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The curriculum for the SHAPE program at the United States Naval Academy was written and in accordance with the contractual terms made with and will be copyrighted by three independent consultants hired by the United States Naval Academy: Gail Stern, Christopher Kilmartin, and John Foubert. This manual was written with the intention of providing a document for USNA faculty and staff who were hired to take over the consultant’s responsibilities for program development and training. We will discuss philosophical issues undergirding the choices we made in writing the program sessions and in conducting the training for peer educators. By providing this information, we hope to put USNA faculty and staff in the best position possible to keep the SHAPE program sustainable and work to make it an integral part of the culture of the Academy.

The SHAPE curriculum reflects the many conversations we had with faculty, staff, and students, considering the most credible research and reliable theories to inform each session, countless hours of drafting and redrafting, getting feedback from midshipmen on how things worked and redrafting as needed. We also sought to capture the complexity of the USNA environment, infusing our material with concepts and language consistent with that of the courses in character and ethics and the experience of midshipmen on and off the yard.

Principles of Developmental Instruction

Based on Perry’s theory of cognitive development, Knefelkamp (1981) identified four developmental instruction variables that, when taken to account during the design of an educational intervention, maximize the chances of a productive learning experience. These variables are structure, diversity, experiential learning, and personalism. In the learning context, Knefelkamp defined structure as the “amount of framework and direction” provided to learners. Structure can vary from low to high. Less mature learners (most plebes) tend to benefit from high structure; the same can stifle more mature learners (most First Class students). Some strategies to provide structure include outlining basic definitions used in the course or training exercise, providing learners with the opportunity to try out tasks prior to being evaluated, providing detailed instructions, using examples that relate to a student’s direct life experience, and allowing time for learners to talk through and summarize what they learned.

Diversity refers to the number and complexity of points of view brought out during the learning experience. Diversity is highest when there is a large volume of complex material, and lowest when there are a few simple bits of information. Naturally, the more mature the learner, the more diversity he or she can handle. Diversity can be provided by providing disparate points of view, different types of assignments, and variability in modes of learning.

Experiential Learning refers to a continuum reflecting the degree to which learners are either directly and concretely involved in a learning activity or are processing material in a more vicarious fashion. Though all learners gain from experiential learning, less mature learners have a stronger need for it in order to solidify their learning. More mature learners have a greater degree of skill in translating vicarious learning activities to real world problems.
Opportunities for experiential learning can be provided by discussing cases with students, giving learners the opportunity to rehearse skills, simulated learning experiences, interviews with experienced others, team projects, collecting data for a research project, and journal assignments where students write about and reflect upon experiences. All of these methods help students solidify their learning – these experiences are particularly important to the learning process of less mature learners.

Knefelkamp’s final developmental instruction variable is *personalism*. She notes that impersonal environments do not promote development. This variable, therefore, ranges from moderate to high. Personalism refers to the degree, depth, and openness that take place during classroom interaction. High personalism would consist of a greater degree of risk-taking, community, objective discussion, and listening to one another’s points of view. Personalism can be encouraged through class discussion, instructor availability, feedback on assignments that is thorough and developmental, and an enthusiastic learning atmosphere.

**Experiential Learning Theory**

Kolb (1981) posited a theory of learning emphasizing a four stage cycle where each step sets the stage for the one that follows. Kolb postulated that learning takes place in a cycle that moves from concrete experience (CE), a feeling dimension, reflective observation (RO), a watching dimension, abstract conceptualization (AC), a thinking dimension, and active experimentation (AE), a doing dimension. Concrete experience forms the basis of observation and reflection. These observations are in turn used to develop one’s ideas, including generalizations and personal theories. From this development of ideas, new implications for action can be discerned by the individual. To be effective, learners need the abilities represented by each of these four components of the learning cycle. They need to be able to involve themselves fully and without bias in learning experiences (CE), observe and reflect on these experiences from multiple perspectives (RO), formulate concepts that integrate their observations into theories (AC), and put such theories to use in making decisions and solving problems (AE).

**Moral Development Theory**

Kohlberg was one of the first to articulate a moral development theory (Evans, Forney & Guido-Dibrito, 1999). Smith (1978) noted that two themes inherent in Kohlberg’s six stage theory of moral judgment were "empathy or role taking and the concept of justice" (Smith, 1978, p. 56). She reported that moral conflicts are precluded when one is unable to conceptualize situations from another person’s perspective. One possibility for the level of moral development of someone who victimizes another person would be that he or she is operating from Kohlberg’s preconventional level of moral judgment, a level characterized by interpreting cultural rules, primarily with regard to personal physical or hedonistic consequences of action. The physical power of those who make the rules in large part determines whether the preconventional person will abide by them.

A man at the preconventional level who chooses to rape or sexually harass another person may be considering only himself, determine that his chances of being punished are low, and not concern himself with the power or status of a woman he abuses to either retaliate or do
anything about his oppressive behavior. Kohlberg's second level of moral development, the conventional level, focuses on conformity and loyalty to a personally justified social order. Actions consistent with familial, group, or national expectations are valued over personal consequences (Smith, 1978). Although rape and harassment are criminal actions, conventional men may seek legitimacy from their personal reference groups to justify their behavior. From this perspective, one could argue that if prevention efforts succeed in leading society to no longer legitimize rape and harassment, men functioning at the conventional moral level would be less likely to force women to have sex against their will and/or to force unwanted sexual attention on them in the workplace.

**Psychosocial Theories**

Chickering and Reisser (1993) formulated a psychosocial developmental theory centered on seven developmental vectors specifying several components of development for the whole college student. Three of their vectors have particular relevance to the study of sexual assault and harassment: developing competence, managing emotions, and developing mature interpersonal relationships. One kind of competence a student must develop is interpersonal competence, which involves, among other things, the skills of effective communication and appropriate responses to other people. In the most common cases of sexual assault and harassment, men do not consider women's lack of consent for sexual relations or attention. One explanation for this lack of consideration may be that the man has not fully developed the interpersonal ability to appropriately respond to women's wishes not to engage in sexual behavior.

The management of emotions is another vector with apparent applications to sexual assault and harassment. Chickering & Reisser (1993) argue that the task in this vector is for students to learn acceptable methods of coping with feelings like anxiety, anger, depression, desire, guilt, and shame. One hypothesis is that victimizers have not effectively learned appropriate methods for controlling their anger and desire. Instead, they force the fulfillment of these emotions in an unacceptable manner.

A final vector with possible connections to sexual assault and harassment is developing mature interpersonal relationships. Chickering notes that the central tenet of this vector is "the ability to respond to people in their own right rather than as stereotypes or transference objects calling for particular conventions" (Chickering & Reisser, 1993, p. 48). If sexual victimization is viewed as the result of female subordination to men and men's inability to see the woman's perspective, these men may not be able to respond to women as individuals rather than as stereotyped objects. Such men may not have developed the ability to overcome prejudiced thinking and develop mature interpersonal relationships based on responding to women as individuals.

**Attitude and Behavior Change Theories**

Two theories of attitude and behavior change, belief system theory and the elaboration likelihood model (ELM), are particularly relevant to efforts to educate men about sexual assault and harassment. Belief system theory suggests that to produce lasting attitude change, interventions must be designed to maintain people's existing self-conceptions (Grube, Mayton
The elaboration likelihood model suggests that enduring attitude change is more probable when participants are motivated to hear the message, are able to understand it, and deem the persuasive material to be relevant to them. Thus, for prevention interventions to be successful, proponents of ELM would argue that men must not only be motivated to learn about the issues and understand the material, but that they must also consider prevention interventions personally relevant.

Belief System Theory

In a comprehensive literature review, Grube et al. (1994) summarized belief system theory as it pertained to changes in values, attitudes, and behavior. They noted that belief system theory "provides a framework for understanding how attitudes, values and behaviors are organized and the conditions under which they will remain stable or undergo change" (Grube et al., p. 153). They further reported that belief systems act as a guide for thoughts and motivation that lead to actual behavior. Some beliefs are more central to the individual, meaning more interconnected, than others. Thus changing a central belief has consequences for other beliefs.

When distinguishing attitudes from values and behavior, Grube et al. (1994) contended that attitudes are less central than values and behaviors. Furthermore:

because attitudes are relatively peripheral in the belief system, changing an attitude has implications only for other logically or functionally connected attitudes and for a limited set of behaviors. Moreover, attitudes, and the behaviors related to them, are instrumental to, or in the service of, more central values and self conceptions. Thus, unless an attitude change occurs in a direction that is consistent with existing values and self-conceptions, it will not endure. (p. 155)

After a thorough consideration of the literature on belief system theory, Grube et al. (1994) conclude that it is possible to change many different types of attitudes, values, and behaviors by using a single intervention. Such interventions, if delivered in such a way that allow existing self-conceptions to be maintained or enhanced, can last for years. Such lasting change usually results from bringing persuasion targets to the point where they become dissatisfied with their current values and seek to change them to maintain self-enhancing perceptions.

Aspects of belief system theory suggest that it is a promising practice to steer clear of approaching men as potential victimizers and instead appeal to them as either potential helpers or potential bystanders. Grube et al. (1994) contend that the most effective means to change or solidify beliefs is the:

need to maintain and enhance positive self-conceptions and self presentations of morality and competence. That is, belief system theory proposes that individuals continually strive to act in ways that are, or at least appear to others to be, as moral and competent as possible. (p. 156)

The Elaboration Likelihood Model
Sixty years of research supports the contention that audience members are more persuaded by an intervention when they are motivated to listen to the message, when they have the ability to comprehend the information being presented, and when they perceive the message as relevant to them (Reinard, 1988). This research served as the background for the elaboration likelihood model (ELM) developed by Petty and Cacioppo (1986). These theorists’ original conceptualization of the ELM suggested that when participants were motivated and able to process information, an enhanced likelihood that they would process the information using central route processing existed. Petty and Cacioppo (1986) defined central route processing as a type of thinking characterized by the thoughtful evaluation of the material being presented. In their extensive research on the ELM, central route processing tended to produce greater attitude change, more strongly predicted behavior, and showed greater resistance to later arguments than its opposite, peripheral route processing. Peripheral route processing occurred when participants based their decisions concerning whether to alter their attitudes on the perceived expertness, trustworthiness, and attractiveness of the presenter. Attitude change produced by peripheral route processing tended to be less enduring than central route processing. Thus, Petty and Cacioppo (1986) contended that interventions designed to change attitudes and behaviors were more apt to be successful when they elicited central route processing.

The ELM has been applied to many contexts including public health issues (Verplanken, 1991), assertiveness training workshops (Ernst & Heesacker, 1993), counseling (Heesacker, Conner, & Prichard, 1995) and rape prevention workshops (Foubert, 2005; Heppner, Humphrey, Hillenbrand-Gunn, & DeBord, 1995). Heppner, Good, et al. (1995) provide a conceptualization of the ELM which helps convey the full nature of this model. They paraphrased the nature of the ELM as follows:

The ELM suggests two routes of attitude change -- the peripheral and central. The model suggests that when people lack motivation to hear a message, they are more likely to attend to peripheral cues such as expertness, attractiveness, or trustworthiness of the presenter. Thus, in the peripheral route, the presenter's characteristics are more important than the content of the message. Attitude change resulting from peripheral route processes is transitory, however, and would not be expected to be maintained over time. Conversely, when people have a high level of personal involvement and are motivated to hear a message, they process centrally. Thus, for these receivers, the message or intervention itself, not the presenter's attributes, is the powerful influence base. The ELM suggests that this type of attitude change is more stable over time, and therefore is obviously more desirable. (pp. 640-641)

McNeill and Stoltenberg (1989) complement this understanding by pointing out that:

the central and peripheral routes represent positions on a continuous dimension ranging from high to low likelihood of issue-relevant thinking rather than two mutually exclusive and exhaustive types of message processing... ...Thus the ELM accounts for a number of both communicator and recipient variables present in the persuasion setting as well


...as the effects of various combinations of these variables on attitudinal and behavioral change. (p. 27)

Thus given the power of central route processing, prevention programs are most likely to be successful when delivered in an easily understandable fashion by peers of audience members. In addition, it is important that such programs be designed to be relevant to men as potential helpers or bystanders who are very likely to know many of the one in four college women who report surviving rape or attempted rape.

**Research on Bystander Intervention**

The importance of bystander intervention is underscored by the fact that passive bystanders, those who do nothing in response to a troubling situation they witness, encourage perpetrators to continue their activity (Staub, 1993). The bystander phenomenon has been studied for several decades. Darley and Latane (1968) conducted the classic study. In this groundbreaking research, participants were led to believe that they were witnessing another person having an epileptic seizure. Some participants thought that there were no other witnesses to the event; others were led to believe that there were several witnesses who could have potentially intervened. Whether participants were male or female, had medical training or not, or had pro-social personality characteristics made no difference in how quickly they sought assistance for the seizure victim. The only fact that led to a quicker response was the participant’s belief that there were no other witnesses present. Participants who did not intervene seemed to be emotionally conflicted about whether or not to do something, rather than apathetic. This study led to the concept of diffusion of responsibility, suggesting that when more people are present, there is a diminished likelihood that any individual will intervene to help a person in distress.

A second theory of bystander intervention, the arousal cost-reward model, emerged in the early 1980’s. Theorists subscribing to this school of thought purport that when a bystander witnesses another person in potential need of assistance, a lack of personal comfort emerges within the bystander’s psyche. The bystander then weighs the potential costs of intervening against the social scorn they may experience if they do not respond. Bystanders choose to act or not act depending upon which option involves the lowest perceived cost. If accurate, bystanders are most likely to intervene when the personal costs, or risks, are low and when the costs of not helping are high (Piliavin, Dovidio, Gaertner, & Clark, 1981). More recent research on the model confirmed that bystanders indicate a low willingness to help someone in situations where the costs of helping are high, and indicate the greatest likelihood of helping when the costs (temporal, financial, or otherwise) are lowest (Fritzsche, Finkelstein, & Penner, 2000).

A large body of research has developed over the past several decades that clarified these personal and interpersonal processes involved in bystanders’ decisions of whether to intervene. Research on bystander intervention has generated knowledge of numerous situational factors, bystander characteristics, victim and perpetrator characteristics that affect a bystander’s willingness to act. Among the situational factors demonstrated in research to affect a bystander are the presence of other witnesses, the bystander’s relationship to other...
witnesses, the ambiguity of the situation, the level of urgency or danger, the setting, and the type of situation. Individual characteristics that influence the decision to intervene include having relevant skills and experience. For example, if one feels certain about how to intervene, it will increase the likelihood of bystander engagement. Other bystander characteristics include demographic variables, feelings and attitudes, and an assessment of the personal cost of intervening. Victim demographics, the victim’s relationship to the bystander, perpetrator demographics, and the perpetrators relationship to the bystander also influence whether or not bystanders will intervene.

In another comprehensive review of the research literature, Banyard, Plante & Moynihan (2004) found that several factors increase the likelihood that people will intervene as bystanders. These factors include being aware of a situation in which someone is being victimized, making a prior commitment to help, having a sense of partial responsibility for helping, believing that the victim has not caused the situation to occur, having a sense of self efficacy in possessing the skills to do something, and having seen others modeling such pro-social behavior. Potential bystanders are likely to weigh the costs and benefits of intervention relative to how they personally believe it will affect their status in a reference group.

Although the presence of other bystanders influences an individual’s choice to intervene, the relationship between the bystander and other present individuals also matters in decisions to act. Specifically, when others present are in-group members of the potential bystander, a motivating influence is exerted, leading to a greater likelihood of bystander action. Therefore, a connection to the bystander, perceiving them as part of one’s in-group of some sort, makes it much more likely that a bystander will intervene (Levine, Cassidy, Brazier, & Reicher, 2002).

Finally, with regard to sex differences, in a situation where a man is behaving violently toward another person or animal, researchers have demonstrated that men are more likely to intervene than women. Men are also more likely to help women than to help other men; women are more likely than men to help children. Taller, heavier, and younger people are more likely to intervene than older, shorter, and lighter people. Interestingly, training in self defense or life saving strategies apparently has no impact on bystander’s willingness to intervene (Laner, Benin & Ventrone, 2005).

**Bystander Intervention on College Campuses**

Increasing numbers of programmers and researchers are conducting workshops and studies on the impact of bystander intervention on men’s violent behavior (Schwartz, 2005). Building on the foundation of research conducted over 40 years ago by Darley and Latane (1968), inquiry into bystander intervention in rape situations emerged. Early research on conditions that affect whether or not a bystander will intervene in a situation where the bystander believes a man is raping a woman found that men and women were equally likely to intervene to assist a woman under attack. Female victims who were seen physically struggling and vocally protesting were more likely to be helped than those verbally protesting but not seen. In addition, people who intervened were more likely to believe that the victim would receive greater physical and emotional injury than people who did not intervene. Yelling “help, rape!” was more effective than yelling “Fire” or blowing a whistle. The only participants who would
intervene directly (as opposed to calling for help from the police or other authorities) were men who reported that they could handle a physical conflict given their physical self-efficacy (Shotlenad & Stebbins, 1980).

Soon after this early research, others began connecting bystander intervention, rape, and the college campus. Such research showed a surprising reversal of the diffusion of responsibility effect. Specifically, when participants were led to believe that they were witnessing a rape about to happen on their own campus, college men were more likely to intervene if they believed that others could tell that he saw what was happening. In such cases, 85% of college men were found to intervene. When a similar situation was concocted without the presence of other witnesses who knew a particular college male was in a position to intervene, 65% intervene (Harari, Harari & White, 1985). These researchers suggest that “clarity and social comparison” help participants define the situation as a violent emergency requiring their help.

More recent research has examined large data sets from the National Crime Victimization Survey to identify the effects of the presence of bystanders on rape situations. Studies examining several years worth of data have shown that the presence of a bystander is the second most powerful protective factor predicting the avoidance of a completed rape when a woman is attacked by a single individual. In fact, the presence of a bystander made a completed rape 44% less likely. Not surprisingly, the absence of a bystander significantly predicted completed rape (Clay-Warner, 2002). A later study of NCVS data found that the presence of a bystander does not affect the amount of resistance a woman exerts against a male attacker (Clay-Warner, 2003). Even more than the presence of a bystander, a victim’s degree of resistance is the strongest predictor of rape avoidance. This line of inquiry suggests that the presence of a bystander exerts influence on a potential rape situation by influencing the attacker’s likelihood of completing a rape rather than through the victim’s physical or verbal response to the attack.

One way in which the presence of a bystander does not affect things involves sexually harassing behavior. When a bystander is present, it does not significantly affect the type of penalty that college students believe a harasser should receive versus an incident in which no bystander is present (Cummings & Armenta, 2002).

With regard to intimate partner violence, research has shown that women report a greater likelihood of hitting their partners in a hypothetical scenario in which their male partner hits them if a bystander is present. In opposite fashion, if men’s partners hit them, men are less likely to hit their partners back in the presence of a bystander. Apparently, women have less fear of physical retaliation from their partner if a bystander is present (Feld & Robinson, 1998).

**Connection Between Alcohol and Sexual Assault**

The consumption of alcohol is a variable that has a tremendous impact on sexual assault. In roughly three out of four cases where a man rapes a woman in college, the woman is intoxicated (Mohler-Kuo, Dowdall, Koss & Wechsler, 2004). In each of these studies, the word “rape” includes intercourse against another person’s will and by force. Surviving rape coincides with higher levels of heavy smoking, high-risk drinking, cocaine use, drinking and
driving, considering and attempting suicide (Silverman, Raj, Mucci, & Hathaway, 2001). The need for rape prevention programs to successfully address the link between alcohol and sexual assault is confirmed by several studies. Collectively, these studies point to the need for rape prevention programs to successfully address the connection between alcohol and sexual assault in order to meet their objectives.

**Sexually Coercive Men Drink More**

For example, researchers have shown that men who are more sexually coercive also drink more alcohol, particularly during sexual encounters (Abbey, Clinton-Sherrod, McAuslan, Zawacki, & Buck, 2003; Abbey, McAuslan, Zawacki, Clinton, & Buck, 2001; Carr & VanDeusen, 2004). Sexually coercive men drink more per week than noncoercive peers and have higher alcohol expectancies. Alcohol expectancies (degree in which alcohol enhances sexuality) moderates the relationship between alcohol consumption and sexually coercive behavior. 21% of college men reported using alcohol or drugs as a means of sexual coercion to intentionally impair their victims (Wilson, Calhoun, & McNair, 2002).

**Drinking more leads to more aggression, but less completed rape**

In addition, the more alcohol men consume, the more aggressive they are in situations in which a sexual assault takes place (Abbey, Clinton-Sherrod, McAuslan, Zawacki, & Buck, 2003; Abbey, McAuslan, Zawacki, Clinton, & Buck, 2001; Carr & VanDeusen, 2004). When offending men use alcohol they are less likely to actually complete a rape than offending men who do not use alcohol (Brecklin & Ullman, 2001). When perpetrators have been drinking, the level at which they sexually victimize women is more severe (Testa & Livingston, 1999). Men’s level of substance use does not tend to effect whether or not they will complete a rape. However, men who abuse substances are more likely to perpetrate physical and sexual violence (Testa, 2004).

**Drunk men ignore survivor’s distress**

The link between alcohol and sexual assault is further compounded by findings that when men are intoxicated, they perceive rape survivors as being less distressed and less disgusted by their attackers than do sober men (Norris, George, Davis, Martel, & Leonesio, 1999). Interestingly, the more sexually coercive a man is, the less honest he believes women are about not wanting to have sex on a particular occasion. This effect is especially evident when alcohol has been consumed by both parties.

**Men more likely to push sex with intoxicated woman**

Studies examining sexually aggressive men have shown that they are less inhibited about being coercive with women who have consumed alcohol. Although the amount of alcohol a woman consumes has no effect on nonaggressive men’s perceptions of how far to push their sexual advances, sexually aggressive men are much more likely to be coercive when a woman has consumed alcohol (Bernat, Calhoun, & Stolp, 1998). Men who view women who are
drinking as more sexually available will persist longer in pressuring a drunk woman for sex than a sober woman (Testa & Dermen, 1999).

Women at risk when drinking

Women who use alcohol immediately before being assaulted are more likely to experience acquaintance and stranger rape (Ullman, Karabatsos, & Koss, 1999). Women who are raped by intoxication drank double what women drank who were raped by other kinds of force (Testa, Livingston, Vanzile-Tamsen, & Frone, 2003). Women who are raped drink more alcohol on a weekly basis than women who are not raped (Testa & Dermen, 1999). Women who survive sexual coercion are more likely than other women to believe that alcohol enhances sex (Testa & Dermen, 1999). Women are at greater risk for being raped while they are intoxicated if they are underage (1.5 times the risk), White (1.5), Live in a sorority house (3.1), are in a sorority (1.7), drank heavily in high school (3.9), drink heavily in college (7.8), and use illegal drugs (4.6) (Mohler-Kuo, Dowdall, Koss & Wechsler, 2004). Women who abuse (rather than just use) substances are more likely to experience physical and sexual violence (Testa, 2004).
Summary of Research Findings Relevant to Sexual Assault and Harassment Prevention Programming

1. One in four college women have experienced rape or attempted rape (Koss, Gydycz & Wisniewski, 1987; Douglass et al., 1995; Fisher, Cullen & Turner, 2006).

2. Peer education programs are more effective (Earle, 1996; Stein, 2007).

3. All-male environments are more successful than mixed environments for changing men. (Brecklin & Forde, 2001).

4. Increasing empathy with rape survivors decreases men’s likelihood of raping (Hamilton & Yee, 1987; Foubert & Newberry, 2006).

5. Increasing men’s aversion to rape decreases the likelihood they will rape (Schewe & O’Donohue, 1993).

6. Nine studies have been done on how men are affected by hearing a rape story. Six, which described a male-on-male rape experience, led to decreased rape myth acceptance and/or likelihood of raping (Foubert, 2000; Foubert and Marriott 1997; Foubert and McEwen 1998; Gilbert, Heesacker and Gannon, 1991; Lee, 1987; and Schewe and O’Donohue, 1993). Three, which described a male-on-female rape experience, actually led to increased rape myth acceptance and/or likelihood of raping (Berg, 1993; Berg, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999; Ellis, O’Sullivan and Sowards, 1992).

7. In cases where both victim and perpetrator are equally intoxicated, people ascribe more blame to the victim and less to the perpetrator versus cases on which no alcohol is present. If victim is more intoxicated than the perpetrator, people blame the perpetrator more (Stormo, Lang, & Stritzke, 1997).

8. Most programs have not been shown to decrease rape-supportive attitudes for men. Even successful programs have not shown that effects are long lasting. (Söchting, Fairbrother, & Koch, 2004).

9. Programs that focus on get men to focus on respecting women’s “no,” not having sex with women who are intoxicated, not expecting sex (i.e. as a payment for dinner), not interpreting women’s flirting, dress, and behaviors as an invitation to sex, challenging gender stereotypes and belief of rape myths, such as blaming the victim and legitimizing rape are rejected by men because they did not see themselves in the same group as rapists and therefore did not interpret the information as applicable to them and do not identify educational efforts of challenging rape myths and rape-supportive attitudes as relevant to them. Teaching men to support survivors and act as allies was viewed by men positively (Scheel, Johnson, Schneider, & Smith, 2001).

10. Men who report enjoying sexist humor are significantly more likely to endorse rape myths, have adversarial sexual beliefs, accept interpersonal violence, and report a greater likelihood of forcing sex. Such men also report higher rates of psychological, physical, and sexual aggression (Ryan, K.M. & Kanjorski, 1998).
11. Sexually coercive men tend to have three common characteristics. First, they tend to be prone to assert their own interests at the expense of others. Second, they tend to prefer short-term sexual relationships rather than long-term commitments. Finally, they tend to approach conflict by being coercive with others (Malamuth, 1998).

12. Knowledge is much easier to change than attitudes and behavior related to sexual assault (Lonsway & Kothari, 2000).

13. After a successful rape prevention program, there is an increase in cases of sexual assault reported to university police (Lonsway & Kothari, 2000).

14. Of men who rape, about 2/3 report doing so more than once – averaging about 6 rapes each (Lisak & Miller, 2002).

15. Reports of a chilly climate on campuses remain to the present day and are characterized by women’s fear for personal safety, harassment, victim blaming, fear of home invasion and being attacked on campus (Kelly & Torres, 2006).

16. When men who have consumed alcohol are in a situation where they are presented with “inhibitive” and “disinhibitive” cues in a potentially sexual situation, the alcohol interferes with men’s ability to understand signals in their environment that pushing sexual behavior is inappropriate in the given circumstances (Gross, Bennet, Sloan, Marx, & Juergens, 2001).

17. Persons who have either been a victim of rape or know a survivor are less likely to hold rape-tolerant attitudes and have a higher level of rape-related empathy (Chng & Burke, 1999).

18. A comprehensive review of sexual assault education programs found that longer interventions tend to elicit greater positive effects on rape attitudes than shorter interventions (Anderson & Whitson, 2005).

19. Interactive programs are equally effective compared to video based programs (Anderson, Stoelb, Duggan, Hieger, Kling & Payne, 1998).

20. The more alcohol a man consumes, the more aggressive he is in a sexual situation. More serious cases of sexual assault happen when perpetrators have had 4-8 drinks when compared to less than 4 or more than 9 drinks. In addition, the more alcohol a victim consumes, the more severe the assault against her tends to be. (Abbey, Clinton-Sherrod, McAuslan, Zawacki, & Buck, 2003).

21. Women in the military are four times more likely to be raped if their superior officers tolerated sexual harassment in the workplace or barracks (Richard, 2003).
SHAPE Curriculum

The Officer Development Division of the United States Naval Academy uses an outstanding framework to build leaders of character during the four years in which midshipmen are in attendance. As we developed the SHAPE curriculum, we saw this framework as one into which sexual assault and harassment prevention programming fit, to provide a seamless learning experience for students and to help them see the connections between understanding these issues and their roles as present and future leaders. Our understanding of the focus of each year at the academy was as follows:

Fourth Class: Becoming a good follower, learning to better understand self and others, and developing rudimentary leadership skills (trust, verbal and non-verbal communication, active listening, and conflict management).

Third Class: Developing a strong ethical and moral foundation for effective leadership, developing self-understanding of personal beliefs, enhance moral reasoning skills, building skills to act with an ethical character with a firm sense of honor and loyalty.

Second Class: Becoming a motivator and standard setter, becoming a leader, mentally connecting ones personal qualities with a chosen leadership style, increasing self-efficacy in skills necessary within the brigade and as a junior officer in the fleet (counseling, listening, mentoring, communication, decision making, critical thinking, teambuilding, motivation, conflict management, and vision).

First Class: Final preparation for junior officership, learning about necessary legal issues, processes, and matters, building a knowledge base from which to lead a disciplinary program, and being able to make decisions about the appropriate process for resolution of a variety of legal issues.

These emphases are reflected in the following preliminary outline of recommended goals, objectives, and training topics for each year of the proposed USNA Sexual Harassment and Assault Prevention Education (SHAPE) Program.

Fourth Class Year

USNA Curricular Emphasis:

1. Becoming a good follower.
2. Learning to better understand self and others.
3. Developing rudimentary leadership skills:
   a. Trust.
   b. Verbal and non-verbal communication.
   c. Active listening.
   d. Conflict management.
Sexual Harassment and Assault Prevention Education (SHAPE) Program Goals for the Year:

1. To connect knowledge of sexual assault and harassment issues with what fourth class midshipmen need to know as good followers and emerging leaders.
2. To attain a basic understanding of definitions of key concepts.
3. To understand why sexual assault is so traumatic, and thus why we need to prevent it from happening.

**Third Class Year**

USNA Curricular Emphasis:

1. Developing a strong ethical and moral foundation for effective leadership.
2. Developing self-understanding of personal beliefs.
3. Enhance moral reasoning skills.
4. Building an ethical character with a firm sense of honor and loyalty.

Sexual Harassment and Assault Prevention Education (SHAPE) Program Goals for the Year:

1. To understand how masculinity and femininity is connected to sexual assault and harassment.
2. To increase motivation to intervene as bystanders when they see potentially risky behavior by others.

**Second Class Year**

USNA Curricular Emphasis:

1. Becoming a motivator and standard setter.
2. Becoming a leader.
3. Mentally connecting ones personal qualities with a chosen leadership style.
4. Increasing self-efficacy necessary brigade and junior officer skills:
   a. Counseling.
   b. Listening.
c. Mentoring.
d. Communication.
e. Decision making.
f. Critical thinking.
g. Teambuilding.
h. Motivation.
i. Conflict management.
j. Vision.

Sexual Harassment and Assault Prevention Education (SHAPE) Program Goals:

1. Help participants develop a mature sense of what constitutes a variety of types of healthy relationships (leader-follower, peer, romantic partner).

2. Advance participant’s complexity in a personally selected code of ethics, commitment to USNA ethical principles, and ability to relate ethics to sexual assault and harassment situations.

First Class Year

USNA Curricular Emphasis:

1. Final preparation for junior officership.

2. Learning about necessary legal issues, processes, and matters.

3. Building a knowledge base from which to lead a disciplinary program.

4. Being able to make decisions about the appropriate process for resolution of a variety of legal issues.

Sexual Harassment and Assault Prevention Education (SHAPE) Program Goals:

1. Building leadership of junior officers to manage sexual assault and harassment cases in their command.
Decisions Made About SHAPE Training

Below is a list of items that are a scheduled part of SHAPE training. The most significant portion of time is spent on presenting, debriefing, and practicing program modules. The second list below consists of items that we originally discussed as possibilities for SHAPE training. When we, as consultants, came up with this more content based model we separated topics into days. This separation is preserved below. We decided to cut many of these items in favor of providing more time for the present/debrief/practice model. A conversation revisiting the wisdom in this decision may be in order now that a transition is taking place in lead trainers from consultants to full time staff.

Current SHAPE Training Topics

Introductions of Trainers
Introductions of SHAPE Trainers
Description of Where SHAPE Program Came From
Overview of Training Process (Model, Debrief, Practice)
Returners state what they learned from last year they wish they had known
Present Modules, Debrief Modules, Practice Modules
Alcohol and Sexual Assault
Facilitations Skills in the Big Group – Integrating Content (Victim Blaming)
Homework
Debriefing Homework
Research on Different Approaches Used Throughout SHAPE Program
Rape Myths and the Importance of Bystander Intervention: The Accused
Discuss Difficult Questions and Situations
Practice Handling Difficult Questions and Situations
Prevalence of Sexual Assault In US and in Military (John)
Basics of Sexual Harassment

Alternative SHAPE Training Format

Training Day 1

Introductions
Team Building: 1 thing interesting about yourself
Confidentiality of Personal Information
Overview of the SHAPE Program Philosophy
Values and Approach of the Program
Overarching Principles
Orientation to the Program (Elaboration Likelihood Model, Belief System Theory)
How the Curriculum Came About
Introducing Ourselves – our expertise and domains
Overview of entire training schedule
Every day we will model part of the training  
We will have content, modeling, and YOU interpreting it in your ways  
We will deconstruct content, delivery, and how to improve, where we need to go.  
Learn how to watch others – give them feedback.  
How did we present the content? How did we facilitate?

Training on Facilitation Skills
See The Men’s Program
See The Men’s Program Debrief

Day 2:

Characteristics of Sexual Assault Offenders (David Lisak Research) in Morning
Consent in the Afternoon
Alcohol and Sexual Assault
Rape myths
Show Lisak video.
Dispel the myth of miscommunication. Lisak found that rapists are predators.
Normative level of coercion. How much resistance is OK and who gets to decide how much.
Risk reduction
Rape of Mr Smith (to address victim blaming).
What is rape prevention, risk reduction.
Use of language, why it is important.

Day 3:

Ashe content
Sex Signals
Gender (Sophomore sessions 1, 2, 3, 4)
What is culture, how does it operate?
Sexism
Homophobia
Social Norms Survey Exercise (do it for average mid)
Social Norm Theory
Fundamental attribution error
Victim Blaming.
Language -- passive voice, dehumanizing language and its effects.
What is women’s and men’s work.

Day 4:

Respect exercise
Honor, courage, commitment
MVP debrief
Sexual Harassment
Bystander intervention.
Latane and Darley.

**Day 5:**

Leadership & sexual assault
Rape Trauma Syndrome; See and practice processing the session
Victim Blaming
Risk reduction.
Receiving a complaint
Take them through confronting an offender.
UCMJ.
PTSD.
Why survivors do not report.
Tonic Immobility.

**Day 6:**

First class year session 4.
Leave a cushion here for catch up and practice.
Format for Training of SHAPE Peer Educators

The format for the training of SHAPE presenters that we selected centered on modeling the presentation of SHAPE sessions, debriefing them, and having presenters practice in smaller groups with the opportunity for small group feedback. This choice was consistent with Knefelcamp’s principles of Developmental Instruction and had the benefit of focusing time on preparing presenters for the facilitation of the specific task to which they were assigned. There were also some content sessions interspersed throughout training so that presenters would know more about the topics about which they were presenting. Several less structured times during the schedule (i.e. the beginning of the day, the end of the day, and session debriefs) allowed time for discussion of more content to be presented. In retrospect, during the time we were presenting SHAPE session to presenters, we often went “off script” and began presenting material about the subject matter of the presentation rather than presenting the script of the presentation itself. In retrospect, this could be because we had no other time planned during the training schedule to discuss critical content areas of sexual assault awareness material. This may indicate a need to re-evaluate the balance between presenting content during SHAPE presenter training and the time intensive process of model-debrief-practice.

Homework

Each evening, we assigned “homework” for SHAPE peer educators. Their homework assignment was to talk with someone who was not affiliated with the SHAPE program about something we discussed that day during training. The person they selected could be anyone – a midshipman, someone back home, someone they knew well or didn’t know well. The objective of the assignment was to get them used to talking about sexual assault and sexual harassment issues. It was also to keep them thinking about the topics we discussed during training so that training became an immersion experience.

Morning Debriefing

Each morning we began with a debriefing session of their homework. This gave us time to discuss with the trainees a wide variety of issues related to sexual assault and sexual harassment. We were able to do so in the context of actual conversations they had with (usually) their peers. The great advantage of this format was that we integrated areas of content with actual discussions they had with real people. We could have made a different decision to include more content-heavy sessions during training to cover other topic areas related to the areas upon which the presenters would be training their peers. The advantage of that format would be that we could have been more strategic in covering a list of predictable areas that are likely to come up in the areas of sexual assault and sexual harassment. We also would have been sure to be more comprehensive in covering a wide range of topics and not risk getting stuck on whatever particular areas challenge the group we were training at the time.
Detailed SHAPE Training Session Outlines

Description of Where SHAPE Came From

Midshipmen, especially upperclassmen, are naturally skeptical about where programs come from and whether there is a hidden agenda behind such programs. There is a great deal about the SHAPE program that, if made transparent, can promote strong buy-in among SHAPE presenters. For example, a great deal of the development of the SHAPE program involved input from midshipmen and particularly from SHAPE presenters. We suggest that you emphasize the following points in this portion of training:

1. Several people were integrally involved in putting together the original idea for SHAPE. Initially, Karen Gentile from the Midshipmen Development Center and a Midshipman named Grant Wanier had a vision for a more comprehensive training program that would provide brigade-wide education to all midshipmen that would be based on the values of the Academy, would speak to midshipmen at their level, would not insult their intelligence, and would be useful to them in their Naval careers.

2. Superintendent, Vice Admiral Rodney Rempt was a strong advocate for addressing the issue of sexual assault and sexual harassment at the Academy and gave his support to doing anything it took to do the job well.

3. Karen Gentile and Grant Wanier met with one of the foremost experts in sexual assault awareness programs, Gail Stern, to get her ideas on how to proceed. Out of these conversations a three person consulting team was developed composed of three of the most knowledgeable experts in the country on the issue of sexual assault and harassment among college age populations: Gail Stern, Christopher Kilmartin, and John Foubert.

4. The consultants began their work by doing a thorough assessment of USNA culture. Instead of assuming that other programming models would fit the USNA environment, they designed programs to fit our culture and values. They spoke with countless administrators. They learned about the values and curricular emphases of each of the four years we have at the Academy. They visited several LEL classes. They interviewed students and conducted focus groups. They read through several reports on the climate here. This served as a foundation for their work.

5. After doing so, they worked with USNA staff and students for three years to design 12 educational programs, choose 4 outside presenters, and design 4 class sessions to be integrated into LEL classes. After each program was written, it was presented to SHAPE peer educators for feedback. This feedback was used to rewrite the program to make it more germane to a USNA audience. It was also rewritten at least a second time after it was presented to an audience of midshipmen and we saw how it actually worked. Often, several rewrites were made to make each program as effective as possible.
6. Being that they are sexual assault experts, the consultants were constantly reading the latest research on how to most effectively educate people about sexual assault throughout the program development process. Therefore, we were able to benefit from programs written by writers who had cutting edge knowledge of research and a current assessment of what was working here at the Academy with real-life midshipmen. The end result is not only the most extensive rape awareness program being presented on any college campus in the country, by far. We also believe that it is the strongest, given the research that went into it and the process that was followed to painstakingly develop each and every portion of it.
Note to trainers: There are several objectives for this training session. First, it is intended to help peer educators develop a deeper understanding of what rape is like. Given that research shows that showing a male on female rape experience can be detrimental to men’s attitudes toward rape as a first-time intervention, this session should not be an initial training exercise for peer educators. One should wait until peer educators have had at least several hours worth of training before doing this exercise.

This session is also intended to help peer educators notice the opportunities different people have to intervene as bystanders, why they might chose to do so, and why they might choose not to do so. In addition, this session provides a great opportunity to educate peer educators about rape myths. In particular, one can address the rape myth that a woman who dresses in a certain way and leads men on deserves to be raped.

This session can also be used to motivate peer educators to act. They are likely to feel powerless when they see the movie clip of a rape scene. The processing of this scene allows you to transfer that feeling of powerlessness into a feeling of empowerment that they can do something about rape when they see a potential rape situation about to occur.

Very important: The day before, morning of, and just before the session, be sure to issue a disclaimer that the movie clip you will be using will show a Hollywood depiction of a rape scene. State that the movie is rated R, not X, so that it will not show penetration, but it will show a rape from the side and there will be some partial nudity. State that it will be graphically violent and very disturbing, especially to those who are survivors or those who are friends of survivors. People can choose to leave or opt out entirely. Offer support resources and have a counselor on hand or on call.

Before you begin the session be sure to set up and test your video clip so you don’t fumble with it when it is time to show.

STATE: In this session we are going to learn more about several issues including the reality of how awful rape is, why some people decide to intervene and others don’t, how some people can be influenced by others to make certain choices, and we will also talk about some beliefs about rape that permeate our culture.

STATE: As you’ve noticed, we’ve had a number of discussions during training about decisions people make. There are decisions people make when they know what is going to happen next, and decisions people make where they have no idea what is going to happen next.

STATE: What we’re going to do today is start this session with viewing a 12 minute portion of the movie “The Accused.” In this movie, Jodi Foster won an academy award for best actress for playing the role of Sara – a woman who survived rape in a bar. It is based on a true story. This clip shows a graphic rape scene. It is more graphic than the police rape training video that you saw with the One in
Four presentation, and some find it more disturbing. The movie is rated R, not X, so it will not show penetration, but it will show a rape from the side and there will be some partial nudity. It is graphically violent and very disturbing, especially to survivors or those who are friends of survivors. Seriously, you can choose to sit this one out and you can leave during if you’d like.

DO: Begin movie clip. To find, go to scene selection. Go to scene that starts with view of a prison on an island. Fast forward through scene of two guys talking on either side of a plastic wall in a prison visitors room. Fast forward through the scene of the Sara, her lawyer, a witness, and his lawyer in a lawyer’s office.

Start the clip just as Sara’s lawyer calls her witness to the stand.

End the clip just as Sara’s lawyer asks her witness whether he thinks Sara Tobias was responsible for the rape, and he says “No.”

DO: Turn on the lights after the clip is over. Pause for 15 seconds or so.

ASK: How did it feel to watch that scene?

ASK: How do you feel right now?

STATE: For those of you who felt helpless in watching that scene, or angry, or (insert appropriate words here), the good news is that you can do something to help prevent something like that – the real life story you just saw depicted on that screen – from happening. There are many different ways to intervene as a bystander that could have prevented that rape from happening. There are many choices people made in that scene that were missed opportunities. There were also many choices people made that were just awful, even evil.

ASK: Who are some of the characters you saw in the clip, the major ones (make sure you write Sara’s name at the end, or at least don’t discuss her until the end)?

Rapist #1 (Danny)  Waitress/Sara’s friend (same person)  Video game guy
Rapist #2 (Bob)  Ring Leader/instigator  Sara
Rapist #3 (Kurt)  Red haired guy who came/left

ASK: How responsible do you think (insert character name here) was for what happened?

Prompt: When does a bystander have an obligation to do something?
Prompt: What are some potential ways that person could have intervened?

Note to Presenter: When you get to Sara state this as the devil’s advocate position and look for the group to refute it.
STATE: Well, then there was Sara. Clearly she deserved to be raped in this situation, didn’t she! I mean come on. She walked into the bar. Lit up a cigarette. Scoped out the room just looking for who she’d hook up with. Sat down with a friend and drank like a lush. Gave “the look” to Bob and said she should take him home and fuck him right in front of her husband. She took the drink from Danny, let him touch her ass. Pfft. She then followed him back into the back room. What was she expecting? Then she made sure she was the only woman in the room by chasing away the other one there. She then smoked a joint and started dancing around like an exotic dancer and pulled Danny right over to her. I mean, what was Danny supposed to think? Of course he was going to do her right there! It was all her fault! Right? The whole thing was all her fault.

Note to Presenter: Trainees are likely to disagree with you (thankfully). If some seem hesitant, ask them to make their point. Others in the group are likely to confront them.

If you have not yet done so, ask questions about when a bystander has an obligation to do something and what some potential ways are to intervene. Be sure to note that one needs to balance their personal safety with intervention, but there is almost always a way to do something without putting oneself in immediate danger.
Alcohol and Sexual Assault

ASK: Before we start today, I want to ask you a couple of questions. How many electoral votes does it take to become President of the United States?

DO: Pause to take responses from people in the room. Vote if needed to come up with the answer. The answer (as of 2009) is 270.

ASK: OK, next question. What is the best form of government?

DO: Take responses. Request that people state reasons why their form of government is the best. Continue to note that you can’t seem to get “the right answer” and how frustrating it is for you because you just want an easy answer, an absolute right or wrong answer, and why don’t they just tell you what THE answer is?

STATE: OK. Well, we’ve just identified the basic issue of why it can be so frustrating to try to educate people about the intersections between alcohol and sexual assault. It boils down to this. Your peers will want you to state rules that relate to how much alcohol someone can drink and still be able to consent that boil down to a question that has a specific answer like “how many electoral votes does it take to become President of the United States.” The reality is that in many cases, an answer like that just doesn’t exist. In many cases, the answer is much more like the second question, “What is the best form of government.” There is no simple, right answer.

WRITE: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16

ASK: How much does someone’s blood alcohol content level increase for every 12 ounces of beer, 5 ounces of wine or 1.5 ounces of 80 proof liquor they consume?

STATE: Yes, you are correct, .02. So let’s write underneath these numbers of drinks how much someone’s BAC would be after consuming that many drinks.

WRITE: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16,.02, .04, .06, .08, .10, .12, .14, .16, .18, .20, .22, .24, .26, .28, .30, .32

STATE: The basic problem with the issue of alcohol and sexual assault is that people try to force an issue of infinite complexity into one that can be summed up into a simple rule. In particular, men want to know “how many beers can she have and still consent.” “How can I tell if things are still OK?” The problem is that in many situations a person cannot tell. It is impossible to tell if a person is too drunk to consent if that person does not show many visible signs of drunkenness. It can also be very hard to determine their state of drunkenness of the person try to tell is himself drunk and sexually aroused.
STATE: Some situations are clear. A person who has had nothing to drink and is otherwise able to consent (free from coercion, legal age, etc.) can consent. In nearly every case imaginable, a person with one drink can also consent. A person who has had 16 drinks in an hour, leading to a BAC of .32 cannot consent. They are dangerously intoxicated and likely in need of medical attention. What about a woman who weighs 120 pounds, has had a normal amount of food for her that day and has had 5 drinks in 2 hours. Can she consent? If someone has intercourse with her, is that rape? Legally, that is a question for a jury.

STATE: The law writes up rape statues to be vague on purpose, so that juries have to figure out whether something is rape or not. The same thing often goes for campus judicial boards and administrative hearings. They have to be interpreted. Is it rape? That is up for a board or administrators to decide. It is not always clear. Most toxicologists will say that if someone is vomiting or passing out, they are definitely too drunk to consent. But you don’t have to be vomiting or passing out to be too drunk to consent. Most juries will say if a man can have and maintain an erection he is capable of giving consent.

STATE: If you want to be safe, if you don’t want to rape, the best thing to do is to make low risk decisions. Low risk decisions involve not having intercourse with people who have consumed increasingly higher quantities of alcohol, or with quantities of alcohol that you don’t know.

STATE: An important thing to remember in all of this is that it is the responsibility of the person who initiates physical activity with another person to obtain proper consent before proceeding with that behavior. If that person is so intoxicated that they don’t know what is going on, they might even say yes – but only because they are so drunk that they would say yes to anything like buying a new car, signing a contract, things they would not otherwise do if they were sober. The burden lies with the person initiating the behavior to obtain proper consent – whether that is the male or the female.

ASK: What are some reasons why men seek a specific answer about when it is OK to have sex with alcohol?

ASK: Are all men going to be satisfied by hearing that “it is a jury question, make low risk decisions, the initiator has to get consent?” Why?

ASK: What are some other possible strategies we can use in addressing the concerns of these men?

ASK: Why is it frustrating for alcohol to be an unclear issue? Can it be a clear issue?
How would you personally answer questions about alcohol if they come up at the end of a program, like “what if they are both drunk, why is the guy at fault” or “how drunk can she be before it is rape?”
Victim-blaming defined

- Victim-blaming is holding the victims of a crime, an accident, or any type of abusive maltreatment to be entirely or partially responsible for the unfortunate incident that has occurred in their life, often when the victim had performed no actions to facilitate the incident. It is also about blaming individuals for their personal distress or for social difficulties, rather than the other parties involved or the overarching social system in place.
Victim-blaming in practice

- Afterwards, they said that the 22-year-old woman was bound to attract attention. She was wearing a white lace miniskirt, a green tank top, and no underwear. At knife-point, she was kidnapped from a Fort Lauderdale restaurant parking lot by a Georgia drifter and raped twice. But a jury showed little sympathy for the victim. The accused rapist was acquitted. "We all feel she asked for it [by] the way she was dressed," said the jury foreman.

- Source: http://www.scu.edu/ethics/publications/iie/v3n2/justworld.html

Just World Hypothesis

- When people believe that the world is an orderly, predictable, and just place, where people get what they deserve.
- This hypothesis helps us function in an unpredictable world, as we need to believe that our actions will have predictable consequences.
- When we encounter evidence suggesting that the world is not fair, we either act to restore justice by helping the victim or we persuade ourselves that no injustice has occurred.
- The more one believes that there is a “just world,” the more likely one is to blame the victim.
Defensive Attribution Hypothesis

- People increase or reduce blame depending on their perceived similarity with the victim and the perceived likelihood of the situation happening to them.
- Defensive attributions predict negative victim perception to decrease as the similarity of the observer to the victim increases (although the opposite results have also been documented).

Victim-blaming Themes—Female Victims

- Character
  - She’s a bad person
  - She’s a slut
  - She led him on/she was a tease
  - Women say “no” when they mean yes
  - Women play games with guys
  - It’s easier for her to “cry rape” than look like a slut
  - She might have been into it at the time, and then the next day she regretted it
  - Women always falsely accuse men of rape
Key Responses

- **CHARACTER**
  - Because you don't like the victim, are you saying the offender was justified?
  - Because you don't like the victim, are you saying that what the offender did wasn't a crime?
  - Because you don't like the victim, are you saying the crime had less of an impact?
  - Let's address the impact of accusing someone of rape.
    - Negative attention; reduced status; family and friends divided.

- **BEHAVIOR**
  - So, every time you (drink, remove yours, or someone else's clothes, or kiss someone) you've had sex with them?
  - So, every time you've had a drink with someone, you've said, "By the way, I'm not having sex with you?"

Key Responses

- Rape shouldn't be a penalty for stupidity/naiveté.
- So what you’re saying is that when you’re at your most vulnerable, based on some choices that you obviously thought were okay in the moment, that someone is entitled to hurt you?
- Do you think that the victim might have known or trusted the offender? Do you think she thought, "Well, I shouldn’t invite him to my room because he might rape me?" Are we asking all crime victims to be psychic, now?
Victim-blaming Themes—Female Victims

- Risk Reduction vs. Rape Prevention
  - Know that when you invite a guy over, you have to be clear that you don't want to have sex with him.
  - Be clearer when you're struggling—say, “This is rape!”
  - Don't kiss anyone first.
  - Don't remove anyone's clothing first. It will send the message that you want to have sex with them.
  - If she didn't want to have sex with him, she should have told him that at the beginning of the evening to take the pressure off of him.
  - Don't drink.
  - Only go out with a guy when you're with a group/buddy/in public.

Key Responses

- While there are many things a person can do to reduce their RISK of being raped, the only person who can prevent the rape is the person initiating the intercourse.
- Even if the victim had done all of the things we believe s/he could have done, would it guarantee that the victim would never be raped?
- It's not about the victim’s choices; it's about the rapist’s choices. Only the rapist can guarantee that the rape does not occur.
Victim-blaming Themes: Female Victims

- **Guy Supportive**
  - His Life is Ruined because of her (character, rule violation, stupidity, failure to communicate effectively)
  - How was he supposed to know what she wanted—he’s not psychic
  - Once guys get going, they can’t stop (blue balls)/it’s very hard for them to stop/it’s rude to ask them to stop
  - He was drinking, too; maybe she raped him
  - Women are always falsely accusing guys of rape
  - It’s always the guy’s fault; women have no responsibility

Key Responses

- **His life is ruined because of HIS choices.**
- **What happens when a woman accuses a popular/average guy of rape? What happens to her status in her unit? In the Navy/USNA as a whole?**
  - It goes down; she may no longer be perceived as a leader
  - She is held responsible for undermining unit cohesion
  - Friends and colleagues take sides
  - The victim is thought of as a liar or damaged goods; no one feels comfortable working with her, being seen with her, or dating her, etc.
- **Can guys stop if they want to? YES. They just have to want to.**
Victim-blaming Themes: Male Victims

- No man would ever turn down sexual contact from a woman (all men want sex from all women, all the time)
- It was probably a case of consensual, homosexual sex that the alleged victim is trying to hide
- Men are strong (especially if they are soldiers), and could resist sex (especially if the aggressor is female) if they really wanted to
- If the victim was gay, it’s not as serious a crime as it would be if he were straight

Key Responses

- Rape is rape.
- Rape isn’t about sexuality; it is about power. Whether one is gay or straight, being forced to engage in sexual contact against your will is a violent act, not a sexual one.
- Are you saying that a man can never refuse sexual contact?
- Are you saying that men can never be vulnerable to the power of another?
- It’s always the INITIATOR’S responsibility—whether that person is a guy or a woman. If you’re initiating the intercourse or any other sexual act, it’s your job to make sure you’ve got consent for it.
Concluding Thoughts

- Why do we NEED rape myths? What and whom does it serve?
  - We don’t want to think that people around us that we know and like and trust can be rapists/hurt us
  - It helps us to not define ourselves as a victim
    - It’s frightening and disempowering to think one could be raped regardless of what precautions they may take
    - Labeling one’s self as a rape victim also carries with it a lot of trauma, requiring introspection and potentially therapy
  - It enables us to distance ourselves from the possibility that we have already committed rape
  - It enables us to continue acting as we always have, without ever having to consider whether our actions are harming another human being
Concluding Thoughts

- Intimacy has a moral component; more than just a legal issue (It’s not just, how much can I hurt someone before it becomes illegal?)
- Integrity is how we behave when no one is looking—integrity is not about mere compliance with the UCMJ
- Honor requires that we support those who are vulnerable, rather than seeing them as an opportunity
- Rape is not wrong because it’s a crime: it’s a crime because it is wrong.
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Definitions

- Rape: Intercourse and/or penetration without consent and by force. Includes oral and anal.
- Attempted rape: Assailant tried but failed to penetrate by force and/or without consent. Includes oral and anal.
- Sexual Assault. Includes broader range of behaviors including touching intimate areas.
The Original One in Four Study

- Koss, Gidycz & Wisniewski (1987)
- 6,000 college students
- 32 college campuses nationwide.
- 15% of college women experienced rape since turning 14 years old.
- 12% experienced attempted rape since turning 14.

Lifetime Incidence of Rape

- CDC, 1995
- Rape. Did not assess attempted rape.
- 5,000 women, 138 campuses. They didn’t look at attempted rape, only rape.
- 20% said they had been forced to submit to sexual intercourse against their will and/or by force.
### Viewing Studies Together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Koss et al. 1987</th>
<th>CDC, 1995</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted</td>
<td>+12%</td>
<td>+?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Sexual Victimization of College Women

- Fisher, Cullen & Turner; US Department of Justice, 2006
- Page 11, 3.1% of undergraduates survived rape or attempted rape during one academic year (6-7 months).
- Page 18, 10.1% survived rape prior to college. 10.9% survived attempted rape prior to college. (no overlap between these numbers).

\[3.1 + 10.1 + 10.9 = 24.1\%\]
## Viewing Studies Together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Koss</th>
<th>CDC</th>
<th>DOJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Rape =</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Attempt =</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Year Rape/Att =</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total =</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Specify Alcohol and #s Go Up

- Mohler-Kuo, Dowdall, Koss & Weschler, 2004
- 25,000 college women nationwide
- Included incidents where women were incapacitated due to alcohol.
- 4.7% experienced rape during an academic year.
Sexual Assault (MST) In the Military

- 28% of women veterans experienced rape or attempted rape during their military service.

- 96% of the perpetrators were members of the military (Sadler, Booth & Doebbeling, 2005).

- A review of all studies of rape in the military concluded that most studies find rates between 20% and 43% (Suris & Lind, 2008).

In The Fleet

- 39% of women who enlist in the Navy have experienced rape or attempted rape prior to their service. This is well over twice as high as the national victimization rate (Stander, Merrill, Thomsen, Crouch & Milner, 2008).

- 13% of men enlisting in the Navy report perpetrating rape or attempted rape prior to their service; a rate twice as high as the 6-9% national average (Abbey & McAuslan, 2004; Lisak & Miller; 2002; Stander, Merrill, Thomsen, Crouch & Milner, 2008).
Sexual Assault on the Yard

- All women at the USNA in April 2004 were asked “Since becoming a midshipman, has someone done any of the following to you without your consent and against your will?
- Touched, stroked or fondled your private parts
- Physically attempted to have sexual intercourse with you, but was not successful
- Physically attempted to have oral or anal sex with you, but was not successful
- Had sexual intercourse with you
- Had Oral sex with you
- Had anal sex with you

USNA

Women
- 83/670 (12%) said yes.
- Approximately 92% of offenders were other midshipmen.

Men
- 26/1046 (2.5%) of said yes.
- Approximately 87% were other midshipmen.
Research on the Different Approaches used in the SHAPE Program

John D. Foubert, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Oklahoma State University

Belief System Theory

To produce lasting attitude change, interventions must be designed to maintain people's existing self-conceptions

(Grube, Maylon & Ball-Rokeach, 1984)
Elaboration Likelihood Model

Behavior Change is Most Likely When People Are:

- Motivated to hear the message
- Can Understand it Well
- Perceive it as Personally Relevant

(Petty & Cacioppo, 1986)
Bystander Intervention

More likely to intervene when:
- Have relevant skills/experience
- Certain how to intervene
- Cost is low
- Victim/perpetrator relationship
- Awareness
- Prior commitment to help
- Sense of responsibility
- Believe victim is not to blame
- Seen others role model it

Bystander Intervention and Victim Blaming

Bystander intervention programs lead to increases in attitude change, an increased sense of self-efficacy in ones ability to intervene, and increases in reports of intervening in real life situations over time (Banyard, Moynihan & Plante, 2007).

When women blame themselves for experiencing rape, it increases their risk for experiencing rape an additional time, (Miller, Markman, & Handley, 2007).

Women Only Sessions

- The more that women can recognize threatening cues in a situation that could turn into a sexual assault situation, the more likely they could be to resist or escape (Turchik, Probst, Chau, Nigoff, & Gidycz, 2007).

- Women who are revictimized have been shown to be less able to recognize danger signals present in situations that could turn into a rape, thus, risk reduction programs should include training on potential danger signals in men and dangerous situations (Wilson, Calhoun, & Bernat, 1999).

Effects of One in Four Program

- Fraternity men who saw The One in Four committed fewer sexually coercive acts (M = .05) during their first year of college than fraternity men who did not see it (M = .40), F (1, 109) = 4.06, p < .05.

References:
Qualitative: 2 Years Later

79% of participants reported either attitude or behavior change due to the program’s effects or that the program reinforced their current beliefs.

Comments 2 years Later

- There was one time when a friend was going to engage in sexual activity with a girl who was really drunk. Me and a couple of other guys intervened because the girl seemed out of it (also, she was another friend's sister). They ended up not having sex.
- Mostly as a result of the One in Four program I am very cautious about initiating any kind of sexual activity while under the influence of alcohol.
- My attitude is pretty much to avoid alcohol mixing with sex and One in Four definitely helped me commit to that idea.
- I have helped a girl friend get out of a potentially scary situation.
- Yes. Drunk girl asked me to take her home, then tried to hookup with me and I said no.
Yes, I have refused sex with a girl who was asking for it but was more drunk that I was.

I have been more aware not only of my own sobriety, but of the sobriety of the girl and acted accordingly by suggesting that we're both too drunk.

Yes - A woman had consumed alcohol, and although she wasn't passing out drunk and seemed coherent, we refrained from sexual activity. Regardless of my personal views of rape and alcohol, I'm aware that situations can easily be misconstrued and get out of control, and I don't want to risk having that happen to a woman, or me.

Yes, I turned down sex because the girl was very intoxicated. She thanked me afterward and things progressed how I wanted them to.
Sexual Harassment
Prevention

Sexual Harassment: Definition

“unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and deliberate or repeated offensive comments or gestures of a sexual nature when submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of a person’s job, pay, or career submission to or rejection of such conduct by a person is used as the basis for career or employment decisions affecting the person; or such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual’s work performance or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment.”
Key Concepts

To be sexual harassment, the behavior must be:

- Sexual or gendered in nature
- Unwelcome
- In the workplace, **broadly defined**
- Unreasonably interferes with work or study

UCMJ language

- The conduct is so severe or pervasive that a reasonable person would perceive, and the victim does perceive, the work environment as hostile or offensive.
Someone in the same position as the target of the harassment.

Sexual harassment includes "any use or condonation, by any person in a supervisory or command position, of any form of sexual behavior to control, influence, or affect the career, pay, or job of a member of the armed forces or a civilian employee of the Department of Defense."
Research Findings

“Units in which members report leadership takes a strong stand against sexual harassment, protects targets, and levies punitive sanctions against offenders have less sexual harassment as well as more satisfied and committed personnel in general.” (Fitzgerald, et al., 1997 study of military sexual harassment).

Connection between Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault

“Women working with superiors who made sexually demeaning comments or allowed such behavior were found to have a nearly four-fold risk of rape while in the military.” (Sadler, et al., 2003).
Future Officer Take Home Message:

One of the best things you can do to avoid a wide variety of problems and foster good working relationships among those in your command (and consequent unit cohesion) is to model an attitude of respect for all persons under your leadership and insist that all others do the same.
Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Prevention: Addressing Tough Questions

May, 2008

Gail Stern
John Foubert
Christopher Kilmartin

Consultants to the United States Naval Academy
Sensitivity
With all this political correctness and oversensitivity, it’s gotten so we can’t say anything. It’s best if males and females stay away from each other, especially mids”.

- So let’s talk about what you wish you could say and what you think you can’t say.
- What’s the goal of saying those things? What is the impact of it?
- Are any of those things appropriate for a work environment?
- Is everything sexual appropriate for a work environment? How do you know, how do you make those decisions?
- Best if males and females stay away from each other? Are you saying that, as a male, you can’t be trusted around a female mid? What does that say about your ability to lead your subordinates in the fleet? How are you going to lead someone whom you have no contact with?
- Give me an example of crude humor that’s “fair game” and crude humor that’s intimidating.
- You’re too sensitive=I’m right; you’re wrong. It’s like saying, “you shouldn’t be angry” when you are. It’s a way of avoiding responsibility for the impact of your actions.

“That’s just how guys talk. Girls need to get a thicker skin and be stronger. No one’s going to coddle them when they get out into the Fleet or Marine Corps”.

- So why don’t we use racial slurs anymore?
- Do you think there were folks who, after the Navy was integrated, were saying, “Look, you’re lucky you’re here, we barely have to tolerate you anyway, but you’re not going to control the way we talk and think about you. Toughen up.” Why is it different for women?
- Why did folks use slurs against minorities? What was the point? (power, dominance, it was socially acceptable at one time, wasn’t it?) What kind of impact do you think that had on sailors during that era? Do you think a lot of people used epithets and made racial jokes without thinking about the impact? Did that lessen the impact? So what do you think Blacks felt over time, working and living in an environment like that? Do you think they were told to toughen up? After all, they fought for the right to be there, and not be coddled?
- Do you think some people joke around to be social? How do you decide if something is wrong? How do you decide what goes too far, if anything? (e.g., if its hurtful
- What is principled, or what qualities of a leader are present if we tolerate an unprofessional working environment?
- Derogatory comments about women are designed to intimidate them. To say in effect, “you are here by my permission, and I can revoke that permission.”
• Toughening up: is there a distinction between what is challenging and may help someone toughen up, and something that is humiliating and intimidating?

“I’ve heard some pretty raunchy stuff from females too. No one ever calls that sexual harassment”.
• Raunchy stuff is inappropriate regardless of who says it, in a professional environment.
• What’s the difference between raunchy and intimidating?
• Sexual harassment has to do either with power, or with creating what is called a hostile work environment. So let’s talk about “what ifs.”
• Sexual harassment has three criteria: sexual in nature, unwanted, and in the workplace (broadly defined as being any interaction, even if not in the physical workplace, that might have an effect on the workplace). If you have a group in the workplace who like to tell dirty jokes and talk about sex, the Navy and the Federal government has no interest in stopping you. But, you need to make sure that it’s not unwanted.

“Female officers feel they have more to prove so they act more harsh and unreasonable. But then they want special treatment and everyone to tiptoe around them”.
Do you think that female officers have more to prove? Why? Because often, if a female officer fails to meet a standard, it is considered to reflect on all women. If a male mid fails, nobody says, “I guess men can’t be officers.”
To female mids: do you want people to tiptoe around you?
Parallel with racism: is using the N-word wrong because some black people are too sensitive and just want to be tiptoed around? No, it’s wrong because it’s hurtful, intimidating, and humiliating. (Racism can be used as a parallel for sexism because most people know that they’re not supposed to be racist, but we don’t have to have a contest on which is worse. They both harm people.)

Risk Reduction=Rape Prevention
“If the girl makes the decision to get so inebriated that she is raped, she assumed the risk. It’s just like the person who smokes accepts the risk of cancer or a person who drives a car accepts the risk of a car accident”.
What are the natural consequences of drinking too much? Hangover, nausea, embarrassment if you have done something stupid while drunk. Does someone deserve to be raped if they get drunk? To the males: raise your hand if you’ve ever drank too much. Did you deserve to be raped? Do you deserve to be robbed if you dress well?
If you leave your Ipod on the seat of your car and forget to lock the door, and someone takes it, is that a crime? At what point does it become not a crime? (when you say, “you can have my Ipod.”). Just as it takes less effort for a thief to steal your IPod when you leave your car unlocked, it takes less effort for a rapist to rape a woman if she is drunk, but reduction of effort does not equal reduction of responsibility.
“I would never put myself in the position of getting raped . . .
- So I don’t have to worry about my risk.
Rape is the decision of the rapist, and nobody has complete control over another person’s behavior. You can resist, but resistance can sometimes be overcome.

“What if the two people are into rough sex or S & M? How is the guy supposed to know that she really was saying no?”

People who are into rough sex have an agreement about what they can or cannot do with each other, and they have a “safe word” that means “stop.”

**It Doesn’t Happen Here**

“One in four? You can make statistics say anything you want. I don’t know anybody who has been raped”.

- It is absolutely true that many people manipulate statistics to make them support their biased conclusions. If I were to stand outside a rape crisis center and ask women entering to report whether they had ever experienced rape I could easily come up with a statistic like “One in Four” – probably a lot higher even. However, that is not how the one in four statistic was discovered.

- It was found through several studies of thousands of college women on hundreds of college campuses nationwide.

- These women answered anonymous surveys about their experiences and had no reason to do anything but report their experiences accurately – they were just answering anonymous surveys and turned it in to researchers. The One in Four statistic has been found ever since the 1980s all the way through the current decade.

- A lot of people don’t think they know someone who has been raped. It may be that no individual you know has told you that they have. Research also shows that almost half of those who experience rape tell absolutely nobody about their experience. The most common person they tell is a friend. If they do tell you, I hope you will support your friend.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

Koss, Gidycz & Wisniewski published a study in 1987 where they interviewed approximately 6,000 college students on 32 college campuses nationwide. They asked several questions covering a wide range of behaviors. From this study 15% of college women answered “yes” to questions that met the legal definition of rape. 12% of women answered “yes” to questions meeting the legal definition of attempted rape, thus the statistic One in Four.

In 1995 the CDC replicated part of this study. They didn’t look at attempted rape, only rape. They found that 20% of approximately 5,000 women on 138 college campuses experienced rape during the course of their lifetime. Had they asked about attempted rape, it is surely likely that they would have reached the One in Four proportion.

In 2000 and again in 2006, the US Dept of Justice did a study called The Sexual Victimization of College Women. To see this study for yourself, enter “The Sexual Victimization of College Women” into google. The study will come up as a pdf. The authors are Fisher, Cullen and Turner. If you look at page 11, you will see that among college women, 2.8% (3.1% of undergraduates) reported surviving rape or attempted rape during one academic year (about
6-7 months). If you look at Exhibit 7, page 18 of the report, you will see that 10.1% of college women reported experiencing rape prior to entering college. 10.9% reported attempted rape prior to college. Note by reading the report that there is no overlap between these numbers. Add 3%, 10% and 11% and you get 24% or the proportion one in four. That is a main source the One in Four statistic.

When you look at other studies of the annual incidence of rape and attempted rape, others find it to be closer to 5%, suggesting that the 1in4 statistic may be an underestimate of the prevalence of rape. For example, Mohler-Kuo, Dowdall, Koss & Weschler found in a study of approximately 25,000 college women nationwide that 4.7% experienced rape during a single academic year. This study did not measure lifetime incidence of rape or attempted rape.

“This stuff (sexual harassment or sexual assault) doesn’t happen here. The selection process is so complete. But I see it could be a problem on a college campus.”

It can surely be tempting to believe that sexual assault doesn’t happen here at the academy. It would be nice to think that. There are a lot of things that happen at the Academy that take place even though we would hope they don’t despite our selection process. Can you think of things that happen here even though we have a selections process? What are some (Get audience to come up with them, they include academic dishonesty/cheating, physical altercations/fights, racial incidents, and even rape).

However, an anonymous survey published just a few years ago that was completed by 97% of all the women at the Naval Academy found that it actually does happen here. In this anonymous survey reported on by the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, it was found that 12% of female midshipmen at the Academy experienced sexual assault. In addition, 66% experienced sexual harassment. That is just while they were here at the Academy and does not include prior experiences.

**False Reporting Part II: ALCOHOL**

“If the accuser was drunk and can’t remember anything, how can she say it was sexual assault? She could have wanted it and shown the guy that she did. Giving the accuser a blank slate to cry rape isn’t fair to guys”.

That is actually a pretty easy question. If she was so drunk that she was blacked out, there was no way that she was sober enough to legally consent to intercourse. That makes it sexual assault for sure. If she woke up and found signs in her body that someone had intercourse with her, she is likely to then try to figure out who did. She might look to see who is around her when she wakes up, what others tell her about who she was around the night before, or what her last memory was. But if she can’t remember anything, there is no way she could meet the legal standard necessary for consent.

As for whether she wanted it, if you think about it, someone can’t want something that is forced upon them. One can think about what it would be like to be in a situation where you are “forced” to do something; however stop and think about it. The meaning of force includes being pushed into doing something you DO NOT want to do. How can somebody on the one hand “Want” to be sexually assaulted when part of sexual assault involves “force” --- a word that involves something, by definition, which is not wanted? Do you see what I mean? As for giving an accuser a blank slate to cry rape and that not being fair to guys, I used to think that too, but then I thought about what survivors go through, and realized that it’s rarely worth it to lie. Making a false accusation isn’t fair to anyone, male or female. It is also extremely rare.
A study released in 2006 (Archimbault et al, 2006) found that 2-4% of rapes reported to the police were false reports. That’s REALLY low. Also, in order to prove a rape allegation, a survivor has to endure many things that could include rejection by some of her friends or family, a hospital visit that is extremely thorough long and painful, telling many different investigators and others involved with the judicial process about what happened over and over again, having to have contact with the accused on multiple occasions, facing people who blame her for what happened, and people who ostracize her for being too naïve, too slutty, or too clueless to know what was going to happen in her future. Not many women I know would choose to go through that kind of re-victimization unless something really awful happened to them.

“How does someone know what a reasonable amount of alcohol is before the other person can’t consent? It’s a guessing game and it’s too easy to use that as a way to cry rape falsely afterwards”.

You can’t know how much is a reasonable amount of alcohol for another person to consent. There are too many factors to consider. You can be fairly sure that one drink and the other person can consent. You can also be certain that if the other person has had a dozen drinks that they cannot consent. Guys tend to want to hear an absolute rule about how much alcohol is OK before a woman can no longer consent to sex. Stop and think about what you are asking. How many drinks can she have before I am raping her? How many drinks can she have before I risk hurting someone? How many drinks can she have before I commit a felony? I know that when I’m drunk, I’ll do a lot of things that I wouldn’t do sober. I also know that when I’m drunk and I want to hook up, I’m tempted to take almost any sign of interest from a woman as a chance to hook up. Now that I’ve been studying sexual assault for awhile, I realize now that when I’m drunk, I do a terrible job of figuring out if a woman is consenting. I don’t know about you, but one thing I’ve noticed when I’m hanging around at a party is that when guys drink, they tend to feel a lot braver about approaching a woman they want to hook up with – a lot more than when they are sober. In talking with a bunch of my friends and hearing about the stuff that goes on, I’ve also noticed that there are some guys who are really clueless when it comes to reading women. Actually, I guess I’m one of those guys sometimes – I don’t know what they mean half the time when they’re talking, let alone what their body language means. So anyway, one of the things I’ve noticed is that not only do some guys feel a lot braver about approaching women when they are drunk, these guys also have basically no chance of reading their body language. What I worry about sometimes is the guys who really want to hook up, who get drunk, who get a woman alone, who have no clue what her body language means, who have no idea what consent is, and then push ahead when they see the first sign they interpret as a yes – “She smiled at me; YES! she wants me. Let’s do it.” They also just don’t even get it when a woman pushes him away or says “I want to go home” when she means “get the hell away from me” or “yeah, kiss me but keep your hands off my butt.” Ask crowd which rule they think is best – when they’re trying to figure out if a woman is sober enough to consent 1) when in doubt, don’t or 2) When in doubt, do anything as long as you think you can beat the charges and avoid getting kicked out of school and doing jail time. Ask what they think would be best for the man and for the woman in the short term and in the long term.

False Reporting

“Why shouldn’t the accuser get punished for their misconduct or for making a false accusation, especially after the case was shown to be false”? 
In criminal trials, the standard of proof is “beyond a reasonable doubt.” Often this standard is interpreted to mean “90-95%” certain, based on the evidence. “Charges dropped” or “not guilty” does not equal “accuser lied,” only that there was not enough evidence to sustain the charge beyond a reasonable doubt. O.J. Simpson was not convicted in criminal court, but that doesn’t mean that he was falsely accused. In civil court, where the standard of proof is lower (“clear and convincing evidence,” which is often interpreted as 75% or more certain), he was found to be responsible for the deaths of his ex-wife and her companion. The standard of proof for a criminal prosecution of a false accuser is the same, and false accusers are criminally responsible if a prosecutor can prove that the allegation was false beyond a reasonable doubt.

Again, however, we should repeat that our focus is to prevent sexual assault and harassment. False accusations occur, but those incidents are very rare compared with the number of victims who never report and the number of rapists who are never brought to justice. A study released in 2006 (Archimbault et al, 2006) found that 2-4% of rapes reported to the police were false reports. That’s REALLY low. Also, in order to prove a rape allegation, a survivor has to endure many things that could include rejection by some of her friends or family, a hospital visit that is extremely thorough long and painful, telling many different investigators and others involved with the judicial process about what happened over and over and again, having to have contact with the accused on multiple occasions, facing people who blame her for what happened, and people who ostracize her for being too naïve, too slutty, or too clueless to know what was going to happen in her future. Not many women I know would choose to go through that kind of re-victimization unless something really awful happened to them.

If audience members begin to ask about studies and how data were collected, say “we can’t go into all the details of the study’s methods, but if you’re interested, we will get the study and send it to you. Trainers can then email the consultants, who will send it.

“**The Duke case showed that girls cry rape and the system is dead-set on sticking it to the accused**”.

Again, we do not know the facts of the Duke case. Charges are dropped because there is not enough evidence to go forward with the trial. Criminal defense attorneys can talk to the media all they want; prosecutors cannot until after the trial (in fact, the prosecutor in the Duke case was disbarred because he broke this rule). Therefore, the public often gets a one-sided view of the case from the perspective of the defense. If the system is “dead-set” on sticking it to the accused, it is doing a really poor job, as the estimates are that the vast majority of rapists never serve even a single day in jail.

Rape is the most underreported crime. Only 5% of rapes are ever reported to police. About 2% of reports are false reports. That means that, of 1000 rapes, 50 are reported, and one is a false report, so for every false report, there are 950 unreported rapes.

“**Kobe Bryant’s reputation and endorsement deals were hurt because someone decided to cry rape and then changed her mind**”.

The Kobe Bryant case is a good example of how dropped charges are not the same as false accusation. The charges were dropped because the victim was intimidated (death threats) and perhaps paid off. But, afterwards, here was Kobe Bryant’s statement: “I do not question the motives of this young woman…I now understand that she sincerely feels that she was a victim of rape…Although I truly believe [his penetration of her, which he said was “sex”] was consensual, I recognize now that she did not and does not view this incident the same way I did.” (Reid, 2004, September 3, A1, A8).
If she saw it differently, what does that mean he did?

Here is some information from Attorney Anne Munch, who was involved with the prosecution during the Kobe Bryant case:

- Victim encouraged to report, does not call police. Her parent calls the next day at noon after mom is called home because of distraught daughter
- 2 tears 1 cm in length to posterior forchette plus several pinpoint injuries
- Bruises on neck due to strangulation act during forced sexual intercourse
- Evidence of large blood smear on defendants clothing
- Suspect lies to police and says no sex
- Suspect (married) then changes story to claim consensual sex
- Suspect admits to his hand around her neck during assault
- Victim had to move to 5 states to avoid attorneys and press.
- Psychologist offered to sell her confidential records to the press
- Hundreds of death threats, two resulting in arrests and jail for two different men
- Could not drive home to see her parents unless disguised
- Was on the cover of The Globe (tabloid newspaper) four times.
- After 14 months, the victim could not take it any more. Could you?

The quote again: “I do not question the motives of this young woman…I now understand that she sincerely feels that she was a victim of rape…Although I truly believe [his penetration of her, which he said was “sex”] was consensual, I recognize now that she did not and does not view this incident the same way I did.”

Translation: “I raped that woman.” There can be no consent if it is not shared (con=with in Latin). So Kobe Bryant, although he is not a convicted rapist, is an admitted rapist.
Only about a year afterwards, Kobe Bryant was returned to his endorsement deals with Nike and others and has suffered very little long term damage to his endorsement deals, etc. Compare the “suffering” of this multi-millionaire to that of the victim, who received death threats, had to disguise herself to avoid tabloid reporters, was featured on the front page of tabloids several times, and no doubt suffered psychologically in the aftermath of the attack and legal processes.

Many people believe that women cry rape to save themselves from embarrassment when they engage in behavior they later regretted, but we should ask ourselves this: have I or anyone I know ever walked into a police station or called law enforcement and accused someone of a very serious felony because I made an error in judgment the night before? If I lost a lot of money in a poker game because I kind of lost my head, would I walk into a police station and accuse the other players of robbing me?

We know from the Kobe Bryant case, and the Duke case, and any case that does not come to trial, that we do not know all the facts.