a driver, both among adolescents (Cooper, 1994) and adults (Mohr et al., 2001). In addition, conversations with college students have revealed that access to alcohol is a factor in students who are under 21 attending

fraternity parties, compared to those over the legal drinking age who more often socialize at bars (Porta et al., 2021). Drinking location has been found to have an impact on whether or not a student drinks alcohol to intoxication. The relationship between party characteristics and likelihood of drinking to intoxication depends on the setting (e.g., off-campus party, fraternity party, campus event, etc.), but in general, college students are more likely to drink to intoxication when kegs are present, the minimum drinking age is not enforced, parties are larger, and partygoers perceive most of their peers at the party are intoxicated (Marzell et al., 2015).

However, alcohol use is not the only problematic characteristic of university parties pointed out by past literature. It has also been established that fraternity parties are perceived by students to be a hotspot for sexual violence (Porta et al., 2021). There is an intersection between alcohol and the party scene- college students who attend fraternity and athlete parties are more likely to be sexually assaulted than students who drink alcohol in other settings or those that did not drink or party at all (Boyle & Walker, 2016). This can be explained by the close relationship between party culture and rape culture. In a robust discussion of how Greek life promotes rape culture, Jozkowski and Wiersma-Mosley (2017) argue that there is a concentration of wealth, privilege, and institutional legitimacy (e.g., large houses on or near campus sanctioned by the university) within fraternities. As a result, fraternities control party life – and thus hold great social power and influence – on campuses. As such, characteristics of fraternity life, especially misogyny, become imbedded in campus life in general. These assertions are supported by other research. For example, Boyle and Walker

(2016) report that college students who attend fraternity and/or athlete parties are more likely than other students, including those that party in other settings, to endorse rape myths that blame victims and excuse perpetrators.

2.2.2 Dating culture

According to researchers, hookup culture has replaced dating, or courtship culture, on college campuses (Bogle, 2008). Concisely, hooking up is used to refer to sex that is often spontaneous and with no expectation of future relationship commitment (Pham, 2016; Holman & Sillars, 2012; Bogle, 2008). Digging deeper, however, hooking up as a behavior is difficult to define. In her study, Bogle (2008) finds college students defined hooking up as anything from kissing to "anything but" sex to casual sex when talking about how *they* specifically define it. When asked what the term means in general, students acknowledged that it does not have an agreed-upon usage – it is so inconsistent that more than one interview participant explained you have to ask the person using it what they mean. More recent research has supported this finding of ambiguity (Holman & Sillars, 2012; Hackman et al., 2017) and variation (Lewis et al., 2013). Interestingly, college students in Bogle's (2008) study agreed hooking up was the dominant way their peers on campus met sexual or romantic partners, despite differences in what the term can mean.

While media sources may claim the college hookup culture is relatively new, researchers argue it is an old phenomenon with a new name. For example, Monto and Carey (2014) compared survey data from 1988-1996 with comparable data from 2004-

2012, and found no difference in number of sexual partners or frequency of engaging in sex. Rather, the main difference seems to be related to terminology and definitions of relationships – the more recent sample was more likely to report sexual relationships with friends and casual dates than the 1988-1996 sample, and less likely to report sexual relationships with spouses or regular partners.

Despite the perceived dominance of hookup culture on college campuses, there is disagreement on how prevalent it really is as a behavior. Kuperberg and Padgett (2016) found participation to be around 60%, but Holman and Sillars (2012) suggest hooking up is more common as a sexual script and expectation than a way students regularly form sexual or romantic relationships. This is supported by similarly high rates of long-term dating – in a national sample of over 20,000 college students, Kuperberg and Padgett (2016) reported 51% of their sample have been in a long-term relationship. Complicating the picture further, there are differences in participation based on identity and campus affiliations. Research has consistently shown students of color and women hookup less often than white students and men (Reling et al., 2018; Holman & Sillars, 2012; Kuperberg & Padgett, 2016). In addition, fraternity and sorority members hookup at higher rates than non-Greek students (Canan et al., 2018; Kuperberg & Padgett, 2016).

Prevalence of participation aside, college hookup culture is harmful in more ways than one. For example, one qualitative study found students to be disappointed, emotionally traumatized, and hurt from hookups (Wade, 2017). The mismatch in understandings of what hooking up entails may be to blame, as well as the lack of

emotional fulfillment (Lewis et al., 2013; Wade, 2017). Another study found that while men hooked up more often than women, they also wished there were more opportunities for long-term relationships (Kuperberg & Padgett, 2016). This suggests perceived cultural expectation may be driving the behavior.

Hookup culture is also closely related to rape myths and rape myth acceptance among college students. Hookup culture has been celebrated by college students as sexually freeing, yet it reinforces the same heteronormative norms of male dominance and female passivity as rape myths, as well as unequal power dynamics in general (Bogle, 2008; Reling et al., 2018; Canan et al., 2018). Hookup culture, as well as party culture, are less accessible for students that do not benefit from class, gender, and race privilege on college campuses, in that those with social privilege control access to spaces hookups are most likely to occur (e.g., fraternity parties; Pham, 2016). Interestingly, in their study of the association between rape myth acceptance and participation in hookup culture, Reling and colleagues (2016) found college students who believe that hookups are innocuous and contribute to social standing were more likely to accept rape myths, while students who saw hookups as sexually freeing were less likely.

2.3 Prevention on college campuses

Sexual violence prevention strategies on college campuses have transformed over the years as goals and methodologies have changed. Initially, campuses focused on reducing risk factors associated with potential victimization by encouraging women

to change their behaviors (Linder et al., 2020; McMahon, 2017; Powell & Henry, 2014). For example, colleges might offer self-defense courses or encourage women to always carry self-defense weapons such as pepper spray on them (McMahon, 2017). The recent push for women to download safety apps that allow loved ones to track their position when engaging in a "risky" activity, such as walking home alone at night, also puts the onus on women as potential victims. In other words, programming focused on rape avoidance or risk reduction rather than rape prevention (Koss & Harvey, 1991). Another immensely popular strategy that has now fallen out of favor was to encourage women to give in to her attacker rather than attempt escape or resistance in an effort to avoid further bodily harm (Koss & Harvey, 1991).

Over time, however, feminist influences have encouraged campuses to shift focus away from viewing women as potential victims, responsible for preventing their own victimization, and toward men as potential perpetrators. To do this, strategies – particularly bystander intervention – aimed to develop confidence in using skills and a sense of community in program participants. Education around communication and healthy relationships are also typically included. This is not to say risk reduction programs no longer exist or no longer have a place, but it is just as important to address perpetration as it is to empower women to protect themselves. Hand-in-hand with this shift was taking a macrolevel view of prevention (McMahon et al., 2021; Bonar er al., 2022). Instead of trying to only teach individuals the skills and knowledge needed to prevent violence, practitioners more often began using violence prevention programming as an opportunity to tackle complex issues such as the roles

of power and patriarchy in creating sexually hostile environments. It has been widely accepted by scholars and practitioners alike that sexual violence is more than the result of an individual's behavior – it is "inextricably part of a gendered social order" and is an expression of the patriarchal structure on which society is built (Pease, 2014, p. 24).

However, this shift to feminist-informed prevention strategies has led to new challenges. Programming that treats men as if they have already committed a crime or will inevitably do so alienates them from the material presented in prevention programs and often targets individual-level behaviors, making participants less likely to be receptive to the material (Newlands & O'Donohue, 2016). This realization has led to the wide adoption of programs intended to shift campus-level social norms - still with a focus on those most likely to commit sexual violence - but as allies in prevention rather than as potential offenders (Davis, 2000). For example, bystander intervention programs attempt to change campus-level norms by encouraging individuals to change not just their own behavior, but also intervene in and influence the behavior of those around them. Change in effect "ripples out" from those that initially take a program to others around them. This can eventually shift and create new norms around dating, consent, and gender entirely. The popularity of peer-led programs are also an attempt toward campus-level change, recognizing the larger influence peers have on community norms than others (Waterman et al., 2021; van Hoorn et al., 2016).

Another driver of the change in programming is legislative. Beginning with the 1992 amendment to the *Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1990* (*Clery*

Act; Campus SaVE Act, 2014), federally funded institutes of higher education are required to provide sexual violence prevention programs. However, the amendment provided no guidance at the time as to what these programs should look like (Kafonek & Richards, 2017). Eventually, the *Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act*, also known as the *Campus SaVE Act*, expanded on previous mandates to the *Clery Act* and required that federally funded institutes of higher education provide programming to incoming students and staff that includes content such as the definition of consent, the types of interpersonal violence, and information on bystander intervention resources on campus (Kafonek & Richards, 2017; Newlands & O'Donohue, 2016).

2.4 Evaluation and outcomes of prevention

While some prevention programs have been evaluated more than others (e.g., bystander intervention), there is a general lack of research investigating the outcomes of prevention initiatives on college campuses, especially over time (Jozkowski, 2015). This has negative implications for development of prevention programming, as there is currently no "best practice" according to the literature, especially when it comes to a unified university-wide effort (Newlands & O'Donohue, 2016).

There are two main types of measures in evaluations of the effectiveness of sexual violence prevention programs: behavior change (e.g., lower self-reported perpetration or more frequent bystander intervention behavior), and attitude and beliefs change (e.g., lower endorsement of rape myths or higher intention to intervene). Due to availability of data and lack of evaluation capacity, outcomes

related to attitude and beliefs change are more common. For example, an overview of prevention efforts concluded that only two types of programs have demonstrated behavior change: social norms campaigns and bystander intervention (Casey & Lindhorst, 2009). Unfortunately, research has found attitude change and measures like intention to intervene are not strong proxies for actual behavior change (Newlands & O'Donohue, 2016).

While there are many different approaches to developing prevention programming, the most popular are bystander intervention and norm change, consent-focused education, and targeted prevention. These categories are not mutually exclusive, and a single intervention may include components from all three. Situational crime prevention strategies are also a common prevention tactic, but are different from the other three in that the goal is to prevent violence through changing the environment rather than changing behavior, attitudes, or community norms.

2.4.1 Bystander intervention and norm change

A major component of prevention and changing behavior is correcting misperceptions of peer attitudes and behavior (Berkowitz, 2010). This is especially true for sexual violence prevention on college campuses, as college students tend to vastly overestimate the prevalence of rape myth acceptance and similarly problematic beliefs among their peers. Bystander intervention (BI; Gidycz et al., 2011) is perhaps the most well-known sexual violence prevention program on college campuses, particularly when it comes to campus norm change. BI programs focus on addressing

the reasons bystanders may not intervene before, during, or after someone is victimized. In doing so, BI encourages participants to contribute to a shift in campus culture, building a norm of looking out for each other and having the confidence to intervene when noticing the signs of violence. While there have been many models proposed, they generally suggest 1) providing knowledge regarding what sexual violence looks like, including in situations relevant to the participants, and general prevalence rates; and 2) developing skills that can be used during an event, such as interrupting a potential offender or calling for help, and building the confidence to use them (Banyard et al., 2004; Gidycz et al., 2011; Katz & Moore, 2013). Bystander intervention is often understood as intervening during a potential victimization event, but it also includes speaking up when witnessing problematic comments, behavior, and attitudes expressed by those in the participant's social network. It is the goal of bystander intervention not just to change the behavior of the individuals taking the program, but to shift community norms as participants interact with their peers and the broader campus or neighborhood community using their new knowledge and skills.

Banyard et al. (2004) note that BI research tends to focus more on understanding behavior and why participants choose whether to intervene, rather than effectiveness of the program itself in changing behavior or reducing sexual violence outcomes. Research regarding these mechanisms has found factors such as whether others are around during the event, perception of whether a potential victim is in distress, and whether a potential victim deserves what is happening to them (e.g., if they are dressed inappropriately or drank too much alcohol – beliefs known as rape

myths) can impact whether a bystander intervenes (Banyard et al., 2004; Bennett et al., 2014). Other factors, including perceptions of appropriate peer and community norms, whether bystanders have role models who have taught them helping behaviors, and whether bystanders feel they possess the necessary skills to intervene in a situation, have also been found to be important (Banyard et al., 2004; Banyard, 2011). In addition, all of these beliefs and skills linked to likelihood of bystander intervention behavior have been found to be modifiable through programming, especially at the high school level (Miller, 2018; Coker et al., 2019). This includes rape myth acceptance, intention to intervene, and awareness of intervention strategies (Kettrey et al., 2019). While researchers argue it is important for exposure to this type of programming to start as early as possible, college students also report similar positive outcomes (Abbey & McAuslan, 2004; Coker et al., 2019).

Despite gaps in the literature, there is emerging research focused on effectiveness of BI programs on outcomes such as perpetration, short- and long-term attitude change, and capacity for community norm change (Casey & Lindhorst, 2009). In a review of 44 bystander intervention studies, including Bringing in the Bystander (Banyard et al., 2004) and the Men's Program (Foubert & Perry, 2007), Mujal et al. (2021) find that there is more consistent evidence for the effectiveness of these programs than ever before. However, none of the programs included in the study, which was limited to programs with pre- and post-test designs, had follow-ups greater than 12 months. A more recent review of BI programs includes published research of rigorous evaluations of BI programs from 1997-2017 (Kettrey et al., 2019). The

authors found that there is consistent support for a decrease in rape myth acceptance and an increase in intention and confidence to intervene after exposure to BI messaging. However, there is no evidence that the program impacts actual perpetration of gender-based violence. Further, most analysis is limited to quantitative methodology. While quantitative research is important in answering questions of causation, it is limited in its ability to allow insight into the possibility of larger campus-level change, processes, or attitudes.

2.4.2 Consent-based education

A common theme in most, if not all, prevention curriculums is consent. This typically includes clarifying and discussing what consent looks like in sexual situations. Unsurprisingly, a lack of comprehension of consent in sexual situations is linked to sexual violence perpetration among male college students, and has been found to be a mediator between known correlates of sexual violence (e.g., rape myth acceptance and rigid masculinity) and perpetration (Warren et al., 2015). One reason for the popularity of programming with an emphasis on consent is due to the importance of addressing the meaning of consent. Beres (2014) explains that definitions for consent are often taken for granted, but it is often defined differently in legal, social, and academic contexts. Beres goes on to discuss legal issues of implied versus explicit consent (i.e., verbal confirmation of consent versus actions that imply consent has been given), coerced or incapacitated consent, and differences across legal jurisdictions. However, legal issues are only one contributing factor to confusion

around sexual consent for college students. For example, Jozkowski and Peterson (2013) discuss gendered social differences in how consent is communicated among college students, as well as gendered patterns in how consent is obtained - or glossed over. They found that in their sample, men were framed as being responsible for initiating sex and consent, while women were responsible for responding to men's interest and granting consent. In addition, some men described initiating consent through what could be perceived as aggression by women. What is seen by men as being assertive and clear could be perceived by women as an assault where they feel unsafe to resist. Thus, it is the task of consent programs to clarify these discrepancies and misconceptions into actionable knowledge.

However, there may be a disconnect between what college students can realistically be expected to do in sexual encounters, and what university policies, and thus sexual violence prevention educators, are asking of them. For example, some policies require verbal consent before each new sex act - potentially requiring partners to stop and discuss what they are doing several times as they reach new "levels" of activity in order to provide explicit consent (e.g., Antioch College). Beres (2014) explains that this model is based on the assumption that sexual violence is the result of miscommunication; however, research shows very little miscommunication actually occurs during sexual encounters. Rather, perpetrators of sexual violence ignore what are clear communicative signals such as hesitancy, tensing up, and similar body language, that communicate discomfort. This sentiment is echoed by consent educators (Beres, 2020). However, other educators do note that teaching affirmative

consent is important and may prevent sexual violence that might occur as a result of a lack of understanding of what consent does and does not look like, such as in cases of intoxication or coercion (Beres, 2020; Warren et al., 2015).

Another important disconnect exists between students' understanding of legal definitions and what they actually do during a sexual encounter. While students can often provide accurate legal definitions, describing issues such as incapacitation and explicit versus implied consent, in actual practice they often prescribe to a "no means no" or "silence as consent" model. In other words, as long as they are not stopped by their partner, they interpret silence or lack of resistance as implied consent (Beres, 2014). This is in conflict with the affirmative consent, or "yes means yes," model adopted by many universities, and shows the importance of addressing misconceptions, practicing skills, and gauging student understanding.

While popular on college campuses, consent-based programs are relatively new (Beres, 2018). As such, there is a dearth of research exploring their effectiveness in educating students or changing their behavior. However, the research to date is promising. For example, Borges and colleagues (2008) found participants in consent programs possessed greater knowledge of university consent policy than the control group. Creating norms around consent has also been successful with adolescents. An evaluation of Safe Dates found reported sexual violence perpetration and victimization both occurred at lower rates compared to the control group (Foshee et al., 2004). Last, a recent evaluation of the RealConsent program, six 30-minute online modules that promote bystander intervention and consent shows promising attitude and behavioral

outcomes. Participants completed a survey both immediately after the program and again after six months. The results indicate the program has a large impact on sexual violence perpetration among college men that remains over time through several mediators, including knowledge of effective consent communication, level of hostility toward women, and rape myth acceptance (Salazar et al., 2019).

2.4.3 Targeted prevention

Targeted prevention is used here to refer to prevention programs that are created and implemented specifically for college populations that have been identified as high risk, either for perpetration, victimization, or both. Perhaps the most common versions of this on college campuses is programming targeted toward students involved in university athletics and Greek life (i.e., sororities and fraternities).

Coaching Boys into Men (CBIM) targets primarily school- or college-aged athletes and uses a bystander intervention and norm change approach. CBIM utilizes coaches as mentors to not only deliver regular programming throughout a lengthy time period, but also to facilitate conversations and serve as role models (Miller et al., 2016). Coaches then encourage students to become role models themselves both for their fellow athletes and other peers in their school. One of the main goals of CBIM is to increase gender equitable attitudes among participants, alongside raising awareness of violence against women, reducing violence perpetration of the participants themselves, and increasing bystander intervention both in terms of intervening before, during, or after a violent event or disrupting behavior that is supportive of patriarchal

norms (Miller et al., 2012; Miller et al., 2016). However, while some evaluations of CBIM have been positive regarding some outcomes (e.g., willingness to intervene), there has been less success in changing norms, especially norms related to hegemonic and toxic masculinity, that have been associated with sexual violence perpetration (Miller et al., 2012).

College men as a whole, not just those in fraternities or involved in athletics, have also been targeted for prevention efforts. Gidycz and colleagues (2011) evaluated The Men's Project, a university program aimed at first year students that facilitated conversations among male-identifying dorm mates with the aim of reducing sexual violence perpetration. At four- and seven-month follow-ups, participants demonstrated an increase in not only accuracy of peer perceptions of violence and campus life, but also behavior change. They reported an increase in bystander behaviors and affirming consent, as well as fewer instances of sexual violence perpetration compared to the control group. The success of The Men's Project suggests the importance of peer-led and gender-specific programming, particularly around issues of consent and rape supportive attitudes (e.g., the belief that it is an expectation for college males to have sex).

2.5 Theory and prevention

While situational crime prevention is not necessarily relevant to prevention *programming*, it is a common approach used for campus prevention approaches and may be the most visible for students. For example, blue light systems and nighttime

escort services are situational crime prevention tactics that are highly visible and may contribute to a student's sense of safety (Linder & Lacy, 2020). In addition, SLT and ELM are each useful for understanding not just program content, but also how implementation practices can have an impact on outcomes among participants. First, SLT describes how skills, behaviors, and attitudes are learned. According to SLT, the four components included in the model – definitions, differential association, imitation, and differential reinforcement – work together to determine whether one is oriented toward engaging in criminal activity. In terms of sexual violence prevention efforts on college campuses, the concepts of differential association and imitation are drawn on when utilizing peers to deliver content. Some programs, like CBIM and the Men's Program, depend on the audience relating to the facilitator and seeing them as a role model, whether it is a coach or respected community members. However, definitions are perhaps the most important component. Prevention programs aim to change problematic attitudes, such as rape myth acceptance, and teach skills that can be used to prevent violence, such as communicating consent or bystander intervention.

Second, ELM is useful for understanding not just why some program participants may have better outcomes than others, but also how to best present material to have the biggest long-term impact. This is most obviously relevant with targeted prevention, where programs are developed with a particular audience in mind to maximize the impact by appealing to that particular subpopulation (e.g., Greek life students). However, it is also useful for understanding how to best deliver content related to issues that may have gender differences in how they are experienced, such

as consent (Salazar et al., 2019). Past research has found men and women tend to communicate consent in different ways, suggesting it may be important to create specialized content and deliver it using varying methods for each of these groups. For example, men tend to be more aggressive and forthright in communicating consent, but they also tend to feel pressure to obtain it rather than give it themselves. According to ELM, it could be useful to obtain buy-in from men by describing the ways this could be harmful to them, rather than framing the conversation around women as potential victims that are the ones to provide consent (Newlands & O'Donohue, 2016).

The following chapter discusses the methodology used in the present study to answer the research questions listed in Chapter 1, including sources of data and plan of analysis. Chapter 4 describes the study site – a university campus - and provides context around the environment, especially relating to sexual violence prevention and views of the student body about sexual violence on their campus.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Case study

To answer the research questions outlined in the introductory chapter, a university campus was examined as a case study. In an overview of past evaluations of sexual violence prevention programs on college campuses, Linder et al. (2020) note most studies are quantitative. While this past research has allowed evaluators to answer questions comparing pre- and post-program outcomes, the lack of qualitative methods has limited the possibility of addressing other types of inquiry. Utilizing a mixed methods approach, specifically a case study that incorporates both quantitative and qualitative data, allows the researcher to answer questions related to process and perception, and perhaps more importantly, contextualize and make sense of outcomes (Stake, 1995). For the current study, salient contexts include history and development of sexual violence prevention programming, campus, state, and federal policies that mandate programming, campus culture and environment, and larger societal events that impact the campus environment (i.e., the Covid-19 pandemic).

3.2 Data sources

To provide a comprehensive view of sexual violence prevention programming at the study site, data were collected from three main sources. First, interviews with key informants were performed to better understand what sexual violence prevention looks like on this campus. Next, documents related to delivered programs were analyzed to provide additional context in understanding the implicit and explicit theories inherent in the university programming. Last, surveys that included both quantitative and qualitative questions were given to students. These surveys were used to gauge student understanding of programming material and understand campus culture. Supporting data were also analyzed from a yearly survey collected at the research site. All sources of data are described in further detail below.

3.2.1 Key informant interviews

The first type of data collection for the current study is interviews performed with key informants, specifically, campus staff and students involved in the creation, implementation, and/or evaluation of sexual violence prevention programs and related efforts. The purpose of these interviews is to understand not just the content of programs, but also the *way* they are taught. For example, interviewees described the use of campus-specific details such as statistics to show prevalence of peer bystander intervention behavior and how different campus groups respond to presenters. In other words, key informants provide details that could not be gleaned from other sources and illuminate the context around the creation and implementation of these programs.

Speaking with campus staff involved with situational crime prevention initiatives, such as placing blue lights, poster campaigns, and night shuttle services, also aided in understanding how the environment plays a role in prevention efforts. It was particularly important to include these types of strategies because the literature suggests the presence of visible deterrents is of great concern to students (Linder & Lacy, 2020).

Six interviews in total were completed, with follow-up communication via email during the survey analysis process. Key informants were invited to participate based on their expertise and job positions on campus. Recruitment began with persons employed by the campus entity that handles the majority of sexual violence prevention programming, the Student Health Department. A snowball sampling method was used to recruit other key informants involved with sexual violence prevention on campus, including student workers who present programs to their peers as peer educators. In addition, representatives of other campus departments, including the campus police department, were interviewed. Key informant interviews took around 45 minutes to complete and were not compensated. All interviews were performed over Zoom, with the researcher taking extensive handwritten notes. These notes were then typed into NVivo for analysis.

3.2.2 Student surveys

To understand student perspectives on campus culture, campus sexual violence, and prevention, data were collected from students using mixed methods

surveys that combined quantitative and qualitative data collection strategies. This survey will be referred to here as the Student Survey. The value of this methodology is being able to reach a far greater number of participants than is typically possible with interviews, and the ability to include measures such as Likert scales and vignettes to get at opinions or beliefs that might be more difficult to ascertain from an in-person discussion. With inclusion of open-ended text responses, qualitative data can also be collected that is better suited to answering different types of questions, such as perceptions. Online surveys also have the added benefit of being anonymous, where students may be more willing to be honest about their thoughts and opinions about campus life and difficult issues (e.g., navigating consent in relationships). According to past researchers using this methodology, text responses can elicit responses comparable to interview data, especially if used sparingly and with prompts (Braun et al., 2021). Braun and colleagues (2021) also explain that a particular strength of mixed methods surveys is the diversity of respondents they are able to access and represent that might be more difficult with other methodologies.

The Student Survey has four sections. First, students were asked demographic questions, including about their time spent on campus before and after the COVID-19 pandemic. In the next section, students were asked about life on campus. This includes open-ended questions about party culture and dating culture, forced-response questions about perceptions of campus safety, and exposure to prevention programming on campus. In the following section, expected outcomes of prevention programming are measured. This section includes three main question types: open-

ended questions, forced choice questions evaluating more specific outcomes (e.g., knowledge of the university's consent policy), and the use of vignettes to illustrate perceptions surrounding consent in sexual encounters. For the consent vignettes, based loosely on Jozkowski and Willis' (2020) work, participants were asked to read short stories detailing a sexual encounter between two people. They were asked to click on lines of the story to highlight when consent is indicated. Different highlight colors were available for each character, with a third color available to indicate that both characters communicated consent. Participants were also asked to provide an explanation or additional thoughts regarding their answer in an open-ended response. In the last section of the Student Survey, participants were asked about whether they think prevention programs on campus are successful or not successful, with space available for further explanation. The survey instrument is available upon request.

Before starting data collection, the student survey was piloted with a small group of undergraduate students. The undergraduate students who were invited to participate were enrolled in a 300-level Women's Studies course that is not a breadth course, and therefore not eligible to be in the study sample. They were informed upon invitation that they would be otherwise unable to participate if another one of their classes were to be invited to participate once the survey was in the field. The pilot feedback was positive, with very few suggestions for changes. Edits included adding clarification on certain questions and defining terms.

The survey participant pool includes all underclassmen in general education, or breadth of knowledge, courses. 80 breadth courses were selected from the Spring 2022

schedule, 25 courses were selected from the Summer 2022 schedule, and 15 courses were selected from the Fall 2022 schedule. Only classes with an enrollment of at least 15 students were selected, and many of these classes had more than one session. Professors were then asked via email whether they were willing to distribute a pre-written survey invitation to their classes. 44 professors agreed, resulting in the survey link being distributed to approximately 3,375 students.

Participating students were asked to read the consent form and mark whether they consented to participate in the survey. If they indicated yes, they were able to move on with the rest of the survey. If they indicated no, the survey ended with a page thanking them for their time. Although the researcher had a goal of recruiting 400 undergraduate students for this phase of data collection, time constraints resulted in 324 total surveys being collected. Ultimately, this survey had a response rate of 9.6%. The survey ended with a question asking participants whether they wanted to be entered into a compensation raffle. Those that agreed were redirected to a separate survey where they were asked to enter their name and contact information. They were required to use their university email in an effort to prevent multiple entries. Then, the researcher used an Excel random number generator to select a raffle winner every 40 participants, resulting in 10 drawings of $100 Amazon e-giftcards. Because data collection was ended before the recruitment goal of 400 was met, the final survey participants were split evenly into three groups. Placeholders were used to fill out each raffle group to keep the odds of winning consistent at 1 in 40.

Table 3.1. Student survey demographics.

	n	%
Gender		
Female	219	72%
Male	73	24%
Other gender	14	5%
Race/Ethnicity		
White	250	77%
Black	24	7%
Hispanic/Latino	25	9%
Other	40	12%
Greek membership	63	21%
Year in school		
Freshman	125	41%
Sophomore	64	21%
Junior	59	19%
Senior	60	19%

The race/ethnicity breakdown is similar to what was reported by the University in 2021 and 2022. However, the proportion of females is higher than the university undergraduate population; 72% of the study participants are female, compared to 59% of the student population. Greek life participation is slightly higher in the student population compared to the survey; the university reports 27% of undergraduates participate in Greek life. The year in school breakdown is also different compared to the undergraduate student population. The proportion of freshmen in the Student Survey is almost double the proportion at the university- 41% compared to 24%. In turn, the distribution of participants across the other three classes – sophomore, junior,

and senior – are all slightly lower. Unfortunately, there are not big enough sample sizes of minority students in terms of race or sexuality for analysis.

3.2.3 Secondary survey data

Survey data will also be used as supplemental data to evaluate the reach of sexual violence prevention programming in the case study site. The researcher will utilize data from an ongoing survey of the student body regarding victimization, perpetration, and risk behaviors, referred to here as the College Survey. Only demographic data will be used, in addition to two survey questions. The first question is regarding exposure to sexual violence prevention programming: "Think back over your time at [University]. Please review the following list of bystander training or intervention programs and check if you have ever received training from any of these programs?" This is followed by a mark all that apply response set that lists all prevention programs, both mandatory and optional, offered at the university. A total of 612 respondents answered this question. The second question asks about awareness of other types of prevention resources available on campus: “Please review the following list of safety measures and resources available at [University]. Check the measures and resources that you are aware of or familiar with.” This is also followed by a mark all that apply response set which includes environmental features, such as blue lights and prevention-oriented posters in campus shuttles, and mental health or crisis services. These data will only be used descriptively to get a sense of the reach of prevention

programming in the wider campus community beyond the experiences of the Student Survey participants. 613 respondents answered this question.

Table 3.2. College survey demographics.

	n	%
Gender		
Female	421	66%
Male	154	24%
Other gender	43	7%
Race/Ethnicity		
White	467	73%
Black	49	11%
Hispanic/Latino	54	8%
Other	122	19%
Greek membership	164	26%
Athlete	24	4%
Year in school		
Freshman	160	25%
Sophomore	142	22%
Junior	181	28%
Senior	146	23%

Compared to the student survey, the demographic breakdown of the students who participated in the College Survey better reflect the student body at the university. For example, year in school is more evenly distributed, and is more similar to the overall student population. Gender is also closer, though a larger proportion of females participated in this survey as well, compared to the university population. Greek

participation is also closer to the student population compared to the Student Survey. Overall, it is not surprising that the College Survey sample is more closely representative of the student population than the Student Survey, as participants were sampled from the full population under study rather than particular classes.

3.2.4 Content analysis

Interview and survey data were supplemented with a content analysis of sexual violence prevention programming materials, such as PowerPoints used during presentations, handouts provided during or after presentations, and materials used to train peer educators. These documents were obtained from a variety of sources, including key informant interviews and university websites related to sexual violence prevention.

3.3 Qualitative analysis

The key informant interviews and programming materials were analyzed using NVivo, and the open-ended responses pulled from the student survey were analyzed in MAXQDA. However, this process looked a bit different depending on the data source. For example, key informant interviews were only coded for broad themes. As they were mainly used to understand prevention programming at the study site, it was not important to identify themes across interviews. On the other hand, the researcher used an inductive method of thematic analysis when analyzing the student surveys (King et al., 2019; Braun & Clark, 2006). In addition, due to student responses being

brief, at later stages of the coding process, thematic codes were quantified to better analyze and describe the data. Regardless, for both qualitative datasets, the researcher first read over the data source and added descriptive codes. After fully analyzing each dataset, the researcher then coded the data a second time from the beginning to ensure the full set of codes were available for analysis of all responses. Next, descriptive codes were grouped into interpretive codes. When analyzing student responses, a certain degree of interpretation was unavoidable. As this dataset consists of short responses to open-ended questions, there is often little context surrounding answers. However, repetition in how different students described their perceptions as well as existing literature helped to validate interpretations made during the earlier stages of coding. Last, overarching themes through different theoretical lenses were identified based on both descriptive and interpretive codes.

The last way consent was explored was with a set of vignettes. Students were asked to read two stories of a sexual encounter and mark where consent was communicated. They were also given the option of explaining their answer. These explanations were coded and analyzed to reveal interpretations of consent in realistic scenarios. A table showing parent codes and the first level of child codes is available in Appendix B.

3.4 Quantitative analysis

The majority of analyses utilizing the available quantitative data were performed using Pearson's chi-square tests. Almost all of the quantitative variables are

categorial, and the remaining variables were recoded and collapsed. These analyses show whether the prevention programming outcomes are statistically related to the predictors. These analyses will also help show program retention differences between different groups, such as males and females or freshmen and all other classes.

There are several outcome variables used to test the impact of sexual violence prevention programs, including retention. They range from capturing endorsement of rape myths to willingness to intervene in harmful situations and understanding of gender-based violence. One outcome included in the student survey is closely related to rape myths. This construct, based on Christie's (1986) ideal victim, is derived from a mark all that apply question: "If sexual violence does happen on or near [University] campus, what do you think the situation most likely looks like? Mark all that apply for what you think the typical situation would be like." Six options were included in a composite measure that are related to potentially harmful stereotypes of sexual violence: (1) that the victim and offender are strangers, or (2) just met, (3) that alcohol or drugs are involved, (4) that physical violence was used, and (5) that it happens at a party, or (6) at a bar. The ideal victim outcome was dichotomized, split between participants who endorsed at least four or less than four of these victimization scenario components.

The university's consent policy is required reading in the online module, and is covered again in the Freshman Seminar and other settings. To measure participant understanding of the policy, they are asked to mark whether five statements pulled from the policy are true or false. The statements are as follows: 1) Consent must be

given by all parties involved during sexual activity; 2) consent can be implied from silence or lack of resistance; 3) consent once at the beginning of a sexual encounter is adequate for the rest of the sexual encounter; 4) the use of alcohol or drugs can limit a person's ability to give consent freely and clearly, and; 5) two people who are dating can infer consent and do not need to actively get consent. These responses were then coded so that accurate responses are equal to 1, and inaccurate responses are equal to 0. Then, the variables were summed to create a score from one to five indicating how many answers correctly reflected the consent policy.

There are five outcomes related to bystander intervention. Consistent with prior literature, the bystander intervention questions evaluated participants' confidence and willingness to use the skills they learned in programming, as well as potential impact on campus norms. The first three questions were asked as a group and all had the answer options of "yes" or "no." These questions asked whether participants have intervened in a dangerous situation since starting at the university, spoken up when a peer told a "sexist, homophobic, racist, or otherwise problematic" joke, or began thinking about campus sexual violence and/or misconduct differently. The next outcome captures participants' confidence in intervening when recognizing a potentially harmful situation. For ease of analysis, responses were recoded into two groups- that those agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, and those that disagreed, strongly disagreed, or were neutral. The last bystander intervention outcome captures the perception of the campus environment. A goal of bystander intervention is not just to teach individual's skills, but also create norms of protecting

each other in the community. To get at this, the question "[University] students actively intervene to keep each other safe" was recoded into the same two groups as the confidence in intervening question.

The last quantitative outcomes capture participants' ability to recognize gender-based violence. The survey included two scenarios describing different interactions between two characters. After reading them, participants were asked to identify whether they were depicting sexual harassment, sexual assault, intimate partner violence, or none of the above. There was also an "I don't know" option. These were coded into dichotomous variables that indicate whether respondents selected the correct answer option.

There were also several predictors used throughout the quantitative analysis. One of the main predictors used captures program participation. This variable was created from a mark all that apply question asking participants to indicate which prevention programs they have participated in from a list of 14 options, including an "other" write-in option. Mandatory online modules, orientation, bystander intervention programs, and Greek and athlete-specific programs were all included, as well as optional programs available upon request. Responses were summed 0 to 14 to create the participation variable. In addition, demographics pointed out by the literature as related to program retention and outcomes were analyzed. Fraternity or sorority membership, belonging to an athletic team, and gender are all risk factors for sexual violence perpetration and victimization (Canan et al., 2018). The first two variables are dichotomous, and to aid analysis, gender was recoded to be dichotomous.

Participants who selected “male” are in one group, while all others (i.e., female, genderfluid, non-binary, and self-described) are in another group. While anyone can be a sexual violence victim or offender, males are at a higher risk of being an offender, while females and gender minorities are more likely to be victims. In addition, year in school was analyzed. As is common at universities, freshmen in this population are exposed to more prevention efforts than other classes (Brown et al., 2015).

3.5 Chapter summary

In sum, the research questions will be answered via a case study design that integrates data from a variety of sources. Research question one, regarding program retention, will be answered using quantitative data from the Student Survey. Research question two will be answered by drawing on qualitative data from the Student Survey, key informant interviews, and content analysis of program materials. Research question three will be answered by combining quantitative and qualitative data from the Student Survey. Last, research question four will be answered via a content analysis of program materials and information draw from the key informant interviews.

Chapter 4

RESEARCH SITE

This case study was performed at a mid-sized Mid-Atlantic university. At the time of the study, there were almost 24,000 students enrolled. This campus was selected partially due to the researcher's access, but also because of the comprehensive slate of prevention programming offered to students by the Student Health department. These programs include a handful of mandatory programming with a focus on first-year students (i.e., online modules, new student orientation, and a first-year seminar for undergraduate freshmen) and several optional programs that are available upon request by professors and student organization leaders. In addition, certain high-risk populations participate in additional mandatory prevention programming. These efforts will be described in greater detail below.

Staff and faculty at this university are regularly adapting to improve offered programs and strengthen prevention efforts across campus. To support these activities, there is a committee dedicated to reviewing and evaluating the university's response to violence, with a focus on taking a systems-wide perspective. Subsequently, programming is currently in flux as improvements are made. While the required online portion has remained fairly consistent, other components have changed over time. For example, the well-known bystander intervention program Bringing in the Bystander

was previously offered. Now, program coordinators are working to develop a comprehensive and unique bystander intervention program that specifically fits this university environment and culture (Interview 1). While it covers the basics of bystander intervention, it also takes a societal and macro view of these issues through discussion of rape myths and societal beliefs that perpetuate gender-based violence. In addition, there are ongoing efforts by the Student Safety Department to review the lighting across campus and meet with student leaders to assess changing needs.

Changes to sexual violence prevention were also prompted by the Covid-19 pandemic, as coordinators were forced to adapt existing online and in-person programming to accommodate remote instruction and the changing social environment. These changes include how peer educators were trained; new and returning peer educators received their training online, which prevented the in-depth conversations and hands-on training they typically engage in each year before teaching programs. These changes, though temporary, will likely have an impact on the experiences and views of those participating in this case study, especially for upperclassmen. For the student body, this means experiences with the temporary online programming may not be applicable to the typical in-person programs in other years. For peer educators, this may impact their program facilitation experience during the pandemic when all programs were online.

4.1 Online modules

First-year undergraduates are required to complete an online course in sexual violence prevention. This university has utilized Haven and Everfi, a set of popular online modules that has been found to be especially effective in bolstering perceived intervention skills and intent, as well as correcting misperceptions of problematic campus social norms (Zapp et al., 2021). The goal of these modules is to foster empathy for survivors and reframe sexual violence away from a "woman's issue" into an issue that should concern everyone on campus. Part of these modules is introducing the concept of bystander intervention and setting healthy campus norms before students arrive on campus (Haven Partner Guide). The modules are interactive, providing scenarios, quizzes, and examples to aid learning. The themes of bystander intervention, along with consent, healthy relationships, and rape myths, appear consistently throughout the prevention programming on this campus. In a large study with participants from 80 universities, college students reported improved scores on several outcomes associated sexual violence and dating violence a month after completing Haven modules (Zapp et al., 2021).

4.2 Focus on new students

This university's focus on first year students, especially undergraduates, reflects research that this group is at the highest risk for sexual violence (Cantor et al., 2017), but is also because they are easy to reach. Prevention programming is integrated with a host of other efforts to support freshmen as they begin navigating

campus life – efforts that do not typically continue as students advance through their programs. First-year undergraduates, first-year graduates, and transfer students receive additional exposure to prevention programming as part of new student orientation. In addition, first-year undergraduates are required to participate in an introductory seminar during their first semester at the university. This freshman seminar provides programming around bystander intervention, sexual misconduct, healthy relationships, alcohol use, and university policies. While content varies based on the topic, concepts such as rape culture, sexual consent, and the importance of looking out for each other are some major themes. For example, while the term rape culture is not explicitly used, there is an entire presentation dedicated to the "pyramid of harm." The pyramid of harm is used to illustrate and discuss how microaggressions like rape jokes or casual misogyny uphold explicit violence, especially sexual violence. Other components of rape culture, such as degradation of women and removal of bodily autonomy, are also present in the pyramid of harm. These seminars are mainly taught by university faculty, but the lessons around bystander intervention, sexual misconduct, and alcohol use are taught by peer educators with the support of faculty.

4.3 Targeted prevention

University program coordinators pay particular attention to underrepresented and minority populations, and make a point of creating programming with content that is accessible and culturally appropriate for these groups. For example, the first-year student cohort may include non-traditional students who are outside the typical 18-24

age range, and the programming that caters to this traditional college age range may not make sense for the non-traditional group. Additional examples are the specialized programming developed for students with intellectual disabilities that is delivered on a more individual basis, and programming specific to international students that explores potential cultural differences in the United States that this population may be unprepared for.

Greek life students and student athletes receive additional doses of programming, with athletes being exposed to up to four years of prevention programming that includes bystander intervention. While these programs are currently in flux, generally they prioritize themes such as bystander intervention, consent, and healthy relationships. It is important to focus on students involved in Greek life and athletics in particular, as these students have been found to be more likely than their peers to participate in risky behavior, such as substance abuse and sexual violence perpetration (McCabe et al., 2018; Canan et al., 2018; Soule et al., 2021). However, campus prevention educators have faced difficulty in engaging these groups, especially men. One key informant noted that fraternity members have challenged educators over statistics, especially false reporting statistics, and fail to see how these trainings are relevant to them (Interview 1).

4.4 Additional programs and services

There are also additional programs available upon request that address issues of consent, healthy relationships, understanding dating and domestic violence, and

bystander intervention. Such programs are regularly utilized by professors, staff, and student leaders for use in their classes or student organizations. There is also a self-defense class offered by the campus police department. This program, known as Rape Aggression Defense (RAD), is taught by a female officer and teaches female participants self-defense skills. While there has been criticism in the past around self-defense as a prevention approach (Koss & Harvey, 1991), RAD takes a more comprehensive approach and also teaches how to recognize red flags in a situation, provides tips for developing a healthy relationship, and aims to build self-confidence that is intended to help participants be assertive about their safety (Interview 3). The Student Health department also holds trainings for resident advisors, student peer educators, registered student organizations, and as required sanctions when student organizations have violated university guidelines.

In addition to programming, there are several efforts across campus in the vein of situational crime prevention. There are two student escort services, including both a walking service and a golf cart service available to students. This campus also features over 100 blue lights, which are a common security measure on college campuses. Blue lights are callboxes that automatically connect to a dispatcher and are marked with a blue light. The intention is that these lights should be placed so that there are always a couple of callboxes visible, ensuring they are a highly accessible resource in case of emergency. Another prevention measure at this campus is the popular LiveSafe app, which is connected to university-specific resources, can track the location of the user if enabled, and allows users to request a safety escort on campus. There is also an on-

going poster campaign, with posters that promote pro-social behaviors and debunk common myths that support sexual misconduct posted in campus shuttles.

4.5 Challenges with prevention

Unsurprisingly, one of the biggest challenges faced by program coordinators and educators is engaging students. There is an emphasis on interactive elements across programs, such as activities, discussions, and role playing. While this helps, educators explain that they are always grappling with how to engage students when discussing the uncomfortable and emotionally difficult topic of sexual violence. For example, one key informant explained that it is not a topic that can be made "fun," so educators have to find clever ways to engage students without coming across as disrespectful (Interview 1). Similarly, educators have faced challenges in how to best disseminate material and be perceived as legitimate by students. For example, a key informant based in Student Safety explained that students may not be receptive to education when given by police officers (Interview 3). Rather, they find other avenues through which to share information and resources on campus. This sentiment was echoed by prevention staff, who acknowledged the importance of peer education.

4.6 Theoretical perspectives

According to key informants, there are barriers faced by coordinators in the development of prevention program curriculums that may be counter to implementing theoretically-informed programs. For example, programs are constrained by both time

and funding availability, limiting what can be realistically included in a short time and how much staff may be able to accomplish. However, components of sexual violence prevention efforts at this university are consistent with situational crime prevention and social learning theory.

Across programs, educators acknowledge that participants may hold definitions that are consistent with committing sexual violence. For example, they may endorse rape myths, see enthusiastic consent as unnecessary, or hold hostile attitudes towards women. Educators try not only to create pro-social definitions, but also disprove or discourage definitions consistent with violence. University-specific statistics showing high student approval of bystander intervention is one example of this, present in various program content as well as take-home resource cards. Utilizing peers as educators and including activities that engage participants in discussion are also consistent with the differential association and imitation components of social learning theory – especially when it comes to targeted prevention. For example, athletic teams participate in specialized prevention programs together as a team. Facilitating programs in this way can help create pro-social group norms that ripple out to the larger student body. In fact, it is a long-term goal of these prevention programs to create campus norms around students protecting each other. Bystander intervention contributes this by encouraging students to intervene in a variety of problematic behaviors, especially in their own peer groups. These efforts aim to shift differential reinforcement, where students engaging in everything from homophobic rhetoric to sexual assault are met with disapproval from peers.

Efforts consistent with situational crime prevention are also present throughout campus via blue lights, police patrols, and increased guardianship. The model of

bystander intervention is also a form of situational crime prevention, where each student is encouraged to become a handler, or someone who intervenes in the commission of violence. This can be an especially effective form of situational crime prevention, as other types of handlers like police officers or resident advisors are often not present in the situations where sexual violence is most likely to occur (i.e., parties or dorm rooms). Consistent with this perspective is an on-going campaign by the university encouraging students to look out for each other. While it started during the pandemic to encourage students to wear masks to prevent the spread of disease, similar messages are imbedded through sexual violence prevention programs.

4.7 Campus sexual violence

When asked on the Student Survey, 56% of students reported they feel safe from sexual violence, with an additional 24% saying they neither agree nor disagree. However, students see sexual harassment as a bigger issue – only 47% feel safe from being sexually harassed while on campus. In addition, students were asked if they feel safe when spending time in the community the campus is a part of. Only 48% feel safe from sexual violence and 42% feel safe from sexual harassment when in the town surrounding campus. These numbers indicate that despite all the work done to prevent violence on campus, there is more work to be done toward creating norms of safety both on and off campus.

There were additional campus changes in the 2021-2022 academic year related to campus safety and sexual violence, when data collection for this study started. Two separate intimate partner violence incidents involving students occurred on campus

that were widely acknowledged and discussed on campus. The latter in particular was met with student protests in response to the way campus administration was perceived to handle the incident. The coordinated student response led to campus-wide conversations about student safety and intimate partner and sexual violence. For example, the researcher attended a talk hosted by the university regarding how to prevent gender-based violence on campus that was a direct response to student concerns, and there was a candlelight vigil held to honor survivors of gender-based violence as a way for students to express their discontent with the campus response. In the weeks that followed these events, campus administration started to implement new safety and prevention measures. Administration expanded student escort services to ensure students are walked safely to their destination and started a nightly shuttle service for students. The university also announced plans to audit the safety lighting around campus, including the blue light system. Both the highly-talked about gender-based violence event and the university response may impact students' awareness and views of both campus violence and prevention efforts, resulting in different perspectives than what may present in another year.

However, sexual and dating violence are not a new concern among students at this university. Results from a 2015 university climate survey show that about half of respondents agree with the statement that sexual assault is a problem on campus, but only about 10% thought the university was doing enough to prevent it from happening. More recent results from the Student Survey show that students at this campus are still concerned about sexual violence, and they see sexual violence as

occurring in a variety of ways across their campus. One student's response exemplifies this: "Sexual violence is at an all time high on this campus and not the dean nor the cops are doing anything to help" (freshman, female). The most popular responses for what sexual violence typically looks like on this campus had to do with alcohol (72%) and parties (60%). However, responses also show an acknowledgement that sexual violence often occurs in the context of an established relationship. Most respondents said the perpetrator and victim either typically know each other (60%), and or are in a relationship (30%).

Additionally, students feel like no one is doing anything to address sexual violence on their campus. For example, one student explained, "I think just that sexual violence on campus is easily written off as not being a big deal or serious because a vast majority of the instances do not necessarily fall under the definition of 'rape'. It comes in many forms and is often not taken as seriously when it is not the stereotypical 'nonconsensual vaginal penetration at the hands of a stranger in a dark alleyway'" (senior, female). There is also a student-run Instagram account that was started in early 2020 that documents instances of gender-based violence on campus, as well as different types of harassment and racism. This account, which posts anonymous submissions from students, seems to be well-known on campus and is part of the overarching conversation.

Contrary to some students' beliefs, there are university efforts to prevent and respond to sexual violence. In addition to the prevention programming and situational crime prevention activities described above, the Student Health department and

campus administration are in regular communication with the student body about issues related to sexual violence. For example, a student life email from April 2022 included information about "sextortion," the use of sexually explicit emails for blackmail. Another student life email reminded students of the denim day event, a yearly event that aims to increase sexual violence awareness.

The two following chapters present the findings of this research. Chapter five addresses the research questions pertaining to retention of key program outcomes. This includes exploring the differences in retention between groups. Chapter six describes the relationship between university programming and the campus environment, focusing on dating and party culture.

Chapter 5

STUDENT KNOWLEDGE OF PREVENTION PROGRAMMING

In this chapter, the research questions relating to knowledge and retention of prevention programming will be explored. This includes two research questions. First, the relationships between demographics that may be important for program retention and program outcomes will be tested. Next, consent will be explored in depth, including student understanding of the university consent policy and how students actually practice consent in their own lives. Last, knowledge and visibility of prevention activities will be evaluated.

5.1 Program retention and demographics

In this section, research question one will be explored. This research question asks whether there are differences in programming retention between different groups of students, including gender, year in school, and program participation. To test the relationships between the predictors and dichotomous outcomes, chi-square tests were performed.

The first outcome is rape myth acceptance, or the endorsement of the ideal victim construct. Rape myths, including this one, is a contributor to sexual violence, and rape culture more broadly. About one-third (37%) of the sample endorsed four or more of the ideal victim characteristics, and 8% endorsed all six. However, chi-square

tests show no significant difference in endorsing this construct, based on gender, program participation, Greek membership, athlete team membership, or year in school. Table 5.1 shows the individual components included in this construct.

Table 5.1. Percent endorsing ideal victim characteristics (N=324)

	n	%
The survivor and perpetrator are strangers	79	24%
The survivor and perpetrator just met	105	32%
Alcohol or drugs are involved	233	72%
Physical violence is involved	124	38%
It happens during a party	195	60%
It happens at a place like a bar	63	19%

When it comes to bystander intervention outcomes, there are a few significant relationships. The significant relationships are available in Table 5.2 below, and the full results are available in Appendix C. In the full sample, 25% of participants report intervening in a dangerous situation on campus, 72% have spoken up when a peer told a problematic joke, and 70% have started thinking about campus sexual violence differently since starting at the university. While there were few significant differences between groups, the relationship between year in school and thinking about sexual violence differently was significant, where freshmen are more likely than others to have started thinking about sexual violence differently. This may be due to the effect of the intervention lessening over time, a problem that is well discussed in the

literature (Newlands & O'Donohue, 2016). The relationship between Greek membership and having intervened in a dangerous situation was approaching significance at the .05 level (X^2 (1, N=180) = 3.316, p=.069). Additionally, program participation was significant at the .05 level, X^2 (1, N=175) = 3.966, p=.046, where those students who participated in at least two programs were more likely to have spoken up when a peer told a problematic joke.

The next outcome is confidence in intervening in potentially harmful situation. In the overall sample, 71% participants agreed that they felt comfortable intervening in a potentially harmful situation. The relationship between Greek life and confidence in intervening was significant, X^2 (1, N=239) = 10.111, p = .001, and the relationship between program participation and confidence was approaching significance at the .05 level (X^2 (1, N=226) = 3.592, p=.058). This may be attributed to Greek life members being exposed more often to potentially dangerous situations than other students, but it may also be due to the additional doses of programming provided to this group (Canan et al., 2018). Alternatively, neither gender, athletic team membership, nor year in school had a significant relationship with this outcome. As to the last bystander intervention outcome, the belief that students on this campus intervene to keep each other safe, 42% of the sample agreed. When testing the relationships between this outcome and various predictors, neither gender, program participation, Greek life membership, nor year in school are significant. However, there is a marginally significant relationship between athletic team membership and the belief that community members will intervene to keep their peers safe, X^2 (1, N=239) = 3.946,

p=.047. This could potentially be due to members of athletic teams having closer bonds than other students.

Table 5.2. Bystander intervention outcomes

	n	**%**	X^2
Intervened in dangerous situation	180	24%	-
Spoken up	184	72%	-
Program participation	-	-	3.966*
Think about CSV differently	207	70%	-
Confidence in intervening	239	71%	-
Greek life	-	-	10.1***
Students on this campus intervene	239	42%	-
Athlete	-	-	3.946*

Only statistically significant relationships reported in table
The percent reported here is the percent that agreed with the outcome.
*: p<.05; **: p<.01; ***: p<.001

The last quantitative outcomes around program retention measure participants' ability to recognize different types of gender-based violence. Significant relationships are available in Table 5.3 below. Full results are available in Appendix C. A theme throughout prevention programming is describing the signs of gender-based violence, as the first step of bystander intervention is identifying a potentially dangerous situation. The first scenario in the Student Survey describes intimate partner violence, marked by controlling behavior, isolating the victim from their support system, and emotional manipulation (see Appendix A). While the majority of respondents

identified the most accurate answer (IPV; n=108), the next most popular answers were none of the above (n=70) or I don't know (n=40). Interestingly there is a significant relationship between gender and identifying this scenario as IPV, X^2 (1, N=239) = 3.830, p=.050, where males less often chose the correct answer. However, this was the only statistically significant relationship. Year in school, Greek membership, being an athlete, and program participation were not significantly associated with recognizing IPV.

The second scenario describes what could be seen as sexual assault or attempted sexual assault (see Appendix A). One person repeatedly kisses another, laughing off and ignoring the other person's attempts at resistance. Again, the majority of respondents identified this scenario as sexual assault (n=180), with the next most common answer being sexual harassment (n=48). Only five respondents replied with either none of the above (n=2) or I don't know (n=3). Gender was again marginally significant, with males less often choosing the correct answer, X^2 (1, N=239) = 3.830, p=.089. Program participation was also significant, but surprisingly, students who participated in two or more programs were more likely that those who participated in only one program to choose the wrong answer, X^2 (1, N=226) = 5.563, p=.018. In addition, both being an athlete, X^2 (1, N=239) = 15.773, $p < .001$, and a Greek life member, X^2 (1, N=239) = 5.022, p=.025, had significant relationships with this outcome. Both groups more often chose the incorrect answer.

Table 5.3. Recognition of gender-based violence.

	n	%	X^2
Scenario 1: Intimate partner violence	239	45%	-
Gender	-	-	3.830*
Scenario 2: Sexual assault	239	75%	-
Program participation	-	-	5.563*
Athlete	-	-	15.773***
Greek life	-	-	5.022*

Only statistically significant relationships reported in table
The percent reported here is the percent that selected the most correct option.
*: p<.05; **: p<.01; ***: p<.001

Taken together, there are few significant differences between groups when it comes to a variety of sexual violence prevention-related outcomes. However, the group that has the most differences is those students involved with Greek life. These students were more confident in their ability to intervene in dangerous situations and more often had past experience intervening in a dangerous situation than other students. However, they were also less likely to correctly identify sexual assault. Examination of these results through an ELM lens can provide some insight. According to this theory, information is more likely to be retained and understood when the audience sees it as relevant to them. An assumption of bystander intervention is that bystanders are around when sexual violence occurs, and sexual violence is often framed as occurring in the context of a party. As discussed in the following chapter, Greek life and partying are closely tied together on this campus. As

such, these students may see this material as being relevant to their expected future experience on campus and more likely to be engaged enough to retain information.

On the other hand, the sexual assault scenario described on the Student Survey differs from the stereotypical understanding of sexual assault. The victim in this case is male, while the perpetrator is female. Further, while the victim verbally protests, they do not physically resist. In addition to Greek life members being statistically less likely to identify this scenario as sexual assault, athletes were also less likely to identify it as such. While this seems to contradict somewhat these groups higher exposure to bystander intervention training, and in the case of Greek life members, higher likelihood of having intervened, social learning theory may provide an answer. Past research has found that rape myths, including beliefs about what sexual assault looks like, are accepted at higher rates among Greek members (Martin, 2016; Jozkowski & Wiersma-Mosley, 2017) and athletes (Sawyer et al., 2002) and may be reinforced among these subcultures through differential association. While these groups may be more likely to intervene, it is possible they have only intervened in "stereotypical" gender-based violence situations, such as catcalling or if a female student at a party is too intoxicated to consent. Unfortunately, sample sizes are too small to examine potential differences among Greek life or athletic team participants as subsamples.

Year in school did not have as much of an impact on retention as was expected due to the tapering off of programming for most students after their freshman year. While students who participated in at least two programs were statistically more likely

to have spoken up when a friend told a problematic joke, they less often correctly identified sexual assault in the scenario. This may indicate inconsistent messaging or terminology across programs. Phrases used across programming materials, such as being taken advantage of sexually, unwanted sexual experience, or sexual misconduct, may not be properly defined or may be used in place of more specific terms, such as sexual assault or sexual harassment.

5.2 Student knowledge of prevention and services

An important goal of sexual violence prevention is to ensure participants know of and are able to access services if they or someone they know has been victimized. The College Survey (i.e., the online survey of students conducted on behalf of the Student Wellness department each year) includes a question about awareness of services: “Please review the following list of safety measures and resources that are available on campus. Check the measures and resources that you are aware of or familiar with.” Out of those that answered the question, 95% (N=585) were aware of at least one resource on campus. The most commonly selected choice was a 24/7 helpline (N=81%), followed by two types of situational crime prevention: blue lights (N=489) and the LiveSafe app (N=380). The least selected choices were the availability of certified victim advocates (N=89) and a sexual violence survivor support group (N=33).

Similarly, the visibility of prevention, including situational crime prevention strategies and a wide variety of programs, can contribute to creating campus norms

that support prevention efforts. There were two questions on the Student Survey that evaluated knowledge of prevention programming. 223 student participants answered the question, "What do you know of sexual violence prevention efforts on campus?" Out of all the sexual violence prevention activities at this university, students who took the survey were most aware of two: mandatory online trainings and blue lights. Previous literature has reported this finding about situational crime prevention as well, where students see callboxes as an important component of campus violence prevention (Garcia et al., 2012). Though it falls more in the realm of intervention rather than prevention, 15% (n=34) of respondents referenced a campus-run sexual violence hotline that is available for students on this campus to call for support.

In addition, 225 students answered the question, "Choose the violence prevention program that stands out the most for you. Please describe what you can remember about your experience." Participants most commonly chose to discuss online training. However, the Covid-19 pandemic may have had an impact on how students responded to this question. Due to the shift to online learning as a result of quarantine and social distancing, several prevention activities that are typically in person were instead administered online. This made it difficult at times to determine exactly which program students were reflecting on when they described their experiences with prevention programs. Regardless, many of those who discussed their experience with online training complained that it was easy to skim through without learning anything. This is not uncommon; previous research has also found that

university online modules are seen as a hoop to jump through, not a learning opportunity (Hubach et al., 2019).

The potential lack of learning was a concern across prevention efforts, as students were worried the education was not reaching the students most likely to need it. For example, one student explained, “The trainings are just teaching those who already know and most of the time, those who commit these acts go to these but simply do not pay any attention” (junior, female). Similarly, there was a general attitude that prevention through education is simply not successful. As one student put it, “People who sexually assault others are not the kind of people who would pay attention to these courses […] Unfortunately I believe that someone who would SA someone is not going to change from a presentation” (senior, female). This suggests not only a need for greater visibility of prevention efforts across campus to ensure feelings of security, but also perhaps more transparency in the overall prevention strategy. For example, it seems many students are unaware of the additional doses of programming required of high risk groups, especially Greek life members and athletes.

5.3 Student understanding of consent policy

Next, research question three will be examined. This research question asks not just whether students understand the university consent policy, but also whether they practice consent in a way consistent with it. In the current study, student understanding of consent was evaluated in three ways. The first is a quantitative question asking students to mark true or false in response to a set of statements about the university

consent policy. The consent policy at this university is typical of other universities across the country, where consent must be freely given by all parties involved in the sexual encounter, and recognizes that consent can be communicated through both words and actions, though it notes that making assumptions can result in confusion or ambiguity. The policy also explains that each act in an encounter should be consented to individually. Interestingly, while there are several suggestions listed in programming materials for how to verbally ask for consent and potential verbal or non-verbal red flags that one's partner is uncomfortable, there are not examples of what consent *does* look like.

In this study, while understanding of consent was largely explored through qualitative methods, quantitative methods were also used. Students were asked to respond to five true or false statements about the university consent policy. Eighty percent of respondents were able to respond correctly to all five statements, with an additional 14% responding correctly to four of the statements. This is not surprising, as consent is repeatedly discussed throughout prevention programs and through other venues around campus (e.g., emails to all students). As the majority of the sample were able to correctly identify the consent policy, it is also not surprising that there were no significant differences between demographic groups for this outcome. A table showing these results is available in Appendix C.

While the quantitative measure indicates student understanding of the university consent policy, it does not show how students actually practice consent in real life situations. To assess this, students were asked to answer a qualitative question

as well: “Please describe how you know you have been given consent in past sexual encounters or how you communicate consent. Or, if you are not comfortable doing so or are not sexually active, please describe how you think consent is communicated.” 192 participants wrote something for this question. The majority mentioned verbal consent (N=152), with a common theme being an emphasis on verbal consent as a requirement before engaging in a sexual encounter. However, others described the possibility of non-verbal consent (i.e., body language). When students offered examples of what non-verbal consent could be, reciprocation and a lack of resistance (e.g., not saying no) were mentioned. These findings echo previous research, where affirmative consent is often overshadowed by non-verbal indicators (Hirsch & Kahn, 2020; Jazkowski & Peterson, 2013). These themes were present in the vignette responses, discussed in the following paragraphs.

An important nuance that was brought up is how consent changes when having a repeat sexual partner, even when the importance of explicit verbal consent was acknowledged. For example, one student shared, “In my opinion, if there is not a verbal agreement, there is no consent. The only time I feel this is an exception is if you are in a long-term relationship” (freshman, female). This sort of contradictory statement was not uncommon, perhaps indicating the conflict between the university’s messaging (i.e., consent should be verbal) with what students are actually experiencing in the context of their own sexual encounters and relationships.

Another difference in consent is gender-based. Though gender comparisons were only mentioned by three participants, there were interesting themes in how men

versus women answered. While some women were assertive in their answers, others were more passive. The latter group described being asked rather than asking for consent, or speaking up if something is wrong rather than saying outright what their boundaries are or what they wanted. For example, one participant explained, "I know I have been given consent in the past because the other person is asking for it. […] I think consent is communicated when both parties are voluntarily taking part" (senior, female). This participant knows she's been given consent after being asked, despite not asking her partner in turn. Men, on the other hand, spoke more about verbally asking for and receiving consent, but not necessarily giving it themselves. A quote by a senior male exemplifies this perspective: "I make sure to communicate verbally, asking my partner if they would like to do something and are comfortable with the situation, if a no or hesitation is shown I will stop immediately."

5.3.1 Vignettes

The final approach to examining student understanding and practice of consent was explored with a set of vignettes. Students were asked to read two stories of a sexual encounter and mark where consent was communicated. Next, they were asked to explain their answer. These explanations were coded and analyzed to reveal interpretations of consent in realistic scenarios. Each vignette will be described in more detail below.

Vignette 1: Coercion

The first vignette describes a relationship that had been going on for a short while. The characters in the story meet for dancing at a bar before they go to the dorm room of one of the characters. The story includes sexual coercion and an example of withdrawing consent. However, because the story only includes actions and does not describe what characters are thinking or feeling, motivations and implications are up for interpretation by the participants. The full vignette is below:

> "Sydney and Jasmine meet and start talking through an app. They've gone on a few dates and kissed a couple of times. Sydney invites Jasmine out dancing at a bar. While dancing, Sydney asks if she can kiss Jasmine. Jasmine responds by kissing her. They continue dancing, grinding each other and kissing. After a while, Sydney invites Jasmine back to her dorm. Jasmine agrees. Once they get back to Sydney's apartment, they lay together on the bed and continue kissing. Eventually, Sydney starts to take off Jasmine's pants. Jasmine stops Sydney. She says she didn't want to do more than make out. Sydney continues kissing Jasmine. Later, Sydney tries to take off Jasmine's pants again. This time she doesn't stop her. Sydney performs oral sex on Jasmine."

A little over half of the participants (n=177) explained how they decided where consent was communicated. Out of these, the majority (n=122) felt the sexual encounter was not consensual. A few were unsure (n=4), and the remainder (n=39) thought the encounter was consensual. The most common response for why it was not consensual was explaining that consent to some activities, such as kissing or dancing, is not consent to all activities, such as sex. For example, one participant succinctly summed up this perspective: "At first consent was mutually given but only for kissing. Everything that followed after was sexual assault." (freshman, female). A handful (n=10) also specifically mentioned that Jasmine was either coerced or pressured. Responses in the vein are consistent with the university's consent policy, where the

survey respondents recognized that consent was not given for every act that occurred. It was also consistent with the university consent policy in that respondents pointed out the inadequacy of the communication in the story, even those that did not see what occurred as sexual assault. Some, exemplified in the following quote, even pointed out that *neither* party consented to sexual activity – "Simply, both parties agreed to kissing. No consent was given for anything further" (senior, female). On the other hand, some participants saw Jasmine kissing Sydney back after being asked, as well as the transition from the public space of the bar to the private space of the dorm, as consent for what followed. Past literature has also found that college students may perceive a transition from public to private space as non-verbal consent to sexual activity (Jozkowski, 2015).

However, not all participants were sure one way or the other whether the sexual encounter described in this vignette was consensual. While it was generally agreed upon that consent was never explicitly or verbally communicated at the end of the story, Jasmine's lack of resistance was perceived by some to be consent - or at least not a lack of consent. This conflict was described well in the following quote: "I don't think consent was explicitly given. since jasmine originally didn't want Sydney [to] take her pants off I really think Sydney should have asked before doing it again. However since jasmine didn't resist or stop her I don't think [this] can be categorized as sexual assault" (freshman, female). This sort of confusion may suggest a need for more in-depth conversations about consent on campus, especially in cases where there

may be ambiguity or pressure, or consent (or lack thereof) is neither verbal nor explicit.

Vignette 2: Alcohol and Non-Verbal Consent

The second vignette in the survey described a sexual encounter after drinking alcohol where neither party verbally consented, but were both active participants in the experience. The full vignette is below:

> "Daniel and Elizabeth have been friends for a while. Tonight, they are hanging out at a bar with a larger group and celebrating the end of finals with a few drinks. Both are flirting with each other. Daniel offers to buy Elizabeth another drink and she accepts. Elizabeth laughs at something Daniel says and touches his hand. Daniel invites Elizabeth over to watch a movie at his apartment around the corner. She agrees. They walk to Daniel's apartment and he gets them each a beer. They start the movie sitting together on the couch with their legs touching. Daniel rests his hand on Elizabeth's leg and she smiles at him. A while later, Daniel leans in to kiss Elizabeth. They start making out. Daniel removes his shirt and then helps Elizabeth off with hers. He takes her by the hand and leads her to his room. Once there, he helps her off with the rest of her clothes and then takes off his. Daniel grabs a condom from his nightstand and hands it to Elizabeth. She puts it on him and they start having sex."

About half of the participants (n=169) wrote about this vignette as well. However, participants were more split about whether this was a consensual encounter. While just over half (n=93) felt it was consensual, a third (n=55) described it as not consensual and 15% (n=25) were unsure, with some overlap between categories. There was tension between what most respondents saw as a consensual encounter – one where both parties are actively participating – and the lack of explicit, verbal consent. One participant's response is exemplary of this tension common: "Consent was never explicitly communicated but the control was in Elizabeths hand with the condom.

though she may have felt pressure. no red flags tho" (senior, female). A similar sentiment is given by a freshman female: "While both parties appear to be ok with the situation, there was no verbal communication to clarify if they were both comfortable and consenting to what was happening." These responses show the conflict between what they are likely aware is the university's messaging around consent being clear by being verbal, and the recognition that sexual encounters may include non-verbal signals as well, albeit less clear ones.

While some respondents who replied to this question described verbalizing as a requirement for consent, many also pointed out actions such as agreeing to go to an apartment or putting a condom on as indicative of consent. A handful of respondents explained that while the encounter seems consensual, Daniel should have explicitly asked Elizabeth if she wanted to have sex- but not the other way around. This is consistent with the gender differences noted in the previous section, where it seems to be the expectation that men receive consent from women but do not have to give it themselves. In addition, while some explained that lack of resistance or silence is not consent, others saw a lack of resistance as an indication of a consensual sexual encounter. Consistent with past research, it was not uncommon for participants to put the onus of preventing sexual assault on the partner refusing to have sex (Jozkowski, 2015). In this case, the onus was put on the woman in the story to make it more clear if she did not want to have sex, and her reciprocation via putting the condom on her partner was viewed as consent.

Only 11 respondents said consent cannot be given when intoxicated. This is surprising, as the consent policy at this university states that consent cannot be given when impaired, such as due to intoxication. Further, this policy is emphasized throughout programs, especially those related to sexual misconduct. The role of alcohol in the vignette does seem to have added to the tension about whether consent was given, however. For example, a senior male explained, "[…] the fact that both parties actively participated in the lead-up to sex without hesitation or reluctance makes it seem like both were interested. However, this ability to consent is really mitigated by the fact that they were possibly drunk. The mix of substances and non-verbal consent isn't good." Alcohol was mentioned by other participants as well, even those that saw this as a consensual encounter. However, the perceived willingness of both characters overshadowed the presence of alcohol in the story. This may also be because while they were drinking throughout the vignette, they were not necessarily portrayed as being drunk.

Taken together, the way students understand and practice consent is complex. While the respondents had a strong grasp of the consent policy at this university as evidenced by 80% of the sample correctly identifying components of the policy, there is tension between that understanding and how they describe consent playing out in real life situations. This is especially true when it comes to the validity of non-verbal behavior as an indication of consent. This, in addition to the nuances in gendered expectations for receiving/providing consent, indicates a potential need for more nuanced discussions of consent that go beyond what is a legal requirement. However,

prevention program facilitators may also be constrained by law and policy around what can be said about consent, regardless of the lived experiences of students. For example, the consent policy at this university states that it is not possible to consent if one is impaired, such as via intoxication. According to the policy, this threshold is determined from the perspective of a reasonable person. In other words, it is up to the student to determine whether their partner is too intoxicated to give consent. However, this can be subjective depending on one's past experience with alcohol, whether they have also been drinking, and other factors. To avoid giving advice that could be misconstrued or against this policy, it is possible that prevention facilitators instead teach that one cannot consent at all if alcohol is involved.

5.4 Chapter summary

In this chapter, two research questions were explored. Regarding research question one, there are not many differences between groups in terms of program retention or understanding of content. Most students, regardless of year in school, gender, or other characteristics, have a basic understanding of core content (e.g., the university consent policy) and feel confident in their ability to intervene in a dangerous situation. In addition, many reported actually intervening in the past, whether it was a potentially dangerous situation or a friend saying something problematic. While fewer students were able to correctly identify intimate partner violence, and to a lesser extent, sexual assault in scenarios, this may be due to a lack of nuance in quantitative research. It is possible participants were aware there was problematic behavior in the intimate partner violence scenario, for example, but they

may not have seen it as such because the characters were college students rather than a married or cohabitating couple.

There were also few differences between groups when examining research question three. Quantitatively, most students understand the university's consent policy. However, qualitative analysis shows that students do not always practice consent in a way consistent with the policy or what is described in programs. For example, there was a greater reliance on non-verbal indicators of consent than may be expected based on program materials, which emphasize the importance and clarity of verbal consent. Further, the qualitative analysis revealed difference in how males and females navigate consent in their sexual relationships. This suggests a need for a more nuanced discussion of consent, especially over time. As previously discussed, students receive the bulk of programming freshman year when they may have had very few campus experiences. It may be useful to remind students of the importance of consent as they get further in their college career when it is more relevant to them.

Chapter 6

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF CAMPUS CULTURE VS UNIVERSITY PROGRAMMING

This chapter focuses on research question two exploring the relationship between student perceptions of campus culture and sexual violence prevention programming content. On college campuses, social lives are often dominated by partying and dating (Porta et al., 2021; Jozkowski & Wiersma-Mosley, 2017). Unfortunately, university party and dating culture are associated with a host of risk factors for sexual violence perpetration and victimization, especially the presence of rape culture (Hochett et al., 2016; Wade, 2017). Thus, it is important to understand what these facets of life look like for college students, especially specific to their university, to enable prevention efforts to best develop and administer programming that targets these potentially risky behaviors.

First, the current campus dating and party culture as perceived by students will be described, based on qualitative responses from the Student Survey. Next, content analysis of the key informant interviews and program materials will be used to describe the content and delivery of campus prevention programs. Finally, these analyses will be compared to reveal similarities, differences, and gaps in prevention programming.

6.1 Student perceptions of campus party culture

To understand how students experience and perceive the campus dating and party cultures, participants were asked two open-ended questions. First, participants answered an open-ended question about campus culture- specifically about campus party culture. 243 (75%) participants wrote something for the question, "How would you describe the party culture on campus? This includes anything you might consider a party. Feel free to include examples that help illustrate your point. For example, what are parties at [University] like? What makes them unique?" There were three main themes that were especially prevalent in their answers that gave a picture of what party culture on this campus looks like, including features that students described as unique to their university environment.

The most striking theme that emerged is that attending parties is seen by most participants as being not just the dominant way to have a social life, but the only way. Over a quarter of students (N=66) saw parties at this university as being a central part of campus life, describing parties as "constant," with an underlying expectation of participation. For some students, this is exactly what they wanted out of their college experience. These students saw parties as fun and exciting, describing music, dancing, and meeting new people as reasons they participate. One student, a freshman, exemplifies this view: "parties are phenomenal, loud music and dancing with all my friends is an amazing experience" (male). Others, however, expressed a sort of resigned acceptance that parties are the expectation for how they socialize. For example, one student explained, "I think everyone just goes with it because that is

what the scene is like at [this campus]. Frat party's are the entire social scene" (freshman, female). Similarly, another student said, "On campus party culture is very prominent, and is almost "required" and very forced upon people especially guys in terms of joining greek life" (freshman, female). Despite the social pressure referenced by some students, it is not true that everyone on this campus participates in party culture. These students described parties as crowded (N=48), smelly (N=10), unsafe (N=21), and overall unpleasant. Sanctioned campus events and hanging out with friends at other venues were mentioned as other alternatives, as well as smaller house, apartment, or dorm parties with a small group of friends.

The next main theme that emerged is the large role of fraternities in controlling party culture, with a mix of positive and negative perceptions. While some students appreciated that fraternities tried to keep everyone safe at their parties, many others expressed concern. Indicators of rape culture were present throughout student responses, such as fraternities letting all women into their parties while turning away non-Greek affiliated men (N=26), the availability of alcohol (N=54), and the perceived prevalence of sexual violence at parties (N=10). These aspects of university party culture are not new. Large house parties, especially those hosted by fraternities, have been identified as high-risk environments for binge drinking and rape culture (Marzell et al., 2015). In a qualitative study with college students, Jozkowski and Wiersma-Mosley (2017) also find that attendance at large fraternity parties are motivated by access, especially free access, to alcohol, and participants in Porta and

colleagues' study (2021) complained that only women and fraternity men were allowed into fraternity parties.

In addition to fraternity parties, 29 students mentioned either "dages" or Saturday parties that take place during the day. Students saw these parties as unique to their university, a weekly event that is more casual and welcoming than fraternity parties. For example, one student described dages as "during the day in yards with less dancing and more drinking games. The day parties are less exclusive and have hundreds of people at certain times" (junior, male). While drinking is still a main activity, students also play games and socialize with each other more than when partying in cramped, loud fraternity basements. Other than those students that had negative perceptions of the party life at this university in general (n=62), participants were more positive about the welcoming nature and relaxed atmosphere of these events. However, past research has found larger outdoor parties are associated with a higher likelihood of excessive drinking compared to other types of parties (Marzell et al., 2015). The presence of alcohol at the center of social life is supported by how one's choice of party venues differs by age. For those under 21, large house parties on campus are the only way to get access to alcohol, meet new people, and have fun. After turning the legal drinking age, however, students are more likely to attend smaller gatherings with friends or go to bars.

The conflict between some students' perception that partying is expected and other students' negative perceptions of party culture can be explained by social learning theory. From a social learning perspective, the belief that partying is an

essential and expected part of campus life falls under the umbrella of definitions. American university culture has become synonymous with partying and alcohol use, and this belief may become compounded for some during freshman year when the school year is kicked off by parties across campus. This definition around campus culture is likely reinforced for some through their social networks – especially those whose networks spend more time partying, such as Greek life members – but not for others, who prefer other social activities such as university-sanctioned events. This process is known in the context of social learning theory as differential association. These mechanisms can be interrupted through sexual violence prevention-related interventions, such as programs that dispel beliefs about peer behavior.

6.2 Student perceptions of campus dating culture

The second question, regarding dating, was phrased: "How would you describe the dating culture on campus? Feel free to include examples that help illustrate your point." 245 participants (76%) wrote something in response to this question. The dominance of party culture was evident across responses even for dating- over 40% of the respondents (N=101) identified parties as the environment where most of their peers met partners. This response outnumbers all the other locations mentioned, with the closest alternatives being online or apps such as Tinder, Bumble, or Instagram (N=71) and a shared class (N=30).

Descriptions of student relationships grouped into three main categories. This finding is similar to previous research, although varying somewhat in how students

make distinctions between types of relationships (Kuperberg & Padgett, 2015). The first category is hookups, and includes relationships such as one night stands, friends with benefits, and situationships (similar to friends with benefits). While each of these types of relationships likely reflects different nuances, there was not enough description of each in the short text responses to analyze them more in depth. These were grouped together because they are each casual in nature and are based on sex. References to hooking up featured heavily in responses, with 122 participants mentioning them. Usage of the term "hookup" was consistent with prior research in that it was used to refer to no strings attached sexual relationships, although it is possible there was variation in which sexual acts different students were referring to (Pham, 2016; Holman & Sillars, 2012; Bogle, 2008). Regardless of specificity, it was common for students to see the dating culture on this campus as being entirely based on hooking up rather than being in or even seeking a long-term romantic relationship. For example, one respondent reported "I feel like dating culture does not exist and instead it is mainly hookup culture." Another student echoed this sentiment – "[I] don't know a single person in a relationship here. Hook-ups either last a few weeks or are usually just a one time thing." In addition, several students expressed that they see the prevalence of romantic partners as rare. While many students saw this as a positive thing and part of their expected college experience, a handful were unhappy with the prevalence of hookup culture. For example, one student explained, "The dating culture at this school is absolutely disgusting […] No one really wants a real relationship here and they only want the hook up" (senior, female).

The second category of dating appearing in responses is long-term hookups, sometimes referred to as "friends with benefits". Long-term hookups are a sort of middle ground between short-term hookups (i.e., one-night stands) and long-term romantic relationships. Compared to the short-term hookups described in the first category, it is more possible that long-term hookups will transition into a romantic relationship. For example, one student explained, "my friends in serious relationships had previously been hooking-up with their partner for nearly a year before they made their relationship official. Those who […] don't see their hook-up [becoming] anything serious usually last about 1 month or 2 together" (junior, female). This way of dating is not new – college students in Bogle's (2008) study also mentioned the possibility, though not expectation, of hookups that last while eventually turning into romantic relationships. This category of dating was at times difficult to differentiate from romantic relationships, but nonetheless emerged as a distinct type of romantic involvement on this campus.

However, the perceived dominance of hookup culture does not mean long-term romantic relationships were unheard of among students. This third category is consistent with traditional monogamous dating where there is an expectation of staying together, at least for a time. This type of romantic relationship may be continued high school relationships or relationships started after meeting a partner in class, a campus event, or online. Often it was students who were either in a relationship themselves or had friends in relationships that saw them as more common.

There were a few clear ways students differentiated between romantic relationships and hookups. First, how two people meet may determine whether they will hookup or date. For example, one student said, “Students tend to meet partners at parties or clubs. Hook ups tend not to last past the night if met at a party but something they do. Relationships made outside of parties last longer.” This sentiment was echoed by others, where how two people meet determines whether they will have a purely sexual and short-term relationship, or start a longer term romantic relationship. Specifically, meeting at parties, online, or on a dating app was associated with hooking up, while meeting in class, at a campus event, or through mutual friends was associated with romantic relationships. Second, age can play a role. Distinctions were made based being a freshman or upperclassmen, such as one respondent who wrote, “A lot of it is hook-up culture … it's junior or senior year that more people take it seriously and look for an actual partner” (junior, female).

6.3 Sexual violence prevention programming

Taken together, social life at this campus as it relates to partying and dating is dominated, or at least perceived to be dominated, by hooking up, drinking, and constant partying. While prevention programing at this university acknowledges this to an extent, at times it does not fully address the issues college students, especially incoming freshmen, will have to grapple with during their college experience. This can result in students feeling less represented in and connected to the program content, resulting in a smaller impact. While there are several ways to compare the campus

experience students describe and the content of prevention programs, there are three main areas of focus in this analysis: hooking up as the dominant form of dating, the presence of rape culture at campus parties, and the relationship between substance use and consent.

6.3.1 Navigating relationships

As part of the orientation process for new students, there is a requirement to complete an online programming module that covers a variety of topics relevant to campus life, including alcohol and sexual relationships. There is an emphasis on healthy relationships imbedded throughout the university's slate of prevention programming, such as the importance of open communication, respect, and boundary setting in sexual relationships. For example, in a section of programming content titled Healthy Relationships, students read "…healthy relationships require open and honest dialogue about boundaries… you most likely will be entering new and perhaps even different kinds of relationships." In this section, it is also acknowledged that the term "relationship" refers not just to romantic or even sexual partners, but also friendships, family, and colleagues, and others. There are also scenarios used for discussion that include hookups as a contextual factor, but the focus is on other characteristics of the interaction (e.g., intoxication) that may prevent discussion about hookups specifically.

Despite these passing mentions of hookups and recognition that sex happens outside of monogamous romantic relationships, there is not advice in the university's programming about how to broach issues of boundaries and consent in the context of

one-night stands, hookups, and less clearly defined sexual relationships in general. In the Student Survey, participants made a distinction between relationships - which have the expectation of being long lasting and tend to involve activities like going on dates - and hooking up - which is purely sexual and often short term (i.e., a one-night stand), with no expectation of spending time together outside of sex. While there might be an expectation of respect and a discussion of boundaries in longer term romantic relationships, these expectations do not necessarily apply to short term hookups. For example, one student explained, "Relationships here are non monogamous if you could even call them relationships. Hook up culture is huge here. People sleep with each other and you never speak to them again. No romance - just sex" (freshman, female). Another student added, "I feel that there is a lot of dating life on this campus, however more than often they don't tend to last long as they are casual hookups" (senior, female). The expectations associated with each type of relationship differ, where the "no strings attached" nature of hookups may result in less communication and a lack of willingness to discuss boundaries and consent (Pham, 2016).

With this separation between romantic relationships and casual hookups, students may not realize the lessons about healthy relationships they are learning are applicable to *all* relationships, not just traditional monogamous relationships. In addition, students may not see themselves or their experiences reflected in program scenarios or advice that highlight more traditional relationships, especially long-term romantic relationships. From am ELM theoretical perspective, this can result in

program participants “checking out” from prevention efforts and not retaining the lesson.

6.3.2 Consent

There are two main consent-related issues brought up in the Student Survey that do not seem to be addressed in university programming, especially not in the mandatory programs expected of the student body as a whole. The first is expectations of consent when in a long-term relationship or with a repeat partner (e.g., friends with benefits). This only came up a handful of times when students were describing how they communicate consent in their own lives, which is not surprising given the context of how prevalent hookup culture is on this campus. For example, a freshman explained, “There have also been times, in a relationship, where verbal consent is not given, consent is just assumed” (female). While other participants were not this explicit, they described similar situations where over time they have learned how to read whether their partner is flirting or “in the mood.” While the tenants of consent, such as consent needing to be freely given and informed, may not necessarily be violated in the situation described by the participant above, assuming sexual consent in any situation can unintentionally lead to coerced or unwanted sex.

The second issue is the relationship between consent and alcohol. Student descriptions of hooking up, and even meeting longer-term partners, are often mentioned alongside the social scene. This means attending campus parties or going out to bars, with the presence of alcohol being ubiquitous. Program materials go into

depth about consent during sexual encounters – explaining that consent is legally required, and must be both proactive and verbal. However, the online module required of new students explicitly says consent cannot be given while under the influence of drugs or alcohol. While this policy makes sense for a university, it does not address the reality of dating, or rather, hooking up. While lessons about consent in general can be applied to any sexual encounter, it might be difficult for students to make that connection when the sex they have been engaging in – or expecting to engage in once they move to campus – is only described in relation to sexual violence. For example, there are scenarios in the university programming describing a sexual encounter between two characters, where one or both participants have been drinking and consent is not clearly communicated in what can only be described as sexual assault. It is unclear whether the messaging is meant to discourage students from ever engaging in sexual activity when alcohol is involved, or only when there is drinking to intoxication.

6.3.3 Rape culture and parties

Indications of rape culture – an environment that facilitates sexual violence – can be found throughout society, but are especially prevalent on college campuses (Jozkowski, 2015; Canan et al., 2018). Responses to the Student Survey revealed that rape culture is embedded in the party and dating cultures of the campus under study, consistent with past research (Canan et al., 2018; Seabrook et al., 2018; Hochett et al., 2016; O'Connor, 2021; Wade, 2017). The emphasis on alcohol, the misogyny inherent

in only letting women (and at times only certain types of women) into parties, and the fear of sexual violence are all indicators of rape culture.

While there is not content specifically about campus parties in university programming per se, there is content that can be applied to the party scene. Lessons about alcohol safety and bystander intervention are the most obvious examples of this type of content. Bystander intervention is the most relevant in risky environments where violence is most likely to occur, such as situations where people are drinking to intoxication. Alcohol consumption is perceived by students to be a major component of having a social life on this campus. For students over the legal drinking age, this tends to mean going to bars or attending a small apartment party with friends. For students who have not yet turned 21, this means having to choose between attending large campus parties to have access to alcohol, or not having a social life.

There is material in university programming relating to the overarching concept of rape culture and rape myths, though this specific terminology does not seem to be used, especially for more general programs required of all students. For example, the "triangle of harm" is regularly used to illustrate how rape culture is created and upheld, including microaggressions, oppressive actions, and explicit acts of violence. However, instead of relating these behaviors to rape culture, they are described as behaviors that can cause harm in general, and also are related to sexual violence. This can be viewed through an ELM lens. Key informant interviews reveal that language choice is intentional- not only is there not enough time during short prevention sessions to cover these issues in adequate depth, but language like "rape culture" can

be politically or emotionally charged in such a way that can alienate some audience members and prevent engagement.

6.4 Chapter summary

Participant descriptions of campus reveal that partying and dating, specifically hooking up, are perceived to be the main ways students socialize at this university. Partying is perceived by most respondents to be such an integral part of campus life that participation is expected. The prevalence of "dages," or outdoor parties on Saturday morning, are indicative of the way partying is prioritized by students. In addition, there were some nuances to parties. Overwhelmingly fraternities, and to some extent athletes, control the party scene. This includes determining who is welcome at parties, contributing to the dissatisfaction of partying for some. However, just because parties being dominant is the perception does not mean it is the lived experience of everyone on this campus. Not all participants see constant partying as a good thing, or even as the only option for socialization. These participants not only showed concern around sexual violence at parties, but also described parties as being too crowded and uncomfortable to be enjoyable.

There was more agreement among participant in describing the dating scene at this campus. In general, types of romantic/sexual relationships fell into three categories: short-term hookups (i.e., one-night stands), long-term hookups (i.e., friends with benefits), and long-term romantic relationships. Hookups are perceived by most

participants to be the predominant way students form sexual relationships, to the extent that many of these students do not think traditional forms of dating exist on this campus. However, others – especially those that are currently in a romantic relationship or know someone who is – explained that dating, while uncommon, does occur.

While program content addresses some components of student life related to risky behaviors or situations, as well as behaviors that uphold rape culture, there is some degree of mismatch. First, advice for how to navigate hookups, particularly in terms of ensuring a sexual encounter is safe and consensual, seems to be lacking. There are themes of communication and boundary setting throughout programming, but while there is passing mention of hookups and acknowledgement that these same lessons apply, the connections may not be explicit enough for students to understand their importance in *all* relationships. Second, there are some gaps when discussing consent in general. The Student Survey revealed that participants have some confusion around the relationship between consent and long-term relationships, as well as consent and alcohol. The latter is particularly concerning, as alcohol is a major component of socialization across campus. Last, students expressed concern over various components of rape culture present at parties. However, while some of these are addressed broadly (e.g., sexual misconduct), the party scene seems unaffected by these efforts. This suggests a need for more focus on these issues throughout programming, as well as additional efforts that may help reinforce messaging.

Chapter 7

KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Since the 1970's anti-rape movement, education has been a key component advocates have relied on to affect social change, especially at the community and cultural levels. At the time, education was meant to raise awareness about everything from prevalence of sexual violence to the lived experiences of survivors (Lee et al., 2007). While these topics are still common for advocates to include in their curriculums, there is increasingly emphasis on prevention through stopping violence before it happens – primary prevention (Banyard et al., 2004). Primary prevention is preventing a problematic behavior before it happens. This can happen by targeting those groups most likely to engage in the behavior and most likely to be impacted. For sexual violence on college campuses, this also means engaging all members of the university community in being active bystanders to prevent violence around them. However, while there are federal requirements for implementing primary prevention on campuses, there is little guidance for how to do this (Kafonek & Richards, 2017; Newlands & O'Donohue, 2016).

This study sheds light on gaps in sexual violence prevention programming on university campuses. Two of the biggest gaps are the conflict between university policies of consent, and how college students are actually navigating consent in their

relationships, and components of university party and dating culture that are not actively being addressed. Further, these findings in combination with past research provides a path forward. Creating programming that is more comprehensive – in terms of content, delivery, and who is involved – can start to fill some of these gaps. It is the goal of prevention to change and create new community norms, but norms cannot be created and promoted without the involvement of everyone on a college campus, not just students. In addition, successful prevention requires acknowledging that rape culture is linked to other social issues, such as racism, classism, and homophobia (Suarez & Gadella, 2010; Crenshaw, 1989; 1991). Thus, sexual violence cannot be prevented without addressing these other social problems as well.

7.1 Key findings

The current study explores the status of sexual violence prevention education at an American university. A combination of qualitative methods, including content analysis and interviews, and quantitative methods, such as survey data, were used to explore the research questions and gain a deeper understanding of the relationship between programming, retention of key concepts, and the context of a particular university campus. This study is one of the first case studies of sexual violence prevention efforts on a university campus to date that compares an in-depth look at the university's approach to prevention with student experiences and perceptions (see also Beres et al., 2019; Sisneros & Rivera, 2018; Bonar et al., 2022; Hirsch & Kahn, 2020).

The value of this mixed methods approach, especially in the context of a case study, is that the different sources of data are able to be in conversation and confirm or refute each other. For example, quantitative analysis can show knowledge of a topic – in this study, key takeaways of sexual violence prevention programs- but cannot show how these takeaways have meaning in students' lives. The findings about consent are the most glaring example of this. Most survey participants were able to correctly identify various components of the university's consent policy through a set of true-or-false questions. This may lead to the conclusion that these students understand and practice consent in a way consistent with this policy (e.g., consent should be verbal, consent should be communicated before each sexual encounter and each individual sexual act). However, when participants were asked to provide an example of how they communicate consent in their relationships, their responses revealed that rather than verbal consent, overwhelmingly participants relied on reciprocation as an indicator of nonverbal consent and identified certain situations where consent did not need to necessarily be communicated at all (e.g., in a long-term relationship). These findings were echoed by the responses to the consent vignettes, where participants explained that non-verbal actions such as reciprocation and transitioning from a public to private space are indicators of consent (see also Hirsch & Kahn, 2020; Jazkowski & Peterson, 2013).

Chapter four answers research question four with a theoretical analysis of current programming practices. While elements of theory were present throughout university programs, such as an emphasis on altering or creating new definitions, key informants

revealed that they typically do not develop programs based on theory. Rather, they are pressed to communicate the most important messages in a short time with limited resources. This means they may not be able to cover all the content they would like to, and content that fulfills certain requirements is prioritized. With this in mind, theory may be useful in exploring *how* programs are facilitated, if not the content itself. For example, ELM provides guidance for how to increase the likelihood that the audience will retain information long term. Together with social learning theory, programs can potentially be tweaked to promote longer lasting change, and reinforce the creation of new community norms that prevent violence.

Chapter five explores the research questions around whether students retain program content, as well as differences between demographic groups. Most students, regardless of year in school, gender, or other characteristics, were able to show a basic understanding of core program content and feel confident in their ability to intervene in a dangerous situation. However, there were a few nuances between groups that suggest a need for a greater focus on certain concepts. For example, fewer participants were able to correctly identify sexual violence in a scenario that includes a female perpetrator and male victim. Two groups characterized by higher rates of rape myth acceptance (i.e., Greek life members and athletes; Jozkowski, 2015; Canan et al., 2018) were less likely than others to select the right answer. This suggests not only a need for further efforts to address rape myth acceptance, but also a need for greater diversity and representation in program content (Bonar et al., 2021). Including examples of people with various racial, ethnic, sexuality, and gender identities not

only combats rape myths (e.g., the ideal victim, Christie, 1986), but can also jumpstart important conversations that provide additional opportunities to reinforce messaging.

Regarding consent, while the majority of participants understand the university policy around consent, they do not necessarily apply this understanding to actual sexual encounters. Despite discussing the importance of verbal consent in response to vignettes, participant descriptions of how they communicate consent reveal a heavy reliance on non-verbal cues, especially reciprocation. This suggests that it would be useful for programming to more fully address the potential risk in assuming consent from behavior, especially in the context of a hookup.

Last, chapter six reveals conflicts between the lived experiences of students on this campus related to partying and dating, and prevention efforts. Three main differences were identified: navigating different types of relationships, issues with consent (i.e., long term relationships and alcohol), and rape culture embedded in party culture. These findings suggest program coordinators should find ways to make programs more aligned with these students' experiences, which can ultimately make them more effective. This is one of the most important contributions of this study, as it reveals that sexual violence prevention programming at universities cannot use a "one size fits all" approach, especially if the aim is to create new community norms that prevent violence. Rather, prevention efforts should be designed and implemented with the specific audience in mind – addressing issues relevant and important to students at this campus, speaking to their experiences and the norms present in the campus environment, and framing content in a way that students can more easily connect with,

and thus, have a stake in learning. For example, participants in the Student Survey see "dages," or large outdoor parties on Saturdays during the day, as being safer and less problematic than the typical fraternity parties. Addressing these parties specifically, such as pointing out how violence can still happen during the day or when there are many bystanders around, can help students see how sexual violence prevention programs are relevant to their campus experiences.

7.2 Study site recommendations

While theory does not seem to be explicitly integrated into sexual violence programming at this campus, that does not mean it is not consistent with theory. Further, these theoretical connections can be built upon to create a stronger slate of programs. First, social learning theory is present in both the bystander intervention approach and consent programs. They both prioritize addressing definitions that facilitate crime, such as rape myth acceptance, and replace them with pro-social definitions, such as respect and boundary setting. Differential association and imitation are also drawn on through the utilization of peers as educators. The intention is that participants in prevention programs taught by their peers will be more likely to engage in bystander intervention and other pro-social behaviors (e.g., seeking consent) if they understand that it is a campus norm. However, there are other ways social learning theory could be utilized.

While it is helpful for peers to facilitate programs, it would be beneficial for students to be role models for their peers in other spaces as well. The program tested by Gidycz and colleagues (2011) is an example of how this might work. This program,

which is gender segregated, includes an informational session with a booster four months later, supplemented by small group discussions. During the men's sessions, participants are able to have open discussions with their peers about masculinity norms, challenging rape myths, and creating new norms around bystander intervention and healthy masculinity. Gidycz et al. (2011) report participants in this program rate lower on sexual aggression, but also are less likely to spend time with sexually aggressive peers. This suggests that the program sets the stage for on-going reinforcement of pro-social norms. As SLT suggests, this is a major component of social learning and whether one will engage in crime (i.e., sexual violence). In addition, one component of SLT that is not present in prevention programs at this campus is differential reinforcement. To address this, programs could include details about what the adjudication process is like for complaints of sexual misconduct, being sure to point out efforts made by the university as a whole to prevent and punish sexual violence when it does occur.

Second, ELM explains that attitude change is most likely to occur when a participant is personally invested and engaged in program content, with an understanding that the content has intrinsic value worth learning (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986; Gilbert et al., 1991). Much of the content used during prevention programs at this university assumes the audience already agrees that sexual misconduct, as well as misogyny and other problematic attitudes, are issues that need addressed. Responses from the Student Survey do show that students, especially women, agree that sexual violence is a problem that needs to be addressed. However, men may feel that prevention efforts do not apply to them, perhaps because they do not care about an issue they see as a women's problem, or they may have negative attitudes about

prevention due to past experience with programs treating men as potential perpetrators (McMahon, 2017; Powell & Henry, 2017). Prevention efforts at this university should explore ways to make all students, especially male-identifying students, partners in protecting their peers and being active bystanders. In addition, Brown et al. (2015) suggest that providing students with choices regarding prevention education, such as between a program that is an introduction to bystander intervention and a program that discusses patriarchy and rape culture, is one way to increase engagement. While still mandatory, empowering students with choice can help them feel more invested in the content less and like prevention is another hoop to jump through and thus, more likely to be engaged and retain it over time.

It may also be beneficial for university staff who develop prevention programs to facilitate focus groups with students. Analysis of program content and the Student Surveys show various conflicts between what programs teach and the lived experiences and perceptions of students on this campus. Focus groups, or some other form of data collection, can help staff better understand how to best connect with program participants, speak to their experiences, and ensure the right issues are being addressed. Information gained directly from students can help programs be designed in such a way that they tap into the central pathway of learning, and thus become more effective.

Third, situational crime prevention is utilized in a few ways. There are blue lights scattered all around campus, as well as regular police patrols, escort services, and a poster campaign in the campus shuttles. In addition, bystander intervention acts as situational crime prevention. Sexual violence tends to occur in private spaces, where resources like blue lights or police patrols are ineffective. Bystander

intervention increases the number of guardians across campus by encouraging students to look out for each other and prevent violence, especially in spaces like parties, bars, and dorms where violence is more likely to occur. Past research (Garcia et al., 2012) and findings from both the Student Survey and College Survey all show students are most aware of prevention efforts that affect the environment, suggesting it may be useful to capitalize on this to create more effective prevention overall.

7.2.1 What changes do students want to see?

In regard to suggestions students have for improving sexual violence prevention across campus, there were several themes. First, respondents wanted more advertising about not only services that are available, but also about prevention efforts. A handful of students mentioned they were not aware of services such as walking escorts or therapy services before taking the survey. Similarly, others felt the university was doing little in the way of prevention, despite a comprehensive slate of programs and activities across campus. Greater communication, perhaps via poster campaigns, social media posts, or campus events, could help students feel more confident that the university is taking action. As one student put it, "I think these efforts should be communicated more to students even if they are not actively seeking out this information" (sophomore, female). In addition to increasing the spread of information, these efforts could also reinforce university messaging around bystander intervention, affirmative consent, and other pro-social behaviors.

A related concern among students is that either the current efforts around education, or education as prevention in general, were not enough. One student

summed this sentiment up nicely: “While [the online module] has good intentions […] if someone is truly a rapist or predator, they know exactly what consent is, they simply do not care if their victim consents. So whether or not they are educated on this topic doesn't necessarily seem relevant in preventing sexual assault” (junior, female). Similar sentiments were expressed around at-risk populations on campus, especially those in Greek life. To address this, students thought it was important to have more mandatory programs required of students, especially material that is in-person and engaging, with special focus on fraternities and sororities. This is despite these groups already being required to participate in prevention efforts not expected of the student population as a whole. On the other hand, there were also a number of complaints about the mandatory online modules. Even when participants admitted prevention is important, they felt the modules were hoops to jump through rather than an effective prevention effort.

Suggestions related to situational crime prevention were also a theme throughout responses. The majority of these were related to an increased feeling of safety at night. Specifically, students wanted brighter and more evenly dispersed streetlights, cameras, an increase in offered transportation after dark, and a more active police presence (i.e., proactive action by police to ensure students get home safe after partying). Similarly, some participants asked for more campus-wide events that promote prevention and healthy relationships. As participants in the Student Survey were most aware of other situational crime prevention efforts, it makes sense to capitalize on this and build out these services when possible.

Many of the suggestions made by participants in the Student Survey are consistent with recommendations throughout the literature. Long-term prevention efforts have been found to be more successful than one-time workshops or presentations at changing both attitudes, and to a lesser degree, behavior. For example, Jozkowski (2015) found that students enrolled in a semester-long course on understanding rape culture had a better understanding of consent, were less likely to blame victims in sexual violence scenarios, and were better able to recognize indications of rape culture throughout society. Past research has also reported college students being interested in campus-wide events, and multiple studies agree that students prefer programs that are peer-facilitated rather than staff led (Garcia et al., 2012; Bloom et al., 2022).

7.3 The future of sexual violence prevention

While this study provides valuable information about the campus under study, it also has wider implications for sexual violence prevention at the university level in general. More than anything, the results of this study show the need for a comprehensive approach to sexual violence prevention that extends past altering the behavior of individuals. Most prevention programs are focused on providing information and building certain skills, such as communicating consent or engaging in self-protective behavior. However, these programs aim for individual-level change that is unlikely to shift a culture conducive to sexual violence. Some programs, like bystander intervention, do have the goal of community change and norm setting, but

may not be effective without a wider university effort that reinforces these norms and behaviors (Bonar et al., 2022; Sisneros & Rivera, 2018; Hirsch & Kahn, 2018). In addition, for the creation of new community norms to be successful, prevention efforts must include conversations about social issues like racism, classism, and homophobia that go hand-in-hand with rape culture – both at the individual level in terms of beliefs held by individuals, and societal institutions (hooks, 1984; Acker, 1992; Suarez & Gadella, 2010).

One way of making prevention efforts more comprehensive is through embracing the socioecological framework, which describes social problems as having risk and protective factors in four levels that are imbedded within each other: the individual level, the interpersonal or relational level, the community level, and the societal level (Brofenbrenner, 1994). In the context of sexual violence, the model acknowledges that violence is not the result of individual behavior, but interconnected factors at all levels of the framework– especially the outer levels (McMahon et al., 2021; Bonar et al., 2022; Hirsch & Kahn, 2018). For example, forces such as white supremacy, patriarchy and hegemonic masculinity, and heteronormativity are deeply imbedded in societal institutions and work together to create rape culture and promote sexual violence (hooks, 1984; Acker, 1992). Thus, prevention should be designed to address each level and not just the individual or even relational levels. Though it might be a lofty goal for a university prevention program to address such prominent societal issues, providing a space to have conversations that confront these topics is a good place to start. In addition, universities should consider campus-wide initiatives that

combat these issues, especially initiatives that involve everyone on campus and the larger community. These community efforts should especially focus on involving local K-12 students in some way. Exposing students to programming not just about consent, but also the larger societal issues of racism, white supremacy, hegemonic masculinity, and heteronormativity, among others, that are linked to sexual violence should start as soon as possible to have the largest impact (Hirsch & Kahn; Edwards et al., 2020). This also sets the stage for more complex conversations at the university level and beyond.

A method that has had success in the past and can provide some guidance for addressing individual behavior, societal forces, and everything in between, is the Whole School Approach (McMahon et al., 2021). As the name suggests, this approach acknowledges the school environment and involves all members of the community in prevention. With this and similar approaches, not only are students placed at the center of conversations about prevention, but everyone on campus and in the larger community has a role to play. Faculty and staff in particular are just as big a part of campus culture as students, and they have a role in shaping that culture through their interactions with students by being role models and providing ongoing support for prevention efforts. These efforts can be as simple as professors taking a stance against rape culture in their classroom, as well as being involved in larger campus efforts and setting campus norms (McMahon et al., 2021). In addition, identifying stakeholders at all layers of the socioecological framework, especially the community and societal levels, can help provide valuable information and partnerships for prevention efforts

moving forward (Bonar et al., 2022; Sisneros & Rivera, 2018). For example, employees at bars and restaurants around campus, police officers and campus security, and student leaders can all be made active partners in prevention.

This sort of approach can also help promote prevention in private spaces, where other efforts are ineffective. Bystander intervention is one way, where students are encouraged to look out for each other and step in to prevent violence between their peers. However, other members of the campus community can also do this. For example, resident advisors in universities, who are an authority figure in the private space of a dorm room, typically receive some sort of training related to sexual violence and bystander intervention. Training resident advisors in these topics has been found to be effective in the past, and the researchers attributed the success of the program to the hand-on approach to program facilitation rather than using a lecture-style method (Banyard, Moynihan & Crossman, 2009).

While they may have fewer daily interactions with students, campus administration also has a large role to play in prevention. Administration sets the tone for the rest of campus, and is the base upon which campus and community norms are built. This was evident in the current study, where participants expressed dissatisfaction with campus administrators' response to a widely acknowledged instance of dating violence, as well as the way sexual violence is perceived to be ignored in general. One way norms are set is through messaging from administration and university offices, such as through email or text communication to the student body. These communications should be used to consistently encourage bystander

intervention behaviors, as well as reinforce messaging that the university does not stand for violence and violence-supportive behaviors (i.e., rape culture). In addition, administration should find ways to show this – not just tell it. This may be participation in campus events that raise awareness about issues related to violence, as well as showing consistent support for campus organizations that do this work.

Part of a comprehensive sexual violence prevention approach is sexual health and healthy sexuality, in addition to content related to consent, healthy relationships, and rape-supportive attitudes. Previous research has noted that incoming freshmen often lack knowledge about these topics, and seem to not receive adequate education before – or even during – college (Synovitz et al., 2002). Most US states either provide abstinence-only education or emphasize abstinence during education, and several are not required to provide medically accurate information (*The SIECUS State Profiles)*. While it would be ideal for comprehensive sexual violence education to be provided before college, of which sexual health is a part, it is possible and even likely incoming freshmen hold risky views that it would be beneficial to address. Further, college students are asking for sexual health and wellness to be included in prevention curriculums, both in past research and the current study, providing greater support for the need to fill this gap in current education (Brown & Rothenberg, 2015). A comprehensive understanding of these topics is associated with lower rape myth acceptance, a higher likelihood of intervening in a risky situation, and may help students be more open and receptive to other prevention efforts (Haberland & Rogow, 2015; McMahon, 2010).

The disconnect between understanding of consent and actual experiences, as well as participant descriptions of campus party and dating culture, show the importance of understanding students' actual sexual experiences and placing them in the context of their particular university. This understanding provides information critical to developing sexual violence prevention that aligns with students' lived experiences. These findings, when paired with the work of Hirsch & Kahn (2018), suggest a way to strengthen sexual violence prevention efforts. Hirsch and Kahn (2018) describe the importance of facilitating college students' understanding of why they seek out – or do not seek out – sexual experiences. Helping students understand their sexual motivations, informed by the context of the campus environment and nuances of its culture, can combat potentially harmful behavior. For example, a college student may engage in sexual intercourse or attend campus parties because they think it is expected. This can result in pairing substance use with sex to cope with feelings of confusion or unease (Hirsch & Kahn, 2018). Inserting opportunities for reflection and conversation about motivation for sex, feelings about sex, and healthy sexuality into prevention programming can help students navigate these feelings and their relationship to sex in a safe way. Further, it is clear that mandatory prevention programs should include more specific examples of the types of sexual experiences that students may be exposed to on this university's campus, which can help students begin to explore their motivations for sex and be better prepared as they become integrated in university life.

It is also important that there is consistency in the content and messaging across programs, especially when current programs at a university are being expanded (Sisneros & Rivera, 2018). Inconsistent messaging across programs can lead to conflicting information, as well as confusion that can dilute or distract from the intended message. For example, in the current study, students who participated in multiple programs were less likely to correctly identify sexual assault in a scenario. This may be due to variation in terminology across programs, which could cause participants to not only be confused, but also not connect core concepts together. Prevention should be viewed as a cohesive effort across a university, where each program has a part to play in attaining the goal of preventing sexual violence, rather than separate efforts utilizing different strategies or messaging.

7.4 Limitations

This study has a few limitations. First, time and funding constraints resulted in a smaller sample size for the Student Survey than anticipated. In addition, despite efforts to increase diversity in the sample, participants in the survey were primarily freshmen, primarily white, and primarily female. This introduces potential bias in the findings, as they will be skewed toward the experiences of these groups. In addition, the lack of variability limited comparisons between different characteristics and efforts to prioritize intersectionality in analysis. This prevented discussions of important components of violence and rape culture, such as white supremacy and racism that are often imbedded in institutions. Future research should make a concerted effort to focus

on these issues, especially when examining the relationship between campus sexual violence, prevention efforts, and larger societal issues especially relevant on university campuses, and societal institutions in general (e.g., race and class).

Another limitation is related to the data collection period. Data were collected during a time of upheaval, when every aspect of university life was impacted. Covid-19 quarantines and the associated changes, such as remote learning, altered how prevention was implemented for upperclassmen in the sample and how peer educators were trained. In addition, remote learning means many students were unable to experience typical campus life, potentially biasing their perceptions. Some upperclassmen in the sample may have been unable to experience pre-Covid-19 culture at this university, and this culture may have been altered or experienced differently by freshmen or transfer students after pandemic quarantines ended.

7.5 Directions for future research

Due to the exploratory nature of the current study, some of the specific findings may not be applicable to other universities. Accordingly, future research should include case studies of university campuses across the United States and beyond. Case study research can aid in creating prevention programs that are specific to the culture at each university by understanding the specifics of why or why not a program may be working as intended, as well as provide a guide for what each university should address in programming and how. Future researchers should also consider a utilizing mixed methods to best understand the state of sexual violence prevention on campuses, and seek information not just from students, but also staff, faculty, administration, and community members.

Exploring student perceptions of everything from campus life to how prevention is implemented to how sexual violence occurs on their campus can help show gaps in sexual violence prevention strategies. In addition, future research should find new ways theory can be incorporated into prevention, especially when solutions are cost-effective and easy to implement even when staff is limited. Theory, such as social learning theory and the elaboration likelihood model of attitude change, can provide guidance in not just what content should be included to best make an impact on the particular audience, but also how to implement it to be most effective in the long term.

REFERENCES

Abbey, A., & McAuslan, P. (2004). A longitudinal examination of male college students' perpetration of sexual assault. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 72*(5), 747–756.

Acker, J. 1992. Gendered institutions: From sex roles to gendered institutions. *Contemporary Sociology, 21*(5), 565-569.

Akers, R. L. (1998). *Social learning and social structure: A general theory of crime and deviance*. Northeastern University Press.

Akers, R. L., & Jennings, W. G. (2015). Social learning theory. *The handbook of criminological theory, 4*, 230-240.

Armstrong, E. A., & Hamilton, L. T. (2013). *Paying for the party: How college maintains inequality*. Harvard University Press.

Banyard, V. L. (2011). Who will help prevent sexual violence: Creating an ecological model of bystander intervention. *Psychology of violence*, *1*(3), 216.

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.

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

Bennett, S., Banyard, V. L., & Garnhart, L. (2014). To act or not to act, that is the question? Barriers and facilitators of bystander intervention. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *29*(3), 476-496.

Beres, M. A. (2014). Rethinking the concept of consent for anti-sexual violence activism and education. *Feminism & Psychology, 24*(3), 373-389.

Beres, M. A. (2018). The proliferation of consent-focused rape prevention social marketing materials. *Orienting feminism: Media, activism and cultural representation*, 181-196.

Beres, M. (2020). Perspectives of rape-prevention educators on the role of consent in sexual violence prevention. *Sex Education, 20*(2), 227-238.

Berkowitz, A. D. (2010). Fostering healthy norms to prevent violence and abuse: The social norms approach. *The prevention of sexual violence: A practitioner's sourcebook*, 147-171.

Black, M., Basile, K., Breiding, M., Smith, S., Walters, M., Merrick, M., ... & Stevens, M. (2011). *National intimate partner and sexual violence survey: 2010 summary report*.

Boeringer, S. B., Shehan, C. L., & Akers, R. L. (1991). Social contexts and social learning in sexual coercion and aggression: Assessing the contribution of fraternity membership. *Family Relations*, 58-64.

Bogle, K. A. (2007). The shift from dating to hooking up in college: What scholars have missed. *Sociology Compass*, *1*(2), 775-788.

Bohner, G., Siebler, F., & Schmelcher, J. (2006). Social norms and the likelihood of raping: Perceived rape myth acceptance of others affects men's rape proclivity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*, 286–297.

Bonar, E. E., DeGue, S., Abbey, A., Coker, A. L., Lindquist, C. H., McCauley, H. L., ... & Walton, M. A. (2022). Prevention of sexual violence among college students: Current challenges and future directions. Journal of American College Health, 70(2), 575-588.

Borges, A. M., Banyard, V. L., & Moynihan, M. M. (2008). Clarifying consent: Primary prevention of sexual assault on a college campus. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, *36*(1-2), 75-88.

Bosma, A., Mulder, E., & Pemberton, A. (2018). The ideal victim through others' eyes. In M. Duggan (Ed.), *Revisiting the "Ideal Victim": Developments in Critical Victimology* (1st ed., pp. 27–42). Bristol University Press.

Boyle, K. M., & Walker, L. S. (2016). The neutralization and denial of sexual violence in college party subcultures. *Deviant Behavior, 37*(12), 1392-1410.

Brantingham, P. L., & Brantingham, P. J. (1993). Nodes, paths and edges: Considerations on the complexity of crime and the physical environment. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *13*(1), 3-28.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1994). Ecological models of human development. *International Encyclopedia of Education*, *3*(2), 37-43.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101.

Braun, V., Clarke, V., Boulton, E., Davey, L., & McEvoy, C. (2021). The online survey as a qualitative research tool. *International journal of social research methodology*, *24*(6), 641-654.

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

Brown, L., Alexander, J., & Rothenberg, L. (2015). Building a comprehensive prevention experience on campus: Sexual violence programming and training initiatives. *Journal of Campus Title IX Compliance and Best Practices, 1*, 11-15.

Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*(2), 217–30.

Campus SaVE Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1092 (2014). https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/20/1092.

Canan, S. N., Jozkowski, K. N., & Crawford, B. L. (2018). Sexual assault supportive attitudes: Rape myth acceptance and token resistance in Greek and non-Greek college students from two university samples in the United States. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 33*(22), 3502-3530.

Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., Harps, S., Townsend, R., Thomas, G., ... & Madden, K. (2019). Report on the AAU campus climate survey on sexual assault and misconduct. *The Association of American Universities, Westat, Rockville, Maryland*.

Casey, E. A. & Lindhorst, T. P. (2009). Toward a multi-level ecological approach to primary prevention of sexual assault. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 10*(2), 91-114.

Christie, N. (1986). The ideal victim. In From crime policy to victim policy (pp. 17-30). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Clapp, J. D., Ketchie, J. M., Reed, M. B., Shillington, A. M., Lange, J. E., & Holmes, M. R. (2008). Three exploratory studies of college theme parties. *Drug and Alcohol Review, 27*(5), 509–18.

Cochran, J. K., Maskaly, J., Jones, S., & Sellers, C. S. (2017). Using structural equations to model Akers' social learning theory with data on intimate partner violence. *Crime & Delinquency*, *63*(1), 39-60.

Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American sociological review*, 588-608.

Coker, A. L., Bush, H. M., Brancato, C. J., Clear, E. R., & Recktenwald, E. A. (2019). Bystander Program Effectiveness to Reduce Violence Acceptance: RCT in High Schools. *Journal of Family Violence, 34*(3), 153–164.

Cooper, M. L. (1994). Motivations for alcohol use among adolescents: Development and validation of a four-factor model. *Psychological Assessment*, *6*(2), 117.

Cornish, D. B., & Clarke, R. V. (1987). Understanding crime displacement: An application of rational choice theory. *Criminology*, *25*(4), 933-948.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1989*(1), 139-168.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review, 43*(6), 1241-1299.

Davis, T. (2000). Programming for men to reduce sexual violence. *New Directions for Student Services, 2000*(90), 79-89.

DeKeseredy, W. S., & Schwartz, M. D. (2013). *Male peer support and violence against women: The history and verification of a theory*. Northeastern University Press.

Eck, J. E., & Clarke, R. V. (2019). Situational crime prevention: Theory, practice and evidence. *Handbook on Crime and Deviance*, 355-376.

Edwards, K. M., Sessarego, S. N., Mitchell, K. J., Chang, H., Waterman, E. A., & Banyard, V. L. (2020). Preventing teen relationship abuse and sexual assault through bystander training: intervention outcomes for school personnel. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *65*(1-2), 160–172.

Eyssel, F., Bohner, G., & Siebler, F. (2006). Perceived rape myth acceptance of others predicts rape proclivity: Social norm or judgmental anchoring? *Swiss Journal of Psychology, 65*(2), 93-99.

Fedina, L., Holmes, J. L., & Backes, B. L. (2018). Campus sexual assault: A systematic review of prevalence research from 2000 to 2015. *Trauma, violence, & abuse, 19*(1), 76-93.

Felson, M. (1986). Linking criminal choices, routine activities, informal control, and criminal outcomes. In: D.B. Cornish and R.V. Clarke (eds.) *The Reasoning Criminal: Rational Choice Perspectives on Offending*. New York: Springer-Verlag, pp. 119–128.

Foshee, V. A., Bauman, K. E., Ennett S. T., Linder, F., Benefield, G., F., & Suchindran, C. (2004). Assessing the long-term effects of the Safe Dates program and a booster in preventing and reducing adolescent dating violence victimization and perpetration. American Journal of Public Health, 94(4), 619-624.

Foubert, J., & Newberry, J. T. (2006). Effects of two versions of an empathy-based rape prevention program on fraternity men's survivor empathy, attitudes, and behavioral intent to commit rape or sexual assault. *Journal of College Student Development*, *47*(2), 133-148.

Foubert, J. D., & Perry, B. C. (2007). Creating Lasting Attitude and Behavior Change in Fraternity Members and Male Student Athletes: The Qualitative Impact of an Empathy-Based Rape Prevention Program. *Violence Against Women, 13*(1), 70–86.

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.

Garcia, C. M., Lechner, K. E., Frerich, E. A., Lust, K. A., & Eisenberg, M. E. (2012). Preventing sexual violence instead of just responding to it: Students' perceptions of sexual violence resources on campus. *Journal of Forensic Nursing*, *8*(2), 61-71.

Gidycz, C. A., Rich, C. L., Orchowski, L., King, C., & Miller, A. K. (2006). The evaluation of a sexual assault self-defense and risk-reduction program for college women: A prospective study. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *30*(2), 173-186.

Gidycz, C. A., Orchowski, L. M., & Berkowitz, A. D. (2011). Preventing sexual aggression among college men: An evaluation of a social norms and bystander intervention program. *Violence Against Women, 16*(6), 720-742.

Gilbert, B. J., Heesacker, M., & Gannon, L. J. (1991). Changing the sexual aggression-supportive attitudes of men: A psychoeducational intervention. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *38*(2), 197.

Haberland, N., & Rogow, D. (2015). Sexuality education: emerging trends in evidence and practice. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *56*(1), S15-S21.

Hackman, C. L., Pember, S. E., Wilkerson, A. H., Burton, W., & Usdan, S. L. (2017). Slut-shaming and victim-blaming: a qualitative investigation of undergraduate students' perceptions of sexual violence. *Sex Education, 17*(6), 697–711.

Hartley, J. (2004). Case study research. In C. Cassell & G. Symon (Eds.), *Essential guide to qualitative methods in organizational research* (pp. 323-333). Sage.

Haven Partner Guide. Everfi. http://info.everfi.com/rs/everfi/images/HavenPartnerGuide- EverFi.pdf.

Heppner, M. J., Good, G. E., Hillenbrand-Gunn, T. L., Hawkins, A. K., Hacquard, L. L., Nichols, R. K., ... & Brock, K. J. (1995). Examining sex differences in altering attitudes about rape: A test of the elaboration likelihood model. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *73*(6), 640-647.

Hirsch, J. S. & Kahn, S. (2020). *Sexual Citizens: A Landmark Study of Sex, Power, and Assault on Campus*. Norton & Company.

Hockett, J. M., Saucier, D. A., & Badke, C. (2016). Rape myths, rape scripts, and common rape experiences of college women: Differences in perceptions of women who have been raped. *Violence against women, 22*(3), 307-323.

Holman, A., & Sillars, A. (2012). Talk about "hooking up": the influence of college student social networks on nonrelationship sex. *Health Communication, 27*(2), 205–16.

hooks, b. (1984). *Feminist theory: From margin to center*. South End Press.

Hubach, R. D., Story, C. R., Currin, J. M., Woods, A., Jayne, A., & Jayne, C. (2019). "What should sex look like?" Students' desires for expanding university sexual assault prevention programs to include comprehensive sex education. *Qualitative Health Research, 29*(13), 1967–1977.

Johnson, N. L., & Johnson, D. M. (2021). An empirical exploration into the measurement of rape culture. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *36*(1-2), NP70-NP95.

Jozkowski, K. N. (2015). “Yes means yes”? Sexual consent policy and college students. Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 47(2), 16-23.

Jozkowski, K. N., & Peterson, Z. D. (2013). College students and sexual consent: Unique insights. *Journal of Sex Research, 50*(6), 517-523.

Jozkowski, K. N., & Wiersma-Mosely, J. D. (2017). The Greek system: How gender inequality and class privilege perpetuate rape culture. *Family Relations: Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies, 66*(1), 89-103.

Jozkowski, K. N., & Willis, M. (2020). People perceive transitioning from a social to a private setting as an indicator of sexual consent. *Psychology & Sexuality*, *11*(4), 359-372.

Kafonek, K. & Richards, T. N. (2017). An examination of strategies for the prevention of gender-based violence at four-year institutions of higher education. *Journal of School Violence, 16*(3), 271-285.

Katz, J., & Moore, J. (2013). Bystander education training for campus sexual assault prevention: An initial meta-analysis. *Violence and Victims*, *28*(6), 1054-1067.

Kettrey, H. H., Marx, R. A. & Tanner-Smith, E. E. (2019). Effects of bystander programs on the prevention of sexual assault among. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*.

King, N., Horrocks, C., & Brooks, J. (2019). *Interviews in Qualitative Research*.

Koss, M. P., & Harvey, M. R. (1991). *The rape victim: Clinical and community interventions*. Sage.

Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C. H., Warner, T. D., Fisher, B. S., & Martin, S. L. (2009). College women's experiences with physically forced, alcohol- or other drug-enabled, and drug-facilitated sexual assault before and since entering college. *Journal of American College Health, 57*(6), 639–649.

Krebs, C., Lindquist, C., Berzofsky, M., Shook-Sa, B., Peterson, K., Planty, M., & Stroop, J. (2016). *Campus climate survey validation study: Final technical report* (p. 218). Washington, DC: BJS, Office of Justice Programs.

Kuperberg, A., & Padgett, J. E. (2016). The role of culture in explaining college students’ selection into hookups, dates, and long-term romantic relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 33*(8), 1070-1096.

Lee, D. S., Guy, L., Perry, B., Sniffen, C. K., & Mixson, S. A. (2007). Sexual violence prevention. *The Prevention Researcher, 14*(2), p. 15-20.

Lee, Y. J., Eck, J. E., SooHyun, O., & Martinez, N. N. (2017). How concentrated is crime at places? A systematic review from 1970 to 2015. *Crime Science*, *6*(1).

Lewis, M. A., Atkins, D. C., Blayney, J. A., Dent, D. V., & Kaysen, D. L. (2013). What is hooking up? examining definitions of hooking up in relation to behavior and normative perceptions. *Journal of Sex Research, 50*(8), 757–766.

Linder, C., & Lacy, M. (2020). Blue lights and pepper spray: Cisgender college women's perceptions of campus safety and implications of the "stranger danger" myth. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *91*(3), 433-454.

Linder, C., Grimes, N., Williams, B. M., & Lacy, M. C. (2020). What do we know about campus sexual violence? A content analysis of 10 years of research. *The Review of Higher Education, 43*(4), 1017-1040.

Lutz-Zois, C. J., Moler, K. A., & Brown, M. J. (2015). Mechanisms for the relationship between traditional masculine ideologies and rape myth acceptance among college men. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, *24*(1), 84-101.

Martin, P. Y. (2004). Gender as social institution. *Social Forces, 82*(4), 1249-1273.

Marzell, M., Bavarian, N., Paschall, M. J., Mair, C., & Saltz, R. F. (2015). Party characteristics, drinking settings, and college students' risk of intoxication: A multi-campus study. The Journal of Primary Prevention, 36(4), 247-258.

McCabe, S. E., Veliz, P., & Schulenberg, J. E. (2018). How collegiate fraternity and sorority involvement relates to substance use during young adulthood and substance use disorders in early midlife: A national longitudinal study. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 62*(3), S35-S43.

McMahon, S. (2017). Active bystander intervention. In C. Kaukinen, M. H. Miller, & R. A. Powers (Eds.), *Addressing violence against women on college campuses* (230-242). Temple University Press.

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

McMahon, S., & Farmer, G. L. (2011). An updated measure for assessing subtle rape myths. *Social Work Research, 35*(2), 71-81.

McMahon, S., Steiner, J. J., Snyder, S., & Banyard, V. L. (2021). Comprehensive prevention of campus sexual violence: expanding who is invited to the table. Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 22(4), 843–855.

Messner, M. A. (2016). Bad Men, Good Men, Bystanders: Who Is the Rapist? *Gender & Society, 30*(1), 57–66.

Miller, E. (2018). Reclaiming gender and power in sexual violence prevention in adolescence. *Violence Against Women, 24*(15), 1785–1793.

Miller, E., Tancredi, D. J., McCauley, H. L., Decker, M. R., Virata, M. C. D., Anderson, H. A., ... & Silverman, J. G. (2012). "Coaching boys into men": A cluster-randomized controlled trial of a dating violence prevention program. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 51*(5), 431-438.

Miller, M. E. (2016). 'A steep price to pay for 20 minutes of action': Dad defends Stanford sex offender. *Washington Post*. Retrieved September 19, 2021, from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/morning-mix/wp/2016/06/06/a-steep-price-to-pay-for- 20-minutes- of-action-dad-defends-stanford-sex-offender/.

Mohr, C. D., Armeli, S., Tennen, H., Temple, M., Todd, M., Clark, J., & Carney, M. A. (2005). Moving beyond the keg party: a daily process study of college student drinking motivations. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 19*(4), 392.

Monto, M. A., & Carey, A. G. (2014). A new standard of sexual behavior? Are claims associated with the "hookup culture" supported by General Social Survey data?. *The Journal of Sex Research, 51*(6), 605-615.

Mouilso, E. R., & Calhoun, K. S. (2013). The role of rape myth acceptance and psychopathy in sexual assault perpetration. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 22*(2), 159-174.

Mujal, G. N., Taylor, M. E., Fry, J. L., Gochez-Kerr, T. H., & Weaver, N. L. (2019). A systematic review of bystander interventions for the prevention of sexual violence. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 22*(2), p. 381-396.

Murnen, S. K., & Kohlman, M. H. (2007). Athletic participation, fraternity membership, and sexual aggression among college men: A meta-analytic review. *Sex Roles, 57*, 145-157.

O'Connor J. (2021). The Longitudinal Effects of Rape Myth Beliefs and Rape Proclivity. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 22*(2), 321–330.

Newlands, R., & O'Donohue, W. (2016). A critical review of sexual violence prevention on college campuses. *Acta Psychopathologica, 2*(2), 14.

Pease, B. (2014). Theorising men's violence prevention policies: Limitations and possibilities of interventions in a patriarchal state. *Preventing sexual violence: Interdisciplinary approaches to overcoming a rape culture*, 22-40.

Petty, R. E. & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). *The Elaboration Likelihood Model of Persuasion* (pp. 1-24). Springer New York.

Pham, J. M. (2017). Beyond hookup culture: Current trends in the study of college student sex and where to next. *Sociology Compass, 11*(8).

Porta, C. M., Elmquist, S., Martin, L., Sampson, K., Stack, K., Hill, A., ... & Driessen, M. C. (2021). "It could bring down Greek life as a whole": Greek life members' perspectives on party culture, safety, responsibilities and consequences. *Journal of American College Health,* 1-11.

Potter, S. J., Moynihan, M. M., Stapleton, J. G., & Banyard, V. L. (2009). Empowering bystanders to prevent campus violence against women: A preliminary evaluation of a poster campaign. *Violence Against Women, 15*(1), 106-121.

Powell, A. & Henry, N. (2014). Framing sexual violence prevention: What does it mean to challenge a rape culture? In N. Henry & A. Powell (Eds.), *Preventing sexual violence: Interdisciplinary approaches to overcoming a rape culture* (pp. 1-21). Palgrave Macmillan.

Powers, R. A., Cochran, J. K., Maskaly, J., & Sellers, C. S. (2020). Social learning theory, gender, and intimate partner violent victimization: A structural equations approach. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 35*(17-18), 3554-3580.

Pratt, T. C., Cullen, F. T., Sellers, C. S., Thomas Winfree Jr, L., Madensen, T. D., Daigle, L. E., ... & Gau, J. M. (2010). The empirical status of social learning theory: A meta-analysis. *Justice Quarterly, 27*(6), 765-802.

Reling, T. T., Barton, M. S., Becker, S., & Valasik, M. A. (2018). Rape myths and hookup culture: an exploratory study of U.S. college students' perceptions. *Sex Roles, 78*(7-8), 501–514.

Salazar, L. F., Vivolo-Kantor, A., & Schipani-McLaughlin, A. M. (2019). Theoretical mediators of RealConsent: a web-based sexual violence prevention and bystander education program. *Health Education & Behavior, 46*(1), 79-88.

Sawyer, R. G., Thompson, E. E., & Chicorelli, A. M. (2002). Rape myth acceptance among intercollegiate student athletes: a preliminary examination. *American Journal of Health Studies, 18*(1).

Seabrook, R. C., McMahon, S., & O'Connor, J. (2018). A longitudinal study of interest and membership in a fraternity, rape myth acceptance, and proclivity to perpetrate sexual assault. *Journal of American College Health, 66*(6), 510-518.

The Siecus State Profiles. SIECUS. (2023, January 24). https://siecus.org/state-profiles.

Sisneros, K., & Rivera, M. (2018). Navigating institutions and institutional leadership to address sexual violence. *New Directions for Student Services, 161*(161), 95–105.

Soule, E. K., Rossheim, M. E., Cavazos, T. C., Bode, K., & Desrosiers, A. C. (2021). Cigarette, waterpipe, and electronic cigarette use among college fraternity and sorority members and athletes in the United States. *Journal of American College Health, 69*(5), 463-469.

Suarez, E., & Gadalla, T. M. (2010). Stop blaming the victim: A meta-analysis on rape myths. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *25*(11), 2010-2035.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research*. Sage.

Suarez, E., & Gadalla, T. M. (2010). Stop blaming the victim: A meta-analysis on rape myths. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *25*(11), 2010-2035.

Sutherland, E.H. (1947). *The Principles of Criminology*. 4th ed. Lippincott.

Sykes, G. M., & Matza, D. (1957). Techniques of neutralization: A theory of delinquency. *American sociological review, 22*(6), 664-670.

Synovitz, L., Herbert, E., Kelley, R. M., & Carlson, G. (2002). Sexual knowledge of college students in a southern state: Relationship to sexuality education. *American Journal of Health Studies*, *17*(4), 163.

Tillyer, M. S., & Eck, J. E. (2011). Getting a handle on crime: A further extension of routine activities theory. *Security Journal*, *24*, 179-193.

Trottier, D., Benbouriche, M., & Bonneville, V. (2021). A meta-analysis on the association between rape myth acceptance and sexual coercion perpetration. *The Journal of Sex Research, 58*(3), 375-382.

van Hoorn, J., van Dijk, E., Meuwese, R., Rieffe, C., & Crone, E. A. (2016). Peer influence on prosocial behavior in adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 26*(1), 90-100.

Wade, L. (2017). *American hookup: the new culture of sex on campus* (First). W.W. Norton & Company.

Warren, P., Swan, S., & Allen, C. T. (2015). Comprehension of sexual consent as a key factor in the perpetration of sexual aggression among college men. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 24*(8), 897-913.

Waterman, E. A., Hutchison, C. A., Edwards, K. M., Hopfauf, S. L., Simon, B., & Banyard, V. L. (2021). A process evaluation of a youth-led sexual violence prevention initiative. *Journal of Prevention and Health Promotion, 2*(2), 163–190.

Wilcox, P., & Cullen, F. T. (2018). Situational opportunity theories of crime. *Annual Review of Criminology*, *1*, 123-148.

Yapp, E. J., & Quayle, E. (2018). A systematic review of the association between rape myth acceptance and male-on-female sexual violence. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 41*, 1-19.

Appendix A

SCENARIOS

Scenario 1: Intimate partner violence

Sam and Benjamin have been dating since sophomore year. Now seniors, Benjamin is getting more attention than ever from underclassmen and Sam has been getting more jealous. Recently Sam started looking through Benjamin's phone and constantly texts him to ask who he's with. When they spend time together in public, Sam always has his arm around Benjamin and gives nasty looks to anyone that gets close. Benjamin no longer feels like he can spend time with his friends or go out on his own without feeling bad. Benjamin has tried to bring up this behavior with Sam, but he makes Benjamin feel guilty.

Scenario 2: Sexual assault

Chloe and Robert are hanging out at with friends at Robert's apartment when Chloe asks Robert to show her something in his bedroom. Once there, Chloe pushes Robert onto his bed and straddles him. Then, she starts kissing him. He tells her he thinks it's weird to make out when there are people around and turns his head away. Chloe laughs it off and continues kissing him anyway, saying guys are always up for messing around. Robert continues to resist but doesn't stop her, not wanting to make a big deal out of it since Chloe said he's supposed to want to be with her. Chloe doesn't stop until one of their other friends walks in and asks Robert something. He takes the opportunity to leave the room.

Appendix B

QUALITATIVE CODES

Parent codes and first level of child codes

Parent Code	**Child codes**
Dating Culture (n=246)	Comparisons (n=12) Hooking up (n=81) Romantic partner (n=31) How meet partners (n=178)
Party Culture (n=244)	Constant parties/parties central to campus life (n=66) Party description (n=88) Hooking up (n=16) Preference for other activities (n=19) House parties (non-Greek) (n=25) Greeks (n=52) Substance use (n=52) Dages (n=28) Parties unsafe (n=33)
Sexual Violence on Campus (n=164)	Campus SV characteristics (n=77) No one doing anything to address it (n=13) SV is prevalent on this campus (n=11) Survivors stay silent (n=10)
Improve Programs (n=189)	Proposed changes to programs (n=92) Campus changes (n=30) Prevention can only do so much (n=28) Lack of campus knowledge about programs (n=42) Need better response to SV (n=32)

Appendix C

RESULTS TABLES

Table C1. Bystander intervention outcomes

	n	**%**	X^2
Intervened in dangerous situation	180	24%	-
Year in school	-	-	.321
Gender	-	-	.000
Program participation	-	-	.836
Athlete	-	-	1.886
Greek life	-	-	3.316
Spoken up	184	72%	-
Year in school	-	-	.204
Gender	-	-	1.873
Program participation	-	-	3.966*
Athlete	-	-	.760
Greek life	-	-	.495
Think about CSV differently	207	70%	-
Year in school	-	-	3.144
Gender	-	-	.921
Program participation	-	-	.555
Athlete	-	-	.029
Greek life	-	-	.421
Confidence in intervening	239	71%	-
Year in school	-	-	.138
Gender	-	-	1.589

Program participation	-	-	3.592
Athlete	-	-	1.708
Greek life	-	-	10.1***
Students on this campus intervene	239	42%	-
Year in school	-	-	1.881
Gender	-	-	1.094
Program participation	-	-	.114
Athlete	-	-	3.946*
Greek life	-	-	2.776

The percent reported here is the percent that agreed with the outcome.
*: p<.05; **: p<.01; ***: p<.001

Table C2. Recognition of gender-based violence.

	n	**%**	X^2
Scenario 1: Intimate partner violence	239	45%	-
Year in school	-	-	1.869
Gender	-	-	3.830*
Program participation	-	-	.005
Athlete	-	-	.005
Greek life	-	-	2.008
Scenario 2: Sexual assault	239	75%	-
Year in school	-	-	.160
Gender	-	-	2.891
Program participation	-	-	5.563*
Athlete	-	-	15.773***
Greek life	-	-	5.022*

The percent reported here is the percent that selected the most correct option.
*: p<.05; **: p<.01; ***: p<.001

Table C3. Consent score.

	n	**%**	X^2
All responses accurate	237	81%	-
Year in school	-	-	.987
Gender	-	-	.791
Program participation	-	-	.524
Athlete	-	-	.035
Greek life	-	-	.194

Appendix D

CONSENT VIGNETTE CODES

Vignette 1: Coercion

Parent Code	**Child codes**
Not consensual (n=122)	Lack of resistance is not consent (n=9) Saying no once indicates non-consent (n=2) Consent to some activities but not others (n=75) No verbal consent (n=28) Continued despite saying no/coercion (n=27) Verbally said no (n=20)
Consensual (n=39)	Didn't say no (n=5) Saying yes once is adequate (n=5) Verbal consent given (n=13) Agreeing to go somewhere private is consent (n=6) House parties (non-Greek) (n=25) Kissing back is consent (n=20)
Unsure if consensual (n=4)	May be coercion (n=1)

Vignette 2: Alcohol and Non-Verbal Consent

Parent Code	**Child codes**
Not consensual (n=55)	She may have felt pressured (n=2) No consent given, but both parties enthusiastic (n=8) No verbal consent (n=49) He may have gotten her drunk on purpose (n=3) Cannot consent when intoxicated (n=11)
Consensual (n=93)	Verbal consent (n=2) Seems consensual but he should have asked (n=15) Agreeing to some things is consent (n=1) Non-verbal consent (n=31) Didn't say no (n=24) Reciprocation is consent (n=56)

	Agreeing to go somewhere private is consent (n=10) Buying/accepting a drink is consent (n=11)
Unsure if consensual (n=25)	Alcohol makes it unclear (n=9)

Appendix E

IRB APPROVAL

Institutional Review Board
210H Hullihen Hall
Newark, DE 19716
Phone: 302-831-2137
Fax: 302-831-2828

DATE:	June 21, 2022
TO:	Rachael Schilling, MS
FROM:	University of Delaware IRB
STUDY TITLE:	[1880427-2] A Case Study Evaluation of a University Sexual Violence Prevention Program: Merging Theory and Prevention
SUBMISSION TYPE:	Amendment/Modification
ACTION:	APPROVED
EFFECTIVE DATE:	June 21, 2022
NEXT REPORT DUE:	March 23, 2023
REVIEW TYPE:	Expedited Review
REVIEW CATEGORY:	Expedited review category # *(6,7)*

Thank you for your Amendment/Modification submission to the University of Delaware Institutional Review Board (UD IRB). The UD IRB has reviewed and APPROVED the proposed research and submitted documents via Expedited Review in compliance with the pertinent federal regulations.

As the Principal Investigator for this study, you are responsible for, and agree that:

- All research must be conducted in accordance with the protocol and all other study forms as approved in this submission. Any revisions to the approved study procedures or documents must be reviewed and approved by the IRB prior to their implementation. Please use the UD amendment form to request the review of any changes to approved study procedures or documents.
- Informed consent is a process that must allow prospective participants sufficient opportunity to discuss and consider whether to participate. IRB-approved and stamped consent documents must be used when enrolling participants and a written copy shall be given to the person signing the informed consent form.
- Unanticipated problems, serious adverse events involving risk to participants, and all non-compliance issues must be reported to this office in a timely fashion according with the UD requirements for reportable events. All sponsor reporting requirements must also be followed.

The UD IRB REQUIRES the submission of a PROGRESS REPORT DUE ON March 23, 2023. A continuing review/progress report form must be submitted to the UD IRB at least 45 days prior to the due date to allow for the review of that report.

If you have any questions, please contact the UD IRB Office at (302) 831-2137 or via email at hsrb-research@udel.edu. Please include the study title and reference number in all correspondence with this office.

Appendix F

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Sexual Violence Prevention Survey

Start of Block: Informed Consent

Q1 **KEY INFORMATION**

Important aspects of the study you should know about first:

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to learn more about student experiences with and opinions about sexual violence prevention at the [University] and explore the connection between prevention and theory.

Procedures: If you choose to participate, you will be asked to take part in a survey regarding your experiences and opinions about sexual violence prevention on campus.

Duration: This will take about 30-45 minutes and will require only one survey for data collection and one survey to collect your contact information to enter a raffle.

Risks: The main risk or discomfort from this research is discussing sexual violence prevention on campus. Though you will not be asked about your experience with sexual violence, this related topic may be a trigger for some people.

Benefits: There are no direct benefits to you as a result of this study.

Alternatives: There are no known alternatives available to you other than not taking part in this study.

Costs and Compensation: If you decide to participate there will be no additional cost to you and you could be compensated up to $100 via an Amazon e-gift card via a raffle. If you choose to enter the raffle, your odds of winning will be 1 in 40. You will only be eligible to enter the raffle once.

Participation: Taking part or not in this research study is your decision. You can decide to participate and then change your mind at any point

Please carefully read the entire document. You can ask any questions you may have before deciding If you want to participate.

Q1 **Sexual Violence Prevention at the University of Delaware** You are being invited to participate in a research study. This consent form tells you about the study including its purpose, what you will be asked to do if you decide to take part, and the risks and benefits of being in the study. Please read the information below and refer any questions you may have before you decide whether or not you want to participate to the PI, Rachael Schilling, at schillra@udel.edu. **PURPOSE OF THE STUDY** The purpose of this study is to learn more about student experiences with sexual violence prevention at the [University]. The aims of the study are to understand the opinions and experiences of undergraduate students, explore the relationship between prevention and campus culture, and strengthen the connection between prevention and theory. In addition, the data from this study will be used in a student dissertation.

WHO IS BEING ASKED TO PARTICIPATE? You will be one of 400 student participants in this study. You are being asked to participate in this study because you have previously participated in sexual violence prevention at this university. You must be at least 18 years of age and be a University of Delaware undergraduate student.

PROCEDURES: WHAT WILL YOU BE ASKED TO DO? As part of this study, you will be asked to participate in a survey about your experiences with sexual violence prevention on campus. This survey will last approximately 30-45 minutes is hosted on Qualtrics. The survey includes both text responses where you will be asked to share your experiences/opinions and multiple choice questions.

WHAT ARE POSSIBLE RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS? Possible risks of participating in this research study include discomfort associated with discussing sexual violence prevention. All participants will be provided information about campuses resources.

WHAT ARE POTENTIAL BENEFITS FROM THE STUDY? You will not benefit directly from taking part in this research. However, as recommendations for improvements to current prevention programming will be provided, all students at the university may potentially be able to benefit from this study.

WHO MAY KNOW THAT YOU PARTICIPATED IN THIS RESEARCH? Your study data will be handled as confidentially as possible, and there will be no identifiable information collected from you in the survey. The contact information collected from you for the purpose of compensation as part of the raffle will in no way be associated with your data. If results of this study are published, personally identifiable information will not be used. The results if the research will be reported as part of the PI's dissertation. No information that gives your name or other details will be shared. While quotes may be used, the PI will associate them with a pseudonym. The PI will make every effort to keep all research records that identify you confidential.

We will keep your study data confidential and only those with permission in the research team will have access to it. We may have to report certain information for legal or ethical reasons, such as child abuse, or intent to hurt yourself or others. If

required, your records may be inspected by authorized personnel in the following groups and agencies: the University of Delaware Institutional Review Board.
COSTS AND COMPENSATION There are no costs associated with participating in the study.

After completing the study, you will have the opportunity to enter a raffle to win a $100 Amazon e-gift card. After every 40 participants have completed the survey and entered the raffle, the researcher will choose a winner using an Excel random number generator. There will be a total of 10 winners. This will result in having a 1 in 40 chance of winning. Winners will be notified via email. If you choose to enter the raffle, you will be asked to enter your contact information in a form that is separate from this survey. You will only be eligible to enter the raffle once.

DO YOU HAVE TO TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY? Taking part in this research study is your decision. You do not have to participate in this research. If you choose to take part, you have the right to stop at any time. If you decide later not to participate, or if you decide to stop taking part in the research, there will be no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your decision to stop participation, or not to participate, will not influence current or future relationships with the University of Delaware.
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD This research study has been reviewed and approved by the University of Delaware Institutional Review Board (UD IRB), which is a committee formally designated to approve, monitor, and review biomedical and behavioral research involving humans. If you have any questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the UD IRB at hsrb-research@udel.edu or (302) 831-2137. **CONTACT INFORMATION If you have any questions about the purpose, procedures, or any other issues related to this research study you may contact the Principal Investigator, Rachael Schilling at (937) 260-9063 or schillra@udel.edu or Dr. Christine Visher, at visher@udel.edu.**

A copy of this information is available for download by clicking here.
By clicking the button below, you acknowledge: Your participation in the study is voluntary. You are 18 years of age. You are aware that you may choose to terminate your participation at any time for any reason. You are an undergraduate student currently enrolled at the [University].

- ○ I consent, begin the study (1)
- ○ I do not consent, I do not wish to participate (2)

End of Block: Informed Consent

Start of Block: Block 1

Text In this first section, please answer a few demographic questions.

Please note that once you click past a section, you will not be able to go back and edit your responses.

Q1 What is your year in school?

- ○ Freshman/First year (1)
- ○ Sophomore/Second year (2)
- ○ Junior/Third year (3)
- ○ Senior/Fourth year (4)
- ○ Other (5) _____

Q2a What is your race? Please select all that apply.

- ☐ White or Caucasian (1)
- ☐ Black or African American (2)
- ☐ American Indian or Alaskan Native (3)
- ☐ Asian or Asian American (5)
- ☐ Middle Eastern (6)
- ☐ Prefer to self-describe (7) _____
- ☐ ⊗ Prefer not to answer (8)

Q2b Are you Hispanic or Latino?

- ○ Yes (1)
- ○ No (2)
- ○ Prefer not to answer (3)

Q3 What is your gender identity?

- ○ Male (1)
- ○ Female (2)
- ○ Genderfluid (3)
- ○ Non-binary (4)
- ○ Third gender (5)
- ○ Prefer to self-describe (6) _____
- ○ Prefer not to answer (7)

Q4 Are you transgender?

- ○ Yes (1)
- ○ No (2)
- ○ I'm not sure/questioning (3)
- ○ Prefer not to answer (4)

Q5 How would you describe your sexuality?

- ○ Straight/heterosexual (1)
- ○ Lesbian (2)
- ○ Gay (3)
- ○ Bisexual (4)
- ○ Queer (5)
- ○ Questioning (6)
- ○ Prefer to self-describe or other (7) _____
- ○ Prefer not to say (8)

Q6 Are you currently or previously a student athlete?

- ○ Yes (1)
- ○ No (2)
- ○ Yes, but not for [University] (3)

Q7 Are you currently or previously involved with Greek life at [University] ?

- ○ Yes (1)
- ○ No (2)
- ○ Yes, but not at UD (3)

Q8 Approximately how many semesters did you spend on [University] 's campus before the COVID-19 pandemic quarantine and the shift to entirely virtual classes? (Before Spring 2020 - Exclude Winter and Summer semesters)

- ○ I was not on campus before the Covid-19 pandemic began (1)
- ○ 1-2 (2)
- ○ 3-4 (3)
- ○ 5-8 (4)
- ○ 9+ (5)
- ○ I'm not sure (6)
- ○ Other (7) _____

Q9 Please check the box for each semester you have been physically on campus (living in [University city] and/or attending classes on the [University] campus).

- ☐ None - I'm still remote (1)
- ☐ Fall 2021 (2)
- ☐ Winter 2022 (3)
- ☐ Spring 2022 (4)
- ☐ Other (5) _____

Text In this section, please answer some questions about [University] campus life.

Q10 How would you describe the dating culture on campus? Feel free to include examples that help illustrate your point.

For example, how long do relationships/hook-ups tend to last? How do students meet romantic or sexual partners?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q11 How would you describe the party culture on campus? This includes anything you might consider a party.
Feel free to include examples that help illustrate your point.

For example, what are parties at [University] like? What makes them unique?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q12 Please mark how strongly you agree or disagree with each statement below regarding student safety.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
When I'm on UD's campus, I feel safe from sexual violence (1)	○	○	○	○	○
When I'm on UD's campus, I feel safe from sexual harassment (2)	○	○	○	○	○
I feel safe walking on/near UD's campus alone late at night (3)	○	○	○	○	○
I feel safe on/near UD's campus during the day (4)	○	○	○	○	○
When I'm in Newark near UD's campus, I feel safe from sexual violence (5)	○	○	○	○	○

When I'm in Newark near UD's campus, I feel safe from sexual harassment (6)	○	○	○	○	○

Q13 If sexual violence does happen on or near [University]'s campus, what do you think the situation most likely looks like? Mark all that apply for what you think the typical situation would be like.

- [ ] The survivor and perpetrator know each other (1)
- [ ] The survivor and perpetrator are in a relationship (16)
- [ ] The survivor and perpetrator are strangers (2)
- [ ] The survivor and perpetrator just met (3)
- [ ] The perpetrator is a student (4)
- [ ] The perpetrator is not a student (5)
- [ ] Alcohol or drugs are involved (6)
- [ ] Physical violence is involved (7)
- [ ] It happens at a dorm on campus (8)
- [ ] It happens at off-campus housing (9)
- [ ] It happens at a place like a bar (10)
- [ ] It happens somewhere else (11)

_____

- [ ] It happens during a party (12)

- [ ] It happens when no one else is around (13)
- [ ] It happens at night (14)
- [ ] It happens during the day (15)

Q13_Text Is there anything else you would like to add about what you think sexual violence usually looks like on [University]'s campus?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q14_Text What do you know of sexual violence prevention efforts on campus?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q14 Please mark all of the violence prevention programs you've participated in.

- [ ] EverFi (Mandatory online programming) (1)
- [ ] New student orientation- In person (2)
- [ ] New student orientation- Online (3)
- [ ] Get up, Stand up (4)
- [ ] BLUE (5)
- [ ] Hens Care (6)
- [ ] BASICS (7)
- [ ] Bringing in the Bystander (8)
- [ ] Freshman Year Seminar (Sexual Misconduct and Bystander Intervention Training) (9)
- [ ] Where Do You Stand? (10)
- [ ] Netflix and Chill- How do you ask for consent? (11)
- [ ] Why Doesn't She Just Leave? (12)
- [ ] Escalation Workshop (13)
- [ ] Other (14)

_____

Page Break

Text This section includes questions about sexual violence prevention and your opinions. It also asks some knowledge-based questions about [University] policy. Please answer to the best of your ability.

Q15 Choose the violence prevention program that stands out the most for you. Please describe what you can remember about your experience.

For example: How was material presented? What did you learn?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q16 Since starting at [University] have you...

	Yes (1)	No (2)	N/A (3)
I have intervened in a dangerous situation while on or near campus (1)	○	○	○
I have spoken up when a friend or peer told a sexist, homophobic, racist, or otherwise problematic joke. (2)	○	○	○
I have started thinking about campus sexual violence and/or sexual misconduct differently (3)	○	○	○

Q17 I feel confident about intervening in a potentially harmful situation.

- ○ Strongly agree (1)
- ○ Agree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Disagree (4)
- ○ Strongly disagree (5)

Q18 [University] students actively intervene to keep each other safe.

- Strongly agree (1)
- Agree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Disagree (4)
- Strongly disagree (5)

Q19 How would you characterize the following scenario?

Sam and Benjamin have been dating since sophomore year. Now seniors, Benjamin is getting more attention than ever from underclassmen and Sam has been getting more jealous. Recently Sam started looking through Benjamin's phone and constantly texts him to ask who he's with. When they spend time together in public, Sam always has his arm around Benjamin and gives nasty looks to anyone that gets close. Benjamin no longer feels like he can spend time with his friends or go out on his own without feeling bad. Benjamin has tried to bring up this behavior with Sam, but he makes Benjamin feel guilty.

- Sexual harassment (1)
- Sexual assault (2)
- Intimate partner violence (3)
- None of the above (4)
- I don't know (5)

Q20 How would you characterize the following scenario?

Chloe and Robert are hanging out at with friends at Robert's apartment when Chloe asks Robert to show her something in his bedroom. Once there, Chloe pushes Robert onto his bed and straddles him. Then, she starts kissing him. He tells her he thinks it's weird to make out when there are people around and turns his head away. Chloe laughs it off and continues kissing him anyway, saying guys are always up for messing around. Robert continues to resist but doesn't stop her, not wanting to make a big deal out of it since Chloe said he's supposed to want to be with her. Chloe doesn't stop until one of their other friends walks in and asks Robert something. He takes the opportunity to leave the room.

- ○ Sexual harassment (1)
- ○ Sexual assault (2)
- ○ Intimate partner violence (3)
- ○ None of the above (4)
- ○ I don't know (5)

Q21 Please mark whether the following statements are true or false regarding [University]'s sexual consent policy.

	True (1)	False (2)	I don't know (3)
Consent must be given by all parties involved during sexual activity (1)	○	○	○
Consent can be implied from silence or lack of resistance (2)	○	○	○
Consent once at the beginning of a sexual encounter is adequate for the rest of the sexual encounter (3)	○	○	○
The use of alcohol or drugs can limit a person's ability to give consent freely and clearly (4)	○	○	○
Two people who are dating can infer consent and do not need to actively get consent (5)	○	○	○

Page Break

Text In this section, you will be asked to read a couple of stories and mark where you feel consent has been communicated by the people involved. If you feel consent has not been communicated or if you would like to explain more about what you think happened in the story, there is space for you to do so below each story.

Q23 Please read the following story. Click to highlight the line(s) where you feel consent has been communicated.

Note: You may highlight a single line, multiple lines, or no lines if you do not believe this encounter is consensual. You may indicate whether Sydney, Jasmine, or both

communicated consent at any point in the story. You will have space to explain your reasoning in the following question.

	Sydney Communicated Consent (1)	Jasmine Communicated Consent (2)	Both Communicated Consent (3)
3: Sydney invites Jasmine out dancing at a bar. (542)			
4: While dancing, Sydney asks if she can kiss Jasmine. (547)			
5: Jasmine responds by kissing her. (549)			
6: They continue dancing, grinding each other and kissing. (429)			
7: After awhile Sydney invites Jasmine back to her dorm. (555)			
8: Jasmine agrees. (556)			
9: Once they get back to Sydney's apartment, (590)			
10: they lay together on the bed and continue kissing. (591)			
11: Eventually Sydney starts to take off Jasmine's pants. (584)			
12: Jasmine stops Sydney. (602)			
13: She says that she didn't want to do more than make out. (607)			
14: Sydney continues kissing Jasmine. (592)			

15:
Later Sydney tries to take off Jasmine's pa nts again. (601)

16: This time she doesn't stop her. (578)

17: Sydney performs oral sex on Jasmine. (583)

Q24
You may use this space to explain how you made your choice.

_____

Q25 Please read the following story. Click to highlight the line(s) where you feel consent has been communicated.

Note: You may highlight a single line, multiple lines, or no lines if you do not believe this encounter is consensual. You may indicate whether Daniel, Elizabeth, or both

communicated consent at any point in the story. You will have space to explain your reasoning in the following question.

	Daniel Communicated Consent (1)	Elizabeth Communicated Consent (2)	Both Communicated Consent (3)
3: Both are flirting with each other. (208) 4: Daniel offers to buy Elizabeth another drink and she accepts. (537) 5: Elizabeth laughs at something Daniel says and touches his hand. (534) 6: Daniel invites Elizabeth over to watch a movie at his apartment around the corner. (530) 7: She agrees. (320) 8: They walk to Daniel's apartment and he gets them each a beer. (531) 9: They start the movie sitting together on the couch with their legs touching. (401) 10: Daniel rests his hand on Elizabeth's leg and she smiles at him. (544) 11: A while later, Daniel leans in to kiss Elizabeth. (541) 12: They start making out. (355) 13: Daniel removes his shirt and then helps Elizabeth off with hers. (542)			

14:
He takes her by the hand and leads her to his roo m. (412)

15:
Once there, he helps her off with the rest of her cl othes and then takes off his. (547)

16:
Daniel grabs a condom from his nightstand and h ands it to Elizabeth. (515)

17: She puts it on him and they start having sex. (543)

Q26 You may use this space to explain how you made your choice.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q27 Please read the story again. This time, click to highlight the line(s) where you feel most of **your peers on campus** would say consent has been communicated.

Note: You may highlight a single line, multiple lines, or no lines if you do not believe this encounter is consensual. You may indicate whether Daniel, Elizabeth, or both

communicated consent at any point in the story. You will have space to explain your reasoning in the following question.

	Daniel Communicated Consent (1)	Elizabeth Communicated Consent (2)	Both Communicated Consent (3)
3: Both are flirting with each other. (208) 4: Daniel offers to buy Elizabeth another drink and she accepts. (537) 5: Elizabeth laughs at something Daniel says and touches his hand. (534) 6: Daniel invites Elizabeth over to watch a movie at his apartment around the corner. (530) 7: She agrees. (320) 8: They walk to Daniel's apartment and he gets them each a beer. (531) 9: They start the movie sitting together on the couch with their legs touching. (401) 10: Daniel rests his hand on (543) 11: Elizabeth's leg and she smiles at him. (441) 12: A while later, Daniel leans in to kiss Elizabeth. (542) 13: They start making out. (355) 14: Daniel removes his shirt and then helps Elizabeth off with hers. (541) 15: He takes her by the hand and leads her to his room. (412)			

16:
Once there, he helps her off with the rest of her cl
othes and then takes off his. (546)

17:
Daniel grabs a condom from his nightstand and h
ands it to Elizabeth. (515)

18: She puts it on him and they start having sex.
(540)

Q28 Please describe how you know you have been given consent in past sexual encounters or how you communicate consent.

Or, if you are not comfortable doing so or are not sexually active, please describe how you think consent is communicated.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Text In this last section, please share your thoughts and opinions about sexual violence prevention on campus.

Q29 Which violence prevention efforts do you feel have been successful on campus? (Mark all that apply.)

- [ ] Mandatory online modules (1)
- [ ] Freshman Year Experience (Sexual Misconduct and Bystander Intervention trainings) (2)
- [ ] Classroom Presentations (3)
- [ ] BASICS (4)
- [ ] BLUE (5)
- [ ] Bystander Intervention Training (6)
- [ ] Residence Advisor Presentations (7)
- [ ] Blue lights (8)
- [ ] Locking certain doors on campus (9)
- [ ] UDPD's walking escort service (10)
- [ ] Evening shuttle service (11)
- [ ] LiveSafe App (12)

☐ Other (13)

_____

☐ None (15)

Q30 Feel free to use this box to explain more about successful violence prevention efforts on campus. Why or why not do you think they have been successful?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q31 How do you feel violence prevention efforts could improve on campus?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Text Please click to the next page to enter the raffle and view campus resources.

Page Break

Q32 Thank you for participating in this survey! Would you like to enter the raffle for a 1 in 40 chance to win a $100 Amazon e-gift card?

If you select yes, you will be redirected to a separate survey where you will be able to enter your contact information.

- ○ Yes, I would like to enter the raffle (1)
- ○ No - I would like to opt out (2)