

Preliminary Evaluation of the 'Playing the Game' Sexual Assault Prevention Theatre Program

W. Gregory Thatcher, MSPH, PhD ¹

Author¹ is affiliated with California State University, Fresno. **Contact author:** W. Gregory Thatcher, California State University, Fresno, 2345 East Ramon Ave M/S MH 30, Fresno, CA 93740; Phone: 559-278-8807; Fax: 559-278-4179; Email: gthatcher@csufresno.edu

Submitted March 17, 2011; Revised and Accepted October 3, 2011

Abstract

Purpose: To compare the effectiveness of a one-time sexual assault prevention theatre performance against a similar content video performance and a non-intervention control group.

Methods: Using the College Date Rape Attitudes and Behaviors Survey, four-hundred ninety-seven students provided matched pairs data for analysis.

Results: At a three-month follow-up when compared to students in other groups, those participating in the theatre program had limited, but noticeable attitude changes and one significant behavior change. Specifically, participants in the theatre group changed their attitudes on women provoking rape, 'no' meaning 'no' and stopping activity when consent is not stated.

Discussion: Educational content/dialogue must be very specific when addressing individual topics on attitudes people hold on the subject of sexual assault. Theatrical performances may be effective programming to reduce sexual assaults on college campuses.

Key words: Sexual Assault Prevention, Theatre, Effectiveness Evaluation

Introduction

National studies estimated 18-25% of all women have been raped during their lifetime and that 12-20% of college women have been raped during their college years.¹⁻⁴ Of these women, more than 80% knew their rapist with 62% reporting being raped by a current or former partner or boyfriend and 21% being raped by an acquaintance.² Fewer than five percent of college women and men who are victims of rape or attempted rape reported it to the police, making rape one of the most (if not the most) underreported violent crimes in the United States.³ While approximately two-thirds of the victims tell someone such as a friend (but usually not a family member or college official), fears associated with the act of coming forward (e.g., further emotional trauma or having to relive the experience during the legal process) often ensures the perpetrator will not be caught and the victim will not receive the necessary assistance. Further, this lack of reporting and the often detrimental psychological effect on the student's life frequently go unnoticed by college personnel and the extent of the true problem is therefore masked in secrecy.

One major challenge to accurate prevalence rates of the problem and for determining the best programming for the population is the differences in defining rape.^{3,5} Often, acquaintance rape victims do not label the assault as rape and therefore fall into a sense of denial the act really took place. Others tend to place the blame on themselves for the occurrence, believing an acquaintance is not capable of such an act or that their behaviors somehow lead the individual on.³ Additionally, victims of acquaintance rape frequently cite a myriad of reasons for not reporting the assault to the police (e.g., embarrassment and shame, fear of publicity, reprisal from the assailant, social isolation from the assailant's friends, self-blame for drinking or using drugs before the rape, and mistrust of the campus judicial system).⁶

Since the early 1990's, when mandated sexual assault prevention programming was initiated,⁷ many colleges and universities have instituted sexual assault prevention education programs. Key components of these programs have centered on educating males and females on the dangers and inaccuracies of rape myths, empathy induction techniques, risky dating and rape awareness behaviors, communication patterns expressing both intentions and expectations, and incidence and

prevalence rates of the problem.⁸⁻¹³ These programs are often implemented using a variety of techniques such as videos, interactive skits, role-playing, theatre, rape survivor stories, as well as basic lecture format.¹⁴ A major concern however, has been that these varied components and formats for presentation often make it difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of such programming and findings are often further confounded because of low sample sizes, short-term follow-up periods, lack of adequate experimental designs that include control subjects, and the use of inaccurate or inappropriate measures.⁹⁻¹¹

Some argued that programming is not useful or effective as a primary prevention tool because they are typically not designed to prevent the first incident of sexual assault perpetration.¹⁵ They contended that initial sexual experiences are often forced encounters usually taking place at a much younger age and therefore some women may already have experience with sexual assault, precluding any programming on the topic being effective.¹⁵ Further, a meta-analytic examination of program effectiveness noted changes are not generally recognized for rape empathy or rape awareness behaviors, but are recognized for rape attitudes, rape knowledge, and behavioral intent.¹¹ Most of the programs reviewed were held with mixed-gender formats, although the largest effect sizes were noted in the all-female programs. Perhaps it is simply that researchers are not addressing the right population with the right components or perhaps the problem is so pervasive and ingrained that no programming will ultimately have the effect everyone wishes and the problem is here to stay.

This analysis provides results of evaluation of effectiveness on a one-time sexual assault prevention theatre program conducted at a mid-sized university on the west coast. Using two methodologically similar programs in two different forms of presentation media (i.e., theatre and pre-recorded video presentation), groups of students were asked to participate in "an honest, constructive, and balanced approach to two of the problems integral to date rape, alcohol abuse and inability to communicate effectively about sex."¹⁶ The components of the program and the evaluation measures used were designed to improve programming at the collegiate level.

Method

Permission was obtained from the producer of the pre-recorded video presentation '*Playing the Game*

2'¹⁷ and it was adapted to a live theatrical performance and subsequently presented in February, 2010. Similar to the protocol assigned to presenting the video, a post-theatrical performance educational discussion was held with participants to clarify the intent and reinforce the message(s) of the presentation. All procedures used were approved by the California State University, Fresno Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects. The program was evaluated using a pre-post assessment design with a comparison group and 3-month follow-up.

Student Recruitment

Program participants were recruited in two ways. First, faculty involved with the campus Alcohol Safety Council were requested to mention the project at their respective college faculty meetings to elicit interest in participation from faculty convening classes in the spring 2010 semester. Twenty-eight classes were identified through this process. These classes were randomly divided into one of three groups (i.e., theatre, video and control). The selection process yielded ten theatre classes (n=315 students), nine video group classes (n=217 students), and nine control group classes (n=296 students). The classes chosen for the control group were offered the opportunity to receive the video-taped presentation after the 3-month follow-up.

Second, participants were recruited for the theatre event by contacting three main sources of on-campus student life: athletics, Greeks, and on-campus housing. Each of these groups require educational events be made available each semester and this health-risk prevention event was determined appropriate and subsequently added to the roster of acceptable presentations open for students to attend. Two weeks prior to the event, flyers were posted in each on-campus dormitory and Greek residences. Athletes were sent an email from the assistant athletic director that was developed by the principal investigator introducing the event and encouraging attendance. In each format for student recruitment, it was stressed that participation was voluntary. Prior to participation in the pretest research questionnaire, students were provided a detailed description of the survey and program they were to be involved. Each student was required to sign a consent form for participation in the program.

Participation

Immediately prior to attending one of three theatrical performances (i.e., 11:00 am, 6:00 pm and 7:30 pm), a total of 461 students from ten classes, athletics, Greek, and on-campus housing were asked to complete a 36-item questionnaire. Of those, 433 students (93.9%) completed usable questionnaires. The remaining 28 students either declined participation in the survey or submitted a questionnaire that contained more than five missing data points and were not included in the analysis. Of the 433 participants providing useable questionnaires, 273 (63.1%) were female and 160 (37.0%) were male.

Participating faculty holding control group classes were asked to make time for surveys to be completed in their classrooms during the same week as the theatrical performances. Each of the nine faculty holding control group classes were able to accommodate this schedule and were surveyed during the second week of February, 2010. Of the 296 students enrolled in the control group courses, 271 (91.6%) provided useable questionnaires. The remaining 25 students were either absent, declined participation, or submitted a questionnaire that contained more than five missing data points and were not included in the analysis. Of the 271 participants providing useable questionnaires, 154 (57.3%) were female and 115 (42.8%) were male.

Similarly, each of the nine faculty holding video group classes scheduled the presentation and surveys during the second week of February, 2010. Of the 217 students enrolled in the video group courses, 164 (75.6%) provided useable questionnaires. One video group course with an enrollment of 32 students was informed by their instructor that the event was not mandatory and she would not be in attendance the day of the presentation. As a result, only eight students were in attendance the day of the presentation. Data for these eight students were included in the analysis. The remaining 29 students were either absent, declined participation, or submitted a questionnaire that contained more than five missing data points and were not included in the analysis. Of the 164 participants providing useable questionnaires, 84 (51.2%) were female and 80 (48.8%) were male. In total, 868 students participated in the pre-test survey.

Nine weeks after the initial presentations, students were asked to complete the questionnaire a second time to determine if attitude or behavioral changes

could be determined. Surveying of the video and control groups held the same protocol used at pretest. Surveying of the theatre groups were completed using in-class surveying for the ten pre-determined classes, organized house visits during each participating Greek chapters weekly meeting, a pre-determined post-test survey date for participating athletes was completed at the university library, and organized dormitory visits for each on-campus housing group. Of the original 433 participants in the theatre group, 195 (45.0%) provided useable post-test data. Of the original 271 participants in the control group, 212 (78.2%) provided useable post-test data. Of the original 164 participants in the video group, 90 (54.9%) provided useable post-test data. Overall, 497 (57.3%) students participated in the post-test survey and constitute the matched-pairs being used for analysis. Table 1 contains a breakdown of the participants by selected demographic variables.

Intervention Activities

For three units of course credit, four female and four male undergraduate peer education students completed a 30-hour training on sexual assault and date rape prevention and intervention. Additionally, these students were trained by a professional theatre director to not only act the 15-minute 'Playing the Game' event, but to stay in character during the 45-minute post-performance dialogue. This was done for the purpose of providing the audience the opportunity to gain insight into the mindset of the character portrayal and subsequently be given the opportunity to discuss the myths and misperceptions associated with that mindset. These same eight students assisted with the facilitated dialogue in the video performance groups.

In order to reinforce the messages of both the theatre and video performances, several themes were discussed post-performance. It was determined that each theatre and video group would have a scripted list of topics to discuss. However, due to the open-ended question format of each presentation, how in-depth each topic was covered was too difficult to measure. Therefore, the authors made note that the following topics were addressed in at least a minimal dialogue for each presentation:

Topic 1: Misinterpretation of both verbal and non-verbal communication.

Facilitators discussed 1) the differences between male and female perspectives on verbally stated intent of behavior (e.g., agreeing to accompany

someone to their room); 2) petting behaviors and the need to set verbal limits; 3) the differences between male and female perspectives on flirty behavior and manner of dress; and 4) the requirements of consent.

Topic 2: Alcohol use and abuse.

Facilitators reinforced that 1) based on state law, alcohol use prohibits actual consent for sexual activity; and 2) alcohol use enhances the difficulty in accurately assessing situations and understanding verbal and non-verbal cues.

Topic 3: What keeps most females and/or males from recognizing such encounters as rape?

Facilitators reinforced 1) that rape can take place between dating partners or two people who know each other; 2) that even when minimal violence is involved such an encounter can still be considered as rape; and 3) that different perceptions and communication patterns by each individual is often the determining factor in the escalation of the event leading to rape.

Topic 4: Ways to decrease the risk of being a victim.

Facilitators discussed 1) setting sexual limits; 2) communicate those sexual limits clearly and candidly to any person you engage in sexual activity with; 3) staying sober; 4) remain in control by never being caught without money or transportation; 5) safe handling of drinks when at a party; and 6) being assertive by saying "no," meaning it, and indicating what they would be prepared to follow through with if the person refuses to accept no as an answer (e.g., "If you rape me, Chris, I'll have you arrested.")

Measures

Researchers measured the attitudes and behaviors of participants using the College Date Rape Attitudes and Behaviors Survey (Appendix 1).¹⁸ This 27-item scale was developed specifically to evaluate the effectiveness of date rape programming and has demonstrated high internal consistency for attitudes (Cronbach's $\alpha = .86$) and moderate for behaviors ($\alpha = .67$), test-retest reliability (attitudes $r = .94$, behaviors $r = .89$) and construct validity.¹⁸ In addition to typical demographic questions, additional demographic questions for this survey included being a member of an athletic team or Greek organization, whether or not they have attended other sexual assault programming in the past two years and if they had been sexually assaulted and/or raped. For the purpose

of this study, researchers defined sexual assault as any act of violence, either physical or verbal, in which sex is used as a weapon and defined rape as any non-consensual sexual intercourse that is forced upon a person. Both reflect the State of California's recognized definitions.

Items for attitude change are based on 5-point Likert scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. In the survey, items 1, 9 and 10 reflect attitudes that would be considered desirable in our society and therefore a positive trend would be expected when determining program effectiveness. The remaining items (2-8, 11-20) reflect attitudes that would not be considered desirable in our society and therefore a negative trend would be expected when determining program effectiveness.

Items for behavior change are based on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from (1) always to (5) never. In the survey, items 21 and 27 reflect behaviors that would be considered desirable in our society and therefore a negative trend would be expected when determining program effectiveness. The remaining items (22-26) reflect behaviors that would not be considered desirable in our society and therefore a positive trend would be expected when determining program effectiveness.

Statistical Analysis

Demographic characteristics were compared between the control, video and theatre groups to assess for baseline differences (Table 1). Program impact on attitude and behavior variables were compared using chi-square and one-way analysis of variance procedures. These procedures were used to assess between-group differences over time. The criterion for statistical significance was set at $p < .05$. All statistical tests were performed using SAS, version 9.1.

Results

Demographic characteristics of program participants are presented in Table 1. The control and both intervention groups were similar in gender, although men were underrepresented in the sample as a whole (59.2% female, 40.8% male). This is nearly identical when reviewing the gender composition of the University's population (59.1% female, 40.9% male).¹⁹ Ethnicity and being a member of an athletic team or Greek organization were also found to be similar across each group. Overall, 89 participants (17.9%) reported having been victims of sexual

assault and 21 (4.2%) reported having been victims of rape. Significant differences were noted between the theatre and control groups for sexual assault (20.5% vs. 15.1%, $F = 4.00$, $df = 2$, $p = .0191$) and having been raped (5.6% vs. 1.9%, $F = 3.87$, $df = 2$, $p = .0217$).

Attitude Changes:

With respect to differences of mean attitude change among the three groups, only five variables were found to be significant (Table 2). When identifying changes considered to be more socially appropriate, theatre group participants (mean change +0.06) significantly changed their attitude toward the variable "I believe that alcohol and other drugs affect my sexual decision making" ($F = 4.54$, $df = 2$, $p = .0141$). Video group participants (mean change -0.01) and control group participants (mean change -0.02) both demonstrated a regressed attitude toward how alcohol affects their sexual decision making.

When identifying changes to attitudes considered to be less socially appropriate, theatre group participants mean attitude change (-0.03) for recognizing that when a woman says 'no' to sex she actually means 'no' was significantly different when compared to the video (0.04) and control (0.07) groups ($F = 2.59$, $df = 2$, $p = .0495$). Further, both the theatre (-0.05) and video

(-0.04) groups demonstrated significant attitude change when compared to the control group (0.10) for understanding that women do not provoke rape by their behavior ($F = 6.29$, $df = 2$, $p = .0020$).

Compared to the video (0.04) and control (0.02) groups, theatre group participants (-0.05) changed their attitude toward the variable "In most cases, when a woman was raped, she was asking for it" ($F = 5.84$, $df = 2$, $p = .0032$). Finally, when comparing the control group (0.01) to the theatre (-0.10) and video (-0.04) groups, a significant difference was noted for the attitude variable "When a woman fondles a man's genitals it means she has consented to sexual intercourse" ($F = 3.37$, $df = 2$, $p = .0355$).

Behavior Changes:

Table 3 reports the changes in behavior between the three groups for each of the seven variables associated with sexual assault. Only one behavioral statement, "I stop the first time my date says "no" to sexual activity" was found to be significantly different between the groups. Specifically, control

group participants (0.04) reported worsening their behavior when compared to participants in the theatre (-0.02) and video (-0.03) groups ($F = 3.13$, $df = 2$, $p = .0450$).

Discussion

This study was conducted to provide preliminary evaluation of a live theatrical performance by comparing to a similar content video presentation and a non-intervention control. Specifically, this study examined if there were changes in attitudes and/or behaviors related to rape and sexual assault after live theatrical performance.

In the present study, 17.9% of participants reported having been victims of sexual assault and 4.2% reported having been victims of completed rape. These rates are much less than rates reported by previous studies.¹⁻⁴ Due to the self-report nature of the survey used, it is difficult to determine if these rates are accurate or reflect biases that would hinder the analysis of the program's effectiveness. However, two control group, two video group and eight theatre group participants changed their reporting during the three month follow-up period may provide further strength of this study. The changes from pretest to posttest suggest one of two possibilities: 1) more participants in the theatre group were sexually assaulted and/or raped during the 3 month follow-up period; or 2) the program elicited a change in the participants making it more comfortable for them to be open about a previous assault. Regardless of which possible explanation, future research to examine the reason for this difference is needed.

Further, five groups of participants (two video and three theatre groups) changed their reporting of being sexually assaulted at pretest to being raped at posttest. Baring the chance the participants were raped during the three-month follow-up period, this suggests the program had a beneficial effect in assisting participants in defining for themselves what occurred. The work of Fischer and colleagues³ and Rozee and Koss⁵ have both written on the difficulties among acquaintance rape victims not labeling the assault as rape. These changes in the post-performance reporting may therefore be an important aspect further study. If participants felt more comfortable in defining and divulging their previous assaults, a program of this nature may be indicated as a useful tool for victims in the recovery process.

The present study identified statistically significant change on only five attitude variables and one

behavior variable. It is encouraging however that those variables identified as significant were the central themes of the presentation. This suggests that while the topics of sexual assault and rape are very difficult to discuss effectively in a one-time event, presenting a highly focused message and the use of more robust follow-up dialogue could create significant change. Future programming would be benefitted by determining if it is possible to isolate or tailor the presentation to certain populations most accepting of specific themes. For example, determining if a gender-specific or age-specific audience is more readily accepting of the information when compared to mixed-gender or varied aged groups. Moreover, in order to potentially improve program fidelity, addressing the cultural or diversity issues that may be present in target populations would also be important.

Further, when compared to a similar content video presentation and a non-intervention control group, interactive theatre was determined to be more effective in producing attitude change. This finding is consistent with previous research and indicates a live theatrical performance may offer improved program effectiveness.¹⁴ However, the short term follow-up for this investigation must be taken into account. It cannot be determined if significant changes will maintain effect over longer periods of time. Future research determining the effectiveness of the program and other sexual assault prevention programs should attempt to utilize longer follow-up periods.

Limitations

There are a number of sampling limitations to this investigation. First, this was more a convenience sample even it was attempted to be a randomly selected classes into the three experimental or control groups initially. It was not possible to determine if those participants were in fact representative of the larger student body. Second, the recruiting of classes to participate in the program was completed by word of mouth from representatives of a campus committee (Alcohol Safety Council – Faculty Sub-Committee). While each college on campus has a representative on the committee and each college had classes participate in the program, it was not able to determine to what extent each college was ultimately represented.

While the gender and ethnic makeup of the participants was consistent with that of the University as a whole, the study did not provide the opportunity for the sample to be selected other than that of

convenience. Further, because the sample of participants was a college population, generalizability with community sample may be limited.

Another point that should be kept in mind when interpreting the results of this study is that data were obtained through self-report instruments. The instrument contained sensitive questions that may have been awkward or uncomfortable for the participant to answer and the use of Likert scales are vulnerable to several types of bias. With content matter centering on an emotionally difficult topic, respondents may have wanted to avoid using extreme response categories (central tendency bias) or try to portray themselves in a more favorable light than their actual attitudes or behavior would indicate (social desirability bias). Lastly, accurately measuring how one defines sexual assault or rape as well as measuring the capacity to divulge such information has always been a recognized challenge for researchers.

While efforts were taken to minimize or reduce the likelihood of these limitations, future investigators are encouraged to continue to improve the measures used for evaluating this type of sensitive programming.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Dr. Robin Sawyer for permitting the use of the video 'Playing the Game 2' and Dr. J. Wanzer Drane for contributions to the statistical analysis.

References

- Kilpatrick DG, Resnick HS, Ruggiero KJ, et al. Drug-facilitated, incapacitated, and forcible rape: A national study. Final report. Available at: <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/219181.pdf>. Accessed October 29, 2010.
- Tjaden P, Thoennes N. Extent, nature, and consequences of rape victimization: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey. Available at: <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/210346.pdf>. Accessed October 29, 2010.
- Fischer B, Cullen F, Turner M. The sexual victimization of college women: findings from two national-level surveys. Washington DC: National Institute of Justice and Bureau of Justice Statistics. 2000.
- Gros AM, Winslett A, Roberts M, et al. An examination of sexual violence against college women. *Violence Against Women*. 2006;12:288-300.
- Rozee PD, Koss MP. Rape: A century of resistance. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 2001 29:295-311.
- Bohmer C, Parrot A. *Sexual Assault on Campus: The Problem and the Solution*. New York: Lexington Books, 1993.
- National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. *Complying with the final regulations: the student right to know and campus security act*. Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. August, 1994.
- Berg DR, Lonsway KA, Fitzgerald LF. Rape prevention education for men: the effectiveness of empathy-induction techniques. *Journal of College Student Development*. 1999;40(3):219-234.
- Breitenbecher KH. Sexual assault on college campuses: is an ounce of prevention enough? *Applied & Preventive Psychology*. 2000;9:23-52.
- Rothman E, Silverman J. The effect of a college sexual assault prevention program on first-year students' victimization rates. *Journal of American College Health*. 2007;55(5):283-290.
- Anderson LA, Whiston SC. Sexual assault education programs: A meta-analytic examination of their effectiveness. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 2005;29:374-388.
- Heppner MJ, Neville HA, Smith K, et al. Examining Immediate and Long-Term Efficacy of Rape Prevention Programming With Racially Diverse College Men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 1999;46:16-26.
- Morrison S, Hardison J, Mathew A, et al. *An evidence-based review of sexual assault*

- preventive intervention programs.*
Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice (NCJ #207262); 2004.
14. Heppner MJ, Humphrey CF, Hillenbrand-Gunn TL, et al. The Differential Effects of Rape Prevention Programming on Attitudes, Behavior, and Knowledge. *Journal of Counseling Psychology.* 1995;42(4):508-518.
 15. Hickman LJ, Jaycox LH, Aronoff J. Dating violence among adolescents: Prevalence, gender distribution, and prevention program effectiveness. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse.* 2004;5(2):123-142.
 16. Sawyer R. *Playing the Game 2: Facilitator's Guide.* Healthvisions Media. 2007.
 17. Nelson M, Suchman S. *Playing the Game 2.* United States: Healthvisions Media. 2007.
 18. Lanier CA, Elliot MN. A New Instrument for the Evaluation of a Date Rape Prevention Program. *Journal of College Student Development.* 1997;38(6):673-676.
 19. California State University Fresno: Institutional Research, Assessment and Planning. Available at: <http://csufresno.edu/irap/data/documents/Fal10910/Demographics/01.pdf>. Accessed February 8, 2011.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Program Participants

	<u>Control</u>		<u>Video</u>		<u>Theatre</u>	
	<i>(n = 212)</i>		<i>(n = 90)</i>		<i>(n = 195)</i>	
Gender	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Female	121	57.1	51	56.7	122	62.6
Male	91	42.9	39	43.3	73	37.4
Race						
Asian	39	18.6	19	21.1	45	23.1
Black	19	9.1	5	5.6	10	5.1
Hispanic	73	34.8	38	42.2	58	29.7
White	65	31.0	21	23.3	64	32.8
Other	16	7.5	7	7.8	18	9.2
Activities						
Athlete	18	8.5	6	6.7	12	6.1
Greek	23	10.9	8	8.9	31	15.9
Victimization						
Sex Assaulted ^a	32	15.1	17	18.9	40	20.5
Raped ^b	4	1.9	6	6.7	11	5.6

^a Significant difference between control and theatre group (F 4.00, df = 2, $p=.0191$)

^b Significant difference between control and theatre group (F 3.87, df = 2, $p=.0217$)

Table 2: Difference in Mean Attitude Change among Study Participants (ANOVA)

	Theatre (<i>n</i> = 195) Mean Chng (SD)	Video (<i>n</i> = 90) Mean Chng (SD)	Control (<i>n</i> = 212) Mean Chng (SD)	F	df	<i>p</i>
Share Expsns	0.00 (0.36)	0.00 (0.38)	0.01 (0.32)	0.54	2	.6456
Dstry Rmnce	0.01 (0.38)	0.00 (0.38)	0.01 (0.32)	0.03	2	.9657
Submissive	0.01 (0.36)	0.06 (0.34)	0.00 (0.33)	0.68	2	.5069
Dress Sexy	0.00 (0.36)	-0.01 (0.32)	0.05 (0.29)	1.32	2	.2685
Ask Date	0.00 (0.11)	0.03 (0.24)	0.03 (0.20)	1.25	2	.2866
Promiscuous	-0.01 (0.36)	0.00 (0.29)	0.05 (0.37)	1.56	2	.2109
Change Mind	0.03 (0.22)	0.01 (0.21)	0.00 (0.22)	0.55	2	.5786
Appear Easy	0.06 (0.45)	0.06 (0.48)	0.08 (0.46)	0.07	2	.9323
Control Arouse	0.05 (0.58)	0.02 (0.56)	0.01 (0.44)	0.16	2	.8508
Alc Dec Make	0.06 (0.68)	-0.01 (0.52)	-0.02 (0.56)	4.54	2	.0141*
Resistance	0.06 (0.55)	0.10 (0.51)	0.04 (0.53)	0.35	2	.7014
No=Maybe	-0.03 (0.32)	0.04 (0.52)	0.07 (0.35)	2.59	2	.0495*
Dinner=Sex	0.00 (0.00)	0.01 (0.12)	-0.01 (0.08)	1.98	2	.1392
Provoke Rape	-0.05 (0.47)	-0.04 (0.40)	0.10 (0.38)	6.29	2	.0020**
Lie Rape	0.01 (0.32)	-0.01 (0.32)	0.02 (0.30)	0.27	2	.7607
Force Alc	0.00 (0.16)	0.01 (0.21)	-0.01 (0.14)	0.39	2	.6752
Expect Sex	0.13 (0.47)	0.12 (0.38)	0.09 (0.36)	0.51	2	.6012
Motivate Desir	0.02 (0.21)	0.01 (0.21)	0.00 (0.22)	0.78	2	.5996
Ask for Rape	-0.05 (0.22)	0.04 (0.32)	0.02 (0.17)	5.84	2	.0032*
Fondle Genitals	-0.10 (0.40)	-0.04 (0.43)	0.01 (0.38)	3.37	2	.0355**

* Significant difference between control and theatre group were noted at $p < .05$.

** Significant difference between control and both intervention groups were noted at $p < .05$.

(Note: items 1, 9 and 10 reflect attitudes that would be considered desirable in our society and therefore a positive trend would be expected when determining program effectiveness. The remaining items (2-8, 11-20) reflect attitudes that would not be considered desirable in our society and therefore a negative trend would be expected when determining program effectiveness.)

Table 3: Difference in Mean Behavior Change among Study Participants (ANOVA)

	Theatre (<i>n</i> = 195) Mean Chng (SD)	Video (<i>n</i> = 90) Mean Chng (SD)	Control (<i>n</i> = 212) Mean Chng (SD)	F	df	<i>p</i>
Stop at 'No'	-0.02 (0.14)	-0.03 (0.24)	0.04 (0.24)	3.13	2	.0450**
Intox Sex	0.01 (0.30)	-0.02 (0.50)	-0.03 (0.26)	1.27	2	.2824
Partner Intox	0.04 (0.26)	0.01 (0.21)	0.00 (0.22)	0.98	2	.6126
Try Touch	-0.03 (0.50)	0.01 (0.52)	0.05 (0.40)	1.21	2	.0985
Won't Stop	0.03 (0.42)	0.07 (0.39)	-0.01 (0.44)	2.07	2	.0511
Parked Car	0.02 (0.28)	0.01 (0.20)	0.02 (0.12)	1.23	2	.3996
Sexist Comnt	0.03 (0.31)	0.03 (0.21)	0.01 (0.16)	1.06	2	.4901

** Significant difference between control and both intervention groups were noted at $p < .05$.

(Note: items 21 and 27 reflect behaviors that would be considered desirable in our society and therefore a negative trend would be expected when determining program effectiveness. The remaining items (22-26) reflect behaviors that would not be considered desirable in our society and therefore a positive trend would be expected when determining program effectiveness.)

Appendix 1:

College Date Rape Attitudes and Behaviors Survey (Lanier, 1997)

Attitudes

(1) Strongly Disagree (2) Disagree (3) Neutral (4) Agree (5) Strongly Agree

1. Males and females should share the expense of a date
2. I believe that talking about sex destroys the romance of the particular moment.
3. Most women enjoy being submissive in sexual relations.
4. If a woman dresses sexy she is asking for sex.
5. If a woman asks a man out on a date then she is definitely interested in having sex.
6. In the majority of date rapes, the victim is promiscuous or has a bad reputation.
7. A man is entitled to intercourse if his partner had agreed to it but at the last moment changed her mind.
8. Many women pretend they don't want to have sex because they don't want to appear "easy."
9. A man can control his behavior no matter how sexually aroused he feels.
10. I believe that alcohol and other drugs affect my sexual decision making.
11. The degree of a woman's resistance should be a major factor in determining if a rape has occurred.
12. When a woman says "no" to sex what she really means is "maybe."
13. If a woman lets a man to buy her dinner or pays for a movie or drinks, she owes him sex.
14. Women provoke rape by their behavior.
15. Women often lie about being raped to get back at their dates.
16. It is okay to pressure a date to drink alcohol in order to improve one's chances of getting one's date to have sex.
17. When a woman asks her date back to her place, I expect that something sexual will take place.

18. Date rapists are usually motivated by overwhelming, unfulfilled sexual desire.
19. In most cases, when a woman was raped, she was asking for it.
20. When a woman fondles a man’s genitals it means she has consented to sexual intercourse.

Behaviors

(1) Always (2) Most of the time (3) Sometimes (4) Rarely (5) Never

21. I stop the first time my date says “no” to sexual activity.
22. I have sex when I am intoxicated.
23. I have sex when my partner is intoxicated.
24. When I want to touch someone sexually I try it and see how they react.
25. I won’t stop sexual activity when asked to if I am already sexually aroused.
26. I make out in remotely parked cars.
27. When I hear a sexist comment I indicate my displeasure.