Gender, Athlete Status, and Bystander Intervention in Situations of Sexual Violence

A Thesis

Presented to the

Graduate Faculty of the

University of Louisiana at Lafayette

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

Deborah L. Hill

Summer 2014

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Gender, Athlete Status, and Bystander Intervention in Situations of Sexual Violence

Deborah L. Hill

APPROVED:

Amy Brown, Chair Assistant Professor of Psychology	Rick Perkins Associate Professor of Psychology
Scott Smith Assistant Professor of Psychology	Mary Farmer-Kaiser Interim Dean of the Graduate School

Table of Contents

Introduction

Imagine you are (or are once again) a typical college student, and you have made it your duty to uphold one of the most time-honored traditions of your collegiate community: attending a house party. You head off to the party, looking forward to a night of fun and festivities, a night void of worry and anxiety. You meet up with your friends and head over to the house of one of your fellow athletes, a baseball player. You begin to enjoy yourself at the social gathering, partaking in the youthful revelry and passively observing those around you. You notice all sorts of typical college party behaviors (drinking, promiscuity, etc.), but nothing dramatically harmful. Just as you are about to leave, however, you overhear a conversation in which a partygoer says, "yea, there's a girl in that room hooking up with a bunch of baseball guys." What would you do? Is it a big deal? Would you immediately go investigate? Would you mind your own business? Would you anonymously tip off local authorities? How would you have determined if it was even an emergency? Maybe the girl wanted to be there; maybe the partygoer was misinformed. If you decided it was an emergency, and subsequently went to investigate, what would you do when you were faced with partially veiled French doors, nine college baseball players and a semi-conscious 17-year-old female being sexually assaulted? What would you do if, when you tried to intervene, and the door literally got slammed in your face? What would you have done in this situation?

On March 3, 2007, April Grolle, Lauren Chief Elk, and Lauren Bryeans were faced with that exact situation and they chose to intervene. Grolle, Chief Elk, and Bryeans were friends and teammates on the De Anza College Women's Soccer team and could not have imagined what they would have to face that fateful night, as they intervened in the group sexual assault of a 17-year-old female partygoer (Roberts, Redmond, & Tomaselli, 2009a;

"Witnesses to Alleged," 2007). Earlier that night, the girls had noticed the eventual victim, but the interaction was passive and casual. One of the girls noticed and briefly commented on the eventual victim's necklace and returned to an unrelated conversation. Later on, however, when Grolle, Chief Elk, and Bryeans overheard someone saying there was a girl in one of the bedrooms with several baseball players, the ensuing interaction became anything but passive and casual. The girls peered through the veiled French doors to the bedroom and witnessed an assailant thrusting on top of the female victim as she lay unconscious (Roberts et. al, 2009a; "Witnesses to Alleged," 2007). When they tried to enter the room, the girls were stopped by one of the men in the room: "she wants to be here," he said (Roberts et al., 2009). The girls were not going to be turned away, however, and they forced their way into the gruesome scene. The victim lay semi-conscious with her pants and underwear hastily pulled around one ankle, vomit dripping from her face (the vomit was later confirmed to be one of the assailants' and not her own). As the girls gathered the 17-year-old, they had to scoop the vomit out of her mouth so she could breathe properly and carry her out of the house with her feet dragging, as she could not bear her own weight. Grolle, Cheif Elk, and Bryeans then took the victim to the hospital to be treated. All of these heroic actions took place as plenty of capable men and women stood by and watched (Roberts et al., 2009a, Roberts, Redmond, & Tomaselli, 2009b; "Witnesses to Alleged," 2007).

This real life incident, and the many more like it, should have us demanding answers. Why did three out-numbered and easily overpowered female soccer players choose to intervene in an emergency situation? Why did everyone else choose *not* to intervene, especially the individuals in the room? Why did the group of baseball players choose to sexually victimize that 17-year-old girl? What situational variables lead to the creation of the

emergency situation? Does being a male college athlete make one more likely to perpetuate sexual violence? Does being a female athlete make one more likely to intervene in an emergency situation? The answers to these questions have overwhelming implications that will contribute to our knowledge of bystander intervention in situations of sexual violence. Contributing to this knowledge base could potentially help the development of interventions designed to diminish the incidence and prevalence of sexual violence on college campuses, a challenging yet worthy undertaking. The scope of this challenge can only be truly appreciated within the context of the contemporary literature on the prevalence and incidence of sexual violence on college campuses, theories on bystander intervention, and how student athletes are or can be related to it all.

Prevalence of Sexual Violence on College Campuses

It is important to note that in discussing sexual victimization and sexual violence, this research will henceforth consistently refer to males as the perpetrators and females as the victims. Although it is acknowledged that males are also victims of sexual violence and females can also be potential perpetrators, the overwhelming majority of sexual violence victims are in fact female and the overwhelming majority of sexual violence perpetrators are in fact males (Katz, 2006). The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence survey indicates that approximately 1 in 5 women will experience rape whereas less then 2% of men will experience rape (Black et al., 2011). Less than 1% of rape is perpetrated by women, meaning over 99% of rape is perpetrated by men (Katz, 2006). It is importing to distinguish between the ideas that "all men are perpetrators" and "most perpetrators are men;" this research is assuming the latter.

Before beginning a discussion on the statistics of sexual violence it is imperative we note a tragic reality about the numbers. Because of a tradition of victim blame, misunderstandings regarding the prevalence of false reports, and social desirability, incidents of sexual violence are wildly underreported. Some research indicates rape, in particular, is *the* most underreported crime in America (Kilpatrick, Edumunds, & Seymour, 1992; Kilpatrick, Resnick, Ruggiero, Conoscenti, & McCauley, 2007). It has been estimated that only 1 in 6 women report their rape to authorities. Relevant to the college campus environment, less than 1 in 20 college women reported their experience with rape to authorities (Kilpatrick, et al., 1992; Kilpatrick et al., 2007). Some estimate the actual prevalence of sexual assault to be as much as 10 times higher than is even reported by national statistics (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987). Part of this may be due to the social desirability response bias, or the idea that participants might respond in accordance to what the socially desirable answer may be rather than the truth. For example a sexual predator may not admit to his/her habits due to the fact that society does not hold his predatory behavior in high esteem. Additionally, a victim might have been subjected to victim blame, which could potentially encourage her to remain quiet on the matter. When we consume statistical information regarding sexual violence on college campuses it is important to note that sexual victimization rates may be higher than our research has the ability to indicate.

Regarding the incidence data that is actually reported, the research indicates there is a specific age demographic worth focusing on. The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey reported in 2010 that nearly 37% of female rape victims experienced their incident between the ages 18-24, which is the largest percentage of any age group (Black et

al., 2011).[1] In another study, 4.7% of college women reported experiencing forced sexual assault and 19% percent indicated they had experienced either attempted or completed rape since entering college (Krebs, Lindquist, Warner, Fisher, & Martin, 2009). As a sample, college students are not only relatively accessible, but in this case they are undeniably relevant as well.

With this data in mind, the natural question might be "what is it about the college campus environment that lends itself to such propensity for sexual violence?" From a more global perspective, people in general may hold certain attitudes that contribute to environments conducive to sexual violence. Rape myth acceptance is one construct that may help elucidate some of these attitudes. Rape myth acceptance includes some beliefs like "when girls say no they are just teasing or playing hard to get," "it can't be called rape if she didn't actually say no or the manner in which she did was unclear or ambiguous," or "women who dress suggestively are the ones who get raped" (McMahon, 2007; 2010; Payne, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999). These beliefs justify sexually violent behavior by perpetuating incorrect information about what qualifies as sexual violence. Another attitude construct that has been discussed in sexual violence research is ambivalent sexism, which is subdivided into hostile and benevolent sexism. Hostile sexism can be described as overtly negative attitudes and opinions toward women. Benevolent sexism superficially reflects a positive evaluation of women, but contributes to the undermining of efforts toward equality. An example of hostile sexism might be the attitude that women are inherently lesser than men. An example of a benevolent sexist attitude might be that women are delicate and should be put on a pedestal (Glick & Fisk, 1996).

---

[1] Age ranges and percentages in this report were: 10 years or younger (12.3%), 11-17 years (29.9%), 18-24 years (37.4%), 25-34 years (14.2%), 35-44 years (4.5%), 45+ (1.7%).

It is important to note that a significant majority of sexual assaults are perpetrated by someone known to the victim (i.e. not the shadowy figure in the dark alley that they have all been taught to fear) (Black et al. 2011; Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000; Katz, 2006; Kilpatrick et al., 1992). In fact, some estimate that only 20% of rape cases are considered stranger rape. Particularly, college campuses have a heightened problem with acquaintance rape with a reported 90% of cases involving someone known the victim, in some cases in the form of date rape (Fisher et al., 2000; Katz, 2006, p. 150). Another common form of sexual assault involves incapacitation, which may be defined as an "unwanted sexual act involving oral, anal or vaginal penetration that occurs after the victim voluntarily uses drugs or alcohol. The victim is passed out or awake but too drunk or high to know what she is doing or to control her behavior" (Kilpatrick et al., 2007, p. 10). Incapacitated sexual assault is an especially relevant situation on or near college campuses as they are often environments heavily fraught with drug and alcohol consumption (Krebs et al., 2009). It is worthwhile to note that an issue with incapacitation and consent is that many male college students are unaware or have a misunderstanding of the meaning (both functional and legislative) of consent and what *actually* is considered consent (McMahon, 2007; 2010).

In addition to date rape and incapacitated rape, there is an interesting dialogue regarding athletic participation and even sports culture as contributing to the prevalence of sexual violence on college campuses. Male athletes have been overwhelmingly implicated as a group on college campuses who are at risk for sexual violence perpetration (Foubert & Perry, 2007; Humphrey & Kahn, 2000; McMahon, 2007; Moynihan, Banyard, Arnold, Eckstein & Stapleton, 2010; McMahon & Farmer, 2009; Murnen & Kohlman, 2007). Additionally, in an unpublished master's thesis, Rebecca Minton discusses the idea that even

just the sport culture on college campuses may also create an environment conducive to sexual violence. In her analysis of 140 college institutions, Minton (2012) reported that there was a significant positive relationship between sports culture and sexual assault (on campuses of 15,000+ students). One explanation is that institutions high in sport culture produce an atmosphere of hypermasculinity. Contributions to this masculine atmosphere include: prevalence of rape myth acceptance; conceptualization of the male body as a weapon; entitlement of male athletes; sexual segregation; degradation of values associated with femininity; and the disenfranchisement, sexualization, and objectification of female athletes (especially cheerleaders) (Minton, 2012; Murnen & Kohlman, 2007). Interestingly, Minton (2012) suggests that it is not just college athletes that are influenced by this sports culture but that non-athlete fans can be influenced by this culture of hypermasculinization as well.

Armed with some of the major theoretical and statistical data regarding the prevalence of sexual violence on college campuses, the focus can now shift to what we can do to prevent these instances. Prevention strategies are aimed at diminishing the potential for an incident to occur. Given that most incidents typically occur in highly populated situations (dorms, parties, etc), targeting the bystander population has proven to be a rather effective strategy on college campuses.

Prosocial Theory and Bystander Intervention

Theory on helping and prosocial behavior sets the foundation for the bystander intervention model. Helping can be defined as "an action that has consequences of providing some benefit to or improving the well being of another person" (Dovidio, Piliavin, Schroeder, & Penner, 2006, p. 22). If we can figure out why helping occurs then we can

hopefully manipulate its frequency. This concept has obvious implications for improving our social environment. Defining prosocial behavior involves a slightly different take. Dovidio et al. (2006) describe prosocial behavior as "interactions between a benefactor (or helper) and someone being helped" (p. 21). The term "interaction" might suggest that there are multiple behaviors (coming from both the receiver and the helper) that are factored into how a situation might be experienced. It would serve us well to investigate both the behavior of the receiver of help and the person providing help to fully understand the nature of prosocial behavior.

Prosocial behavior has important implications specifically regarding bystander intervention. Bystander intervention (and its antagonist, bystander non-intervention) became a popular research venture due in large part to the work of Bibb Latané and John Darley. Interestingly, Latané and Darley's work was initiated by the public reaction to the infamous Kitty Genovese murder. Kitty Genovese was sexually assaulted and murdered in the doorway of her apartment building as an estimated 30+ people were aware of the incident and did not provide help. The poignancy of the Kitty Genovese tragedy cannot be understated as it is one of the first tragedies that initiated popular interest, and subsequently inspired research, like this study, in bystander intervention concerning situations of sexual violence (Dovidio et al., 2006).

There are several ways in which we attempt to explain bystander behavior, some of the more notable explanations involve a decision-making model, the concept of cost-reward analysis, the relationship to the person in need, and situational influences (Dovidio et al., 2006). It is important to note that these explanations are not mutually exclusive; they are

enmeshed in each other and in the global process one goes through when faced with a situation requiring bystander intervention.

The decision-making model. Latané and Darley developed the bystander decision-making model. It involves five successive steps or decisions the bystander must make in order for helping to occur. In order for a bystander to help, they must: notice the event, determine that the event requires help, take responsibility for helping, determine how best to help, and finally, execute a helping action. According to this model, if at any of the five steps the bystander fails to decide appropriately, helping will not occur (Dovidio et al., 2006; Latané & Darley, 1969; 1970). The intricacies of each step in the model are worth noting.

The first step involves the bystander noticing an event; if the bystander never notices the event then they will not be likely to help. A discussion of stimulus overload is helpful in understanding this step. Those who live in a large urban city are often overwhelmed with the sensory experience of their surroundings. These citizens may not notice the cries of someone in pain because they are drowned out by cars honking, jack hammers hammering, and people talking (Dovidio et al., 2006). Another example more specific to the research discussed here involves intoxication. Intoxication involves an array of sensory impairments that can quite conceivably lead to a bystander not noticing an event. One could easily imagine that noticing an event at a college party might be difficult as a result of drug and alcohol consumption.

The second step in the decision-making model involves determining that the event is one that requires help. A good example of this may involve an altercation between an adult and a child, where the adult is pulling on the child, trying to get them into a vehicle while the child is screaming and crying. Assuming the bystander has noticed the event, they must now determine whether this is an incident that requires help or not. Is the adult kidnapping the

child? Or is the child having a tantrum because they do not want to go to the dentist (Dovidio et al., 2006)? This step is also applicable to the college party scene again because of the amount of alcohol available for consumption and thus increased population of bystanders with impaired judgment (Burn, 2009). For example, a partygoer may witness a female being led unwillingly into another room. Is the female being coerced into a sexually violent situation or is she sick and her friend is merely trying to remove her from the chaos for an auditory reprieve? In addition, the abundance of alcohol, and bystanders influenced by said alcohol, may conceivably result in pluralistic ignorance, or the instance where bystanders look to other bystanders to determine what to do and when they discover no one is doing anything they follow the status quo (Burn, 2009).

The third step involves the bystander taking responsibility for intervening in the emergency situation. Latané and Darley discuss diffusion of responsibility as a barrier to intervention at this stage. Diffusion of responsibility is a concept that suggests that the greater the number of fellow bystanders, the less an individual feels personally responsibility for intervening in an emergency situation (Burn, 2009; Latané & Darley, 1969, 1970). Another factor influencing a bystander's perceived responsibility involves their relationship to the potential victim or perpetrator (Burn, 2009). A similar effect may be applied to bystanders of the same "in-group" as the victims, where bystanders belonging to the same in-group may also feel more responsibility to intervene (Burn, 2009). A good example of this is found in the evidence that suggests women, in general, report more willingness to intervene in sexually violent situations (females are more willing to help fellow female victims). Another factor that may influence bystanders' feelings of responsibility involves perceptions of victims' worthiness. Specifically concerning sexual violence, bystanders may perceive the

victim as having made choices that may have increased their risk (provocative behavior, intoxication, etc) (Burn, 2009).

The fourth decision to be made in this model involves what type of help to provide in the given situation. Issues arise here when bystanders lack the skills (or perceive they lack the skills) needed to intervene or feel that action might be dangerous for themselves or others (Dovidio et al., 2006; Latané & Darley, 1970, p. 34-35). For example, a bystander may fail to intervene at the scene of a car crash because they have no first responder training or medical expertise. In the case of Kitty Genovese, perhaps some of the bystanders felt that if they had intervened, then they too would have become victims of the knife-wielding perpetrator.

The final step in the decision-making model involves actually enacting a helping behavior. One of the most often reported barriers experienced in this final step involves the concept of audience inhibition. A potential helper may fail to intervene because they feel other bystanders would not support the helping behavior or because they fear the audience may negatively evaluate their behavior. In a track and field event, a bystander may witness an opponent fall but fail to help him up because he fears the negative repercussions from his teammates. In situations of sexual violence, bystanders may fear their involvement may be viewed negatively by others around them (as though it were the couple's business alone). This perceived cost of intervening may outweigh the benefit of helping and lead to nonintervention (Latané & Darley, 1970, p. 29-36).

After reviewing the decision-making model it is easy to understand why helping behavior may be difficult for the general population. However, there is solace to be found in evidence that suggests that once bystanders are made aware of this process and the implications of their helping actions, they are less likely to fall prey to barriers of

intervention, they are more willing to intervene, and they are more confident in their intervention (Banyard, Moynihan & Plante, 2007; Banyard, 2008; Burn, 2009; Foubert, Langhunrichsen-Rohling, Brasfield & Hill, 2010).

Cost-reward analysis. As described by Dovidio et al. (2006), a cost-reward analysis assumes that people are naturally inclined to seek the most benefit for the least amount of harm possible. Bystanders in emergency situations are no different, as they under go a cost-reward analysis when deciding whether or not to intervene. There are two types of cost associated with helping behavior. The cost for helping, which may include physical harm, social disapproval, time, effort, and/or money (Dovidio et al., 2006) and the cost for not helping, which may include the victim's need not being alleviated, feelings of guilt because one didn't help, feelings of distress because of another person's suffering, etc. The rewards for helping can range anywhere from monetary compensation to social benefits like praise, fame, or admiration (Bowes-Sperry & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005; Dovidio et al., 2006). Based on this theory, if the benefits of helping outweigh the costs for helping (as perceived by the bystander) then intervention is likely to occur (Bowes-Sperry & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005; Dovido et al., 2006).

Relationship to the potential victim, group identity, group cohesiveness, and social connectedness. Research suggests there are several facets of the relationship the bystander has with the person in need of help that should be considered when analyzing bystander behavior (Dovidio et al., 2006). For example, interpersonal attraction to the person receiving help may increase bystander helping (Dovidio et al., 2006). Additionally, assuming there is a pre-established relationship between the helper and the person in need, the quality of that relationship has implications as well. As one might expect, the better the quality of the

relationship between the two, the more likely the bystander is to help (Dovidio et al., 2006). Similarly, bystanders are more likely to help those in their same group. This trend can be seen among groups formed by gender, geographical location, culture, race, and even sports team allegiance (Banyard, 2008; Dovidio et al., 2006). In addition to group identity, the cohesiveness of these groups may play a role in bystander intervention; for example a team of athletes may be more likely to help each other (or help each other help others) then a randomly formed group because of the strength of their group cohesiveness. Group cohesiveness also leads to increased responsiveness to social norms, if social responsibility is one of those norms then the group may be more likely to help (Rutkowski, Gruder, & Romer, 1983).

Another construct that has not been extensively researched regarding bystander intervention is social connectedness. Social connectedness has been described as a sense of connectedness (as opposed to emotional distance) between the self and others or society in general (Lee & Robbins, 1995). Though social connectedness has not been looked at in bystander intervention regarding situations of sexual violence, it has been somewhat linked to bystander intervention in bullying. In a study by Eliza Ahmed (2008), school connectedness (a construct very similar to social connectedness) was significantly correlated to likelihood of intervention in situations of bullying. Additionally, social connectedness has been positively correlated with social identity among women (recall that social identity is related to rates of bystander intervention) (Lee & Robbins, 1998). Athlete status has also been correlated with social connectedness with student athletes maintaining greater levels of social connectedness than their non-athlete counterparts (Armstrong & Oomen-Early, 2009).

As mentioned previously, it is important to consider these elements as enmeshed rather than mutually exclusive components of the bystander's decision-making process. For example, a bystander in a situation of sexual violence might consider the costs (backlash from the perpetrator or even victim) and benefits (protecting someone from sexual violence), decide the benefits outweigh the costs, and consequently take responsibility for helping (Latané and Darley's third step in the decision-making model). Perhaps a bystander is evaluating the relationship or similarity to the recipient of help when considering what kind of help to provide (step four in Latané and Darley's decision-making model). For example, if you suspect a neighbor you have met a handful of times is a victim of sexual violence, you may take steps to intervene anonymously (such as calling the police). However, if the victim is a sibling or teammate, the choices for intervention will likely become more immediate and personal (such as verbal or even physical confrontation).

The influence of the social situation. When faced with a confusing situation, it is not uncommon for us to search for clues regarding how we are supposed to act from the other people around us (Dovidio et al., 2006). For example, if you attend a prestigious dinner party and are faced with an obnoxiously confusing display of silverware, you are likely to take the cues from those around you and use these cues in deciding which utensil to use. This phenomenon occurs in bystander situations quite frequently. When an incident occurs, and it is unclear what the behavior protocol is, bystanders may turn to others for guidance (Dovidio et al., 2006). Specifically, given the opportunity to help, when bystanders turn to others and notice they are not helping, this may lead to their inaction as well. Similarly, some bystanders may have a misperception of normative opinion and thus develop their own opinion based off that misperception; we call this pluralistic ignorance. A common example is when college

students assume that their peers binge drink regularly, so they behave in accordance to this perceived norm. In actuality, their peers do not binge drink as much as they assume. Pluralistic ignorance can also occur in an emergency when one does not act because they perceive others' inaction as the social norm or expectation (Dovidio et al., 2006). An example might be that when a bystander sees a homely, unkempt person lying on the sidewalk unconscious, they may assume that others' perceive this person as undeserving of aid and that is why they have remained where they are. Because of this perception, one might fail to help, assuming it is the group expectation, when in reality no such expectation exists.

Why bystander intervention works. With a better understanding of what it means to intervene in a situation, research can now focus on developing the implementation and measurement of bystander intervention models. Though bystander intervention research has traditionally involved general emergency situations, recently there has been a growth in the literature of bystander intervention specifically regarding sexual violence on college campuses (Banyard et al., 2007; Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Garcia, Weaver, Moskowitz, & Darley, 2002; Latané, 1981; Latané & Darley, 1969).

In situations of sexual violence there are potential helpers and potential receivers of help who have to overcome significant barriers for assistance to be provided, making the provision of help both more important and more difficult to provide (Bowes-Sperry & O'leary-Kelly, 2005). Consider for example the college party atmosphere, where the lines of sexual consent are blurred by high rates of alcohol consumption (Krebs et al., 2009; Mohler-Kuo, Dowdall, Koss, & Wechsler, 2004). Evidence indicates that approximately half of all rapes involved alcohol on the part of the victim or perpetrator (Abbey, McAuslan, Zawacki, Clinton, & Buck, 2001; Koss et al., 1987). Some research reports that more than 8.5% of

college women experience incapacitated rape (Krebs et al., 2009) and that incapacitated rape can be severely psychologically damaging in several domains, even as damaging as forcible rape (A. Brown, Testa, & Messman-Moore, 2009; Kilpatrick et al., 2007). As mentioned previously, alcohol consumption might act as a barrier for bystanders as they might not notice an event or they might notice but deem it unworthy of intervention.

Considering the context of a college campus, we can narrow down the different types of rape prevention programs typically available. Some programs are more focused on the potential victim and themed around risk reduction or empathy. Other prevention programs are directed toward potential perpetrators (this approach tends to make participants, men especially, defensive) (Katz, n.d.). Regardless of the audience the program is aimed at, there are certain types of interventions that can be distinguished. Primary prevention programs involve attempts to stop the problem before it really starts, for example targeting rape myth acceptance and sexist attitudes. Secondary prevention programs are conceptualized as prevention programs that recognize the problem exists and focuses on at-risk groups (both at-risk as victim and at-risk as a perpetrator). Tertiary prevention programs involve providing help for those who have already been affected by the issue (McMahon, Postmus, & Koenick 2011). Ideally, we would want to focus our efforts at primary prevention programs, as they can help stop the problem before it starts. Though the bystander intervention model touches on all of these aspects, it appears to be most effective at the preventative level.

One of the most referenced strengths of the bystander intervention model is that it targets men as potential helpers rather than potential perpetrators, which makes them more likely to fully engage in the material. It has been illustrated that when men are approached as inevitable perpetrators they become defensive and largely disinterested in this "women's

issue" (Katz, n.d.; O'Brien, 2001). Another strength of the bystander intervention model is that it is highly applicable in the college campus environment. Some behaviors that are indicative of this environment include the perpetuation of rape myths, victim blaming, and ambiguity on the nature of sexual behavior in the college party environment. Some of this ambiguity involves defining consent, particularly when alcohol is involved. Additionally, there is evidence to suggest that bystanders face ambiguity regarding peer attitudes toward sexual aggression (A. Brown & Messman-Moore, 2010).

Deficits with the bystander intervention model regarding sexual violence prevention involve the fact that there is little research on the long-term effects of the bystander intervention model, largely due to the fact that the model is so young (Banyard, 2008). Additionally, it has been difficult to reach a consensus regarding what exactly constitutes bystander behavior and what exactly constitutes sexual violence (A. Brown et al., 2009).

In evaluating the effectiveness of bystander intervention programs, some of the more successful programs include: Mentors in Violence Prevention, Men Against Violence, and Bringing in the Bystander. The Mentors in Violence program was developed largely due to the efforts of Jackson Katz. In this program, specific communities are targeted as potential leaders, most often collegiate and professional athletic teams or members of the military. By engaging these both at-risk and highly visible groups, the MVP program approaches bystander intervention in sexual violence as an issue that women have been dealing with alone for far to long (Katz, n.d.). The Men Against Violence program was developed by Luoluo Hong at Louisiana State University and is aimed at targeting traditional male gender roles and philosophies that lead to violence against women (Choate, 2003). The Bringing in the Bystander program was developed by Banyard and colleagues and is aimed at engaging

campus communities in developing a better understanding of sexual violence and what they can do as bystanders to help prevent it (Banyard, Moynihan, & Crossman, 2009; Banyard et al., 2007; Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2005). Banyard and her colleagues have developed measures and interventions regarding bystander attitudes, efficacy, and willingness to intervene (Banyard, 2008; Banyard et al., 2007). Because of these efforts, the field can now endeavor toward developing effective prevention strategies.

Engaging Student Athletes

The implications of activating cohorts of college students regarding sexually violent situations is hardly more elucidated then in the De Anza rape case. Both the helpers and the alleged aggressors in this case were student athletes. An investigation of male student athletes and their specific proclivity for perpetration as well as both male and female student athletes and their potential as empowered and highly visible campus leaders against sexual violence seems a relevant and compelling venture (Bowes-Sperry & O'leary-Kelly, 2005; McMahon & Farmer, 2009). It seems like every day there are reports of athletes' misconduct. Some notable examples include Kobe Bryant's rape allegations, Penn State's sexual abuse scandal, and Stubenville's sexual abuse scandal. Despite the media stigma, the literature indicating that male student athletes are more likely to perpetrate sexual assault is equivocal at best. Some argue that it is not that male student athletes commonly perpetrate sexual violence, it is that male student athletes are highly visible and thus we hear more about their misconduct. Some claim a culture of hypermasculinity has contributed to a well-earned title of at-risk perpetrator. Student athletes are also a group that, because of training schedules and time management, fall prey to a culture of binge drinking. Alcohol consumption is an important risk factor in sexual assault perpetration and untangling the effects of alcohol use

from athlete status can difficult (T. Brown, Sumner, & Nocera 2002; Crosset, 1999; Smith & Stewart, 2003). The current literature base could benefit from more evidence indicating whether or not male student athletes are inherently more likely to perpetrate sexual violence especially when considering the factor of alcohol consumption.

There are quite a few bystander intervention programs geared toward engaging highly visible campus communities, namely collegiate athletics. Engaging this group makes sense because, as mentioned previously, news reports of an athlete or athletic department involved in a sexual violence scandal are common. What better community to engage than one that has such high rates of perpetration? Attacking the problem at its source seems like a good idea. Further though, engaging this highly visible campus community may not only reverse the trend within athletics themselves but may also influence the consumers of college athletics as well. Imagine if instead of reading about another sexual violence incident involving a collegiate athletic community member we instead read that some of the leaders in this community speaking out against sexual violence? Similar questions have been presented by Crosset (1999), suggesting researchers are interested in the potential effects of engaging this group.

Though engaging male student athletes has arguably greater potential for impact because they are more visible than their female counterparts, as the quarterback on the university football team typically receives much more attention then the All-American volleyball star, this is hardly any reason to abandon female student athletes as a targeted group for bystander intervention research and implementation (O'Brien, 2001). Female student athletes are highly visible campus leaders as well. Additionally, female student athletes have their own set of rape myths that they accept, namely that they are less likely to

be sexually victimized (McMahon, 2007). Rejecting these and other rape myths as well as confronting sexist or abusive attitudes allows female student athletes to influence their fellow women. Female student athletes may be more willing to intervene because they posses confidence or even physical acuity that allows them more intervention choices or more confidence in choosing to intervene.

The Current Study

This study sought to further explore and provide evidence for some of the basic conclusions that have been drawn regarding gender, student athlete status, and bystander intervention in sexual violence in the context of the college environment. By doing so, the field can help develop a better knowledge base on the subject, which will eventually allow for development of better intervention programs. This study will focus specifically on a college student population.

The current research base has indicated that several factors may be meaningful regarding bystander intervention in sexual violence. The research demonstrated a gender difference, with females being more willing to intervene then males (Banyard, 2008; McMahon, 2010). Those exposed to sexual violence and intervention training have shown increased bystander intervention awareness and willingness to intervene (Banyard et al., 2009; Banyard et al., 2007; Foubert et al., 2010; Garrity, 2011; Gidycz, Orchowski, & Berkowitz, 2011; McMahon, 2010; Moynihan & Banyard, 2008). There have also been suggestions that group cohesiveness can predict bystander intervention (Rutkowski et al., 1983). Additionally, there has been some cursory investigation regarding rape supportive attitudes as a factor that may influence bystander intervention (McMahon, 2010). Rape supportive attitudes can include rape myth acceptance as well as hostile sexism and

benevolent sexism (sometimes referred to together as ambivalent sexism) (Glick & Fisk, 1996; Payne et al., 1999). Groups that have been of particular interest in the bystander intervention field include men, military personnel, and athletes because of their at-risk status (Choate, 2003; Foubert & Perry, 2007; Garrity, 2011; Gidycz et al., 2011; O'Brien, 2001). On college campuses, researchers have shown an interest in student-athletes and fraternities in particular with the prediction being that these groups are more likely to be at risk for perpetration (these findings have been equivocal) and thus would be appropriate targets of bystander intervention training (Choate, 2003; Foubert, 2000; Humphrey & Kahn, 2000). Though research targeting these groups has indicated relatively short term increases in willingness to intervene, there has not been a breadth of work to determine whether changes hold up long term (Choate, 2003; Garrity, 2011; O'Brien, 2001). This study will seek to elucidate some of the aforementioned factors as well as other possible mediators of bystander intervention in situations with the potential for sexual violence.

Based off the idea that underlying attitudes can affect behavior, this study investigated several rape supportive attitudes. The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory scale was used to determine participant endorsement of both hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes (Glick & Fisk, 1996). Hostile sexism might be referred to as sexist attitudes that reflect overt negative opinions of women, whereas benevolent sexist attitudes seem to reflect a positive evaluation of women but are damaging to progression toward equality (Glick & Fisk, 1996). In addition to hostile and benevolent sexism, this study examined rape myth acceptance, which has been indicated as an underlying attitude that may be related to bystander intervention intention. Rape myth acceptance involves the perpetuation of cultural myths that

justify male sexual aggression and effectively blame victims for sexual violence (Payne et al., 1999).

Willingness to intervene (or bystander intentions) refers to participants' perceived likelihood of intervening in a sexually violent situation. Bystander behaviors, in this study, refers to a cluster of behaviors that include the following: how many opportunities participants had to intervene, the frequency with which they intervened (total actions) the frequency with which they did not intervene (total inactions), how often, given the opportunity, participants intervened (action per opportunity) and how often, given the opportunity, participants missed the opportunity to intervene (inaction per opportunity). Banyard & Moynihan (2011) and A. Brown, Banyard, & Moynihan (2014) found different predictors for willingness to intervene and intervention behaviors, which justifies measuring both constructs. However, there is not enough evidence to make firm predictions about separate outcomes in this study and since the current study made similar predictions for each, the term "bystander tendencies" will be used henceforth when referring to both constructs.

This study examined differences across gender in regard to rape supportive attitudes and bystander tendencies. Rape supportive attitudes, frequency of alcohol consumption, social connectedness and previous exposure to sexual violence education were investigated as predictors of bystander tendencies. Further, the study investigated these variables as possible mediating factors that may help explain bystander tendencies across athlete status. We know already that high group cohesiveness can lead to increases in bystander tendencies (Rutkowski, et al., 1983). Group cohesiveness as a construct is highly comparable to social connectedness, which will be measured in this study; student athletes have also been found to be higher in social connectedness than non-athletes (Armstrong & Oomen-Early, 2009). In

addition, exposure to sexual violence education has been indicated as a factor of increased rates in bystander tendencies. In regard to willingness to intervene, it has been indicated that participation in bystander intervention training (or even general sexual violence education) leads to increased willingness to intervene (Banyard et al., 2009; Banyard et al., 2007; Foubert et al., 2010; Garrity, 2011; Gidycz et al., 2011; McMahon, 2010; Moynihan & Banyard, 2008). Athletes are more likely to have experienced sexual violence education as it has become widely mandated by athletic administrations. Rape supportive attitudes have been indicated as correlating negatively with bystander tendencies. The literature on rape supportive attitudes regarding athletes is inconclusive, though there are suggestions that the athletic community maintains their own subset of context specific rape myths (McMahon, 2007). Additionally, alcohol use will be examined as a possible mediator of bystander tendencies. Some evidence has suggested that higher rates of alcohol consumption contribute to low ratings of bystander tendencies (A. Brown, 2013). Athletes have been indicated as a group that abuses alcohol, especially in context of binge drinking (Doumas, Turrisi, Coll, & Haralson, 2007; Ford, 2007).

Should the data indicate that student athletes report more positive bystander tendencies than non-athletes, this relationship may be mediated by their increased likelihood of having previously been exposed to sexual violence education and/or their higher rates of social connectedness. Should the data indicate that student athletes report fewer positive bystander tendencies, this relationship may be mediated by rape supportive attitudes and/or rates of alcohol consumption.

Because of the subject matter in this study, participants may have been motivated to present themselves positively. To control for this social desirability bias, the survey included

a version of the Marlow-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. This measure is used often in social psychology research to determine to what degree participants are answering questions in accordance with what might be considered socially desirable rather than truthful (Crowne & Marlow, 1960).

This study investigated several specific hypotheses in order to elucidate the relationship between gender, athlete-status, and bystander intervention in situations of sexual violence. Based on what is already known and what is still in question, this study tested the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: There will be a gender difference in rape supportive attitudes, willingness to intervene, and intervention behavior. Specifically, females will score lower on Rape Myth Acceptance and Hostile and Benevolent Sexism, and score higher on willingness to intervene and intervention behavior than males.

Hypothesis 2: Rape supportive attitude scores will negatively predict willingness to intervene and intervention behavior.

Hypothesis 3: Frequency of alcohol consumption will negatively predict willingness to intervene and intervention behavior.

Hypothesis 4: Social connectedness will positively predict willingness to intervene and intervention behaviors.

Hypothesis 5: Previous exposure to sexual violence education will positively predict willingness to intervene and intervention behaviors.

Hypothesis 6: Because the relationship between athlete status and bystander tendencies is not well understood, this study will explore some potential mediators for each outcome:

6a: If student athletes report significantly lower rates of willingness to intervene and intervention behaviors than non-athletes, rape supportive attitudes and frequency of alcohol consumption will be explored as potential mediators.

6b: If student athletes report significantly higher rates of willingness to intervene and intervention behaviors, social connectedness and previous exposure to sexual violence education will be explored as potential mediators.

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited through a university subject pool consisting primarily of introductory psychology students and also through the social networking platform, Facebook. For this study, 282 participants responded to the survey (127 participants were recruited from the subject pool and 155 were recruited from social networking). If approached through the university's subject pool, participants earned extra credit in their psychology course. All other participants had the opportunity to enter to win a drawing for a $50 Best Buy gift card.

The mean age for the total sample in this study was 22.188. There were a number of participants who were out of the typical age range for college students (e.g. some reported being 60 and 70 years old). Though it is not unordinary that individuals outside the traditional age of college students may actually be enrolled at a college or university, this could present potential issues when comparing the student athlete to the non-athlete population. The student athlete population tends to stay within the traditional college student age range because it is generally a time of prime physical health. There were additional concerns about how these non-traditional aged students may differ from traditional aged students on some of the items in this survey (for example, on the social connectedness scale). Because of these concerns, an age range of 18-25 was established, and those participants who did not fall within the age range were eliminated from further analyses.

This older mean age and number of older participants may have occurred because there was no question in the survey that actually asked whether or not the participant was enrolled in college. Participants were asked what year in college they were currently enrolled in, however there was an option labeled "graduate" that may have led some participants to

believe that choice meant someone who has graduated from a college or university rather than a current graduate student.

After eliminating participants who were not in the age range of 18-25 and those who had failed to fully complete any of the surveys contained in the main analyses, the sample consisted of 196 participants. The demographic information gathered indicated that of the 196 participants, 42 (21.429%) were men and 154 (78.571%) were women. Of the sample, 46 participants (23.469%) indicated they were athletes and 150 participants (76.531%) indicated they were non-athletes. The mean age of participants was 20.192 (*SD* = 1.797). The sample consisted of 75 freshman, 42 sophomore, 27 junior, 33 senior, and 19 graduate students. The average number of sports played by the athletes in this sample was 1.089 (*SD* = 0.358) and the most common sports reported were soccer (28.889%), basketball (24.444%), volleyball (8.889%), and water skiing (8.889%). Of the athletes included in this sample, 83.721 were N.C.A.A. Division I athletes, 2.326% were N.C.A.A Division II athletes and 13.953% were club or intramural athletes.

Measurements

Demographic Items. Participants were asked several demographic questions including: gender, age, academic year, whether or not they were an active member of an athletic team, and whether they have been exposed to sexual violence education before. Participants were asked if they played any sports for their college or university, how many sports they played for their college or university, what sports they played (their primary and potentially secondary sport), and what division or category their sport(s) was governed by

(N.C.A.A, N.A.I.A, N.J.C.A.A, N.C.C.A.A, club or intramural, or other).[2] Participants were asked if they have been exposed to any sexual violence education, under what contexts they received that education, and whether or not their experience included bystander intervention specific information. Because the Daily Drinking Questionnaire is brief, it was included on this demographic page in an effort to present the material efficiently.

Daily Drinking Questionnaire (Collins, Parks, & Marlatt, 1985). This measure is a two-question chart in which participants indicate on average how many drinks are consumed on a given day and how many hours are spent drinking on a given day. Participants reported this consumption behavior for a typical week.

Ambivalent Sexist Attitudes: Hostile and Benevolent Sexism (Glick & Fisk 1996). This measure is a 22-item scale, with two 11-item subscales measuring participants' endorsement of both hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes. An example of a hostile sexism item is, "Women seek to gain power by getting control over men." An example of a benevolent sexism item is, "Women should be cherished and protected by men." Ratings are based on a 1-7 scale with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement. Participants' ratings are averaged for both the hostile and benevolent sexism subscales. The internal reliability coefficients for both hostile and benevolent sexism were 0.869 and 0.787 respectively.

Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale- Short Form (Payne, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999). This measure is a 20-item scale used to measure participants' endorsement of common sexual assault myths. Of the 20 items, 17 are used in analyzing rape myth

---

[2] N.C.A.A- National Collegiate Athletic Association; N.A.I.A- National Association of Intercollegiate Athletes; N.J.C.A.A- National Junior College Athletic Association; N.C.C.A.A- National Christian College Athletic Association

acceptance and three items are distracter items. Items are measured on a seven-point Likert scale with higher scores indicating greater agreement with each item. For example, "Women tend to exaggerate how much rape affects them." The score for each participant is obtained by averaging the 17 target items. The internal reliability coefficient for the IRMA-SF was 0.844.

Social Connectedness Scale (Lee, Draper, & Lee, 2001). This measure is a 20-item scale used to measure a participant's sense of connectedness or belonging with others in their social environment. Items are measured on a six-point rating scale with higher scores indicating greater agreement with each item. For example, one item is, "I can actively find myself involved in people's lives." Ten of the items are worded positively and 10 of the items are worded negatively. The score for each participant is obtained by reverse scoring the 10 negatively worded items and summing them with the ten positively worded items. The internal reliability coefficient for the SCS-R was 0.899.

Bystander Intentions Scale (Brown, Banyard, & Moynihan, 2014). This measure is a 30-item list of potential bystander helping behaviors adapted from the Banyard, Moynihan, Cares, & Warner (2014) Bystander Attitudes measure. Participants were asked to indicate on a five-point Likert scale how likely or willing they would be to engage in the described bystander behavior. For example, "Expressing disagreement with a friend who says having sex with someone who is passed out or very intoxicated is okay." Higher scores indicate a high likelihood that participants would engage in the listed behavior. Participant ratings on the 30 items were averaged to obtain an overall score. The internal reliability coefficient for the bystander intentions scale was 0.942.

Bystander Behavior/ Opportunity Scale (Banyard & Moynihan, 2011). This measure consists of 26 items in which participants indicated "yes" or "no" in regard to whether they actually behaved in accordance to each item within the last two months. The items were worded in the past tense being as they are asking about past behaviors. The 26 items can be divided into four sub-categories: 12 items dealing with sexual violence and intimate partner violence, five items dealing with party safety, five items dealing with helping friends in distress, and four items dealing with confronting language. Though intimate partner violence is not a particularly explicit concern, the evolution of this measure has maintained the use this subset and it does add to the measure's range of helpfulness. It is not necessary that these subcategories be scored. Though they are useful in certain studies, there were not used in this study. In this study, this measure presented participants with each item. Then participants were asked whether or not they had the opportunity to intervene in a situation like the one the item described in the past two months. If the participant indicated they had not, they were taken to the next question. If the participant indicated they indeed did have the opportunity to intervene they were then asked whether they did intervene when they had the opportunity and whether they did not intervene when they had the opportunity. The survey format allowed for participants to answer both yes and no to whether or not they intervened in a situation like the one in the item to allow for multiple opportunities classified under the same item. The internal reliability coefficient for the bystander behavior/opportunity scale was 0.857.

Social Desirability (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). This measure is a 33-item list of statements designed to assess social desirability bias among participants. Participants indicated whether each item was true or false as relevant to them personally. For example, "I

never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble" or "I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved." Though there are two subscales (the attribution and denial subscale) in this measure, they do not have to be scored independently. Additionally, the subscales in this measure were not relevant to this study, so they were not scored. For some items, a participant answering "true" was considered the socially desirably response and for some items answering "false" was considered the socially desirably response. Participants' answers were compared to a key that indicated which responses for which items were considered socially desirable (Paulhus, 1991). The total number of answers that were in accordance with the key, meaning the total number of socially desirable responses, indicated their level of social desirability bias. Higher scores indicated greater social desirability bias. The internal reliability coefficient for the MC-SDS was 0.765.

Procedures

Participants completed an online survey consisting of all the measures mentioned above. Measures were presented in the survey in the following order: demographic measures (including the measure of drinking behavior), then the measures of rape myth acceptance, ambivalent sexism, social connectedness, bystander intentions, bystander behaviors, then social desirability.

Results

The general approach to the results in this study involved first looking at the relationships between continuous variables by means of correlational analyses. Next, two-way analysis of variance tests were used to determine main effects and interactions of gender and athlete status on each of the measured study variables: rape myth acceptance, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, social connectedness, drinking behavior, bystander intentions, and bystander behaviors. Exposure to sexual violence education was also a dependent variable, but because it is a dichotomous variable, the main effects were investigated with a chi-squared test. For those variables that were correlated with social desirability, social desirability was included as a covariate in subsequent models in order to control for any social desirability bias. Regression analyses were run next to determine which variables related to bystander intentions and bystander behaviors most strongly predicted bystander intentions and bystander behaviors. Finally, further regression analyses were run to determine if any of these predictor variables mediated the effects of athlete status on bystander intentions and bystander behavior.

Before results of specific hypotheses can be presented, it is helpful to examine descriptive statistics of the sample (descriptive statistics also provided in Appendix A). The overall mean for rape myth acceptance was relatively low at 2.113 (*SD* = 0.750) (on a Likert scale of 1-7 with 1 = *strong disagreement* and 7 = *strong agreement*), indicating that this sample generally did not support rape myths. The overall mean for hostile sexism was 3.648 (*SD* = 1.083) on a scale of 1-7 with 1 = *strong disagreement* and 7 = *strong agreement*, which falls on the *somewhat disagree/not sure* rating. The overall mean for benevolent sexism was 3.992 (*SD* = 0.979) on the same scale as hostile sexism, which falls on the *not*

sure rating. These means suggest that overall the participants in this sample were moderate in their endorsement of sexist attitudes. The mean for social connectedness scores was 84.515 out of a possible 120 (*SD* = 13.703) meaning that most of the participants in this study were fairly socially connected. Regarding sexual violence education, 89 (45.408%) participants in this study had been exposed to sexual violence education and 107 (54.592%) had not.

To measure drinking behavior, this study investigated two different approaches. This study examined binge drinking behavior because of its association with student athletes. Binge drinking was defined as five or more drinks across two hours for men and four or more drinks across two hours for women (National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2004). Additionally, drinks per week was defined as the total number of drinks reported by the participant across all seven days of a typical week. After a distribution analysis indicated an extremely low number of participants who even qualified as binge drinkers (n=16), drinks per week was used as the drinking measure in further analyses. The mean drinks per week for this sample was 6.592 drinks (*SD* = 6.915).

The overall mean for bystander intentions was 4.766 (*SD* = 0.857) on a scale of 1 to 6 (with 1 indicating *not at all likely* to engage in a particular bystander behavior and 6 indicating *very likely* to engage in a particular bystander behavior) meaning overall participants reported fairly high intentions to intervene.

Bystander behavior was measured in survey format by asking participants whether or not they had the opportunity to intervene in whatever situation was described, then whether they acted given the opportunity or did not act given the opportunity. This method produced five measures of bystander behavior: total opportunities, total actions, total inactions, action per opportunity, and inaction per opportunity. All five of these measures capture slightly

different perspectives on bystander intervention behavior and all were looked at in further analyses. Total opportunities indicates the total number of different items in which participants had the opportunity to intervene over the past two months. Total actions indicates for each participant the frequency of actual intervention across all opportunities over the past 2 months, while total inaction indicates for each participant the frequency of missed opportunities over the past 2 months. Action per opportunity is the proportion of times a participant acted given the opportunity, while inaction per opportunity is the proportion of times a participant missed a chance to act given the opportunity. Action per opportunity and inaction per opportunity were calculated by taking the total actions (or inactions) for each participant and dividing that number by total opportunities for that participant. The mean for total opportunities was 8.313 opportunities (SD = 4.524). The mean for total actions was 7.306 actions (SD = 4.140). The mean for total inactions was 2.781 inactions (SD = 3.458). The mean for action per opportunity was 0.888 (SD = 0.170), meaning on average, participants intervened 88.8% of the time they had the opportunity. The mean for inaction per opportunity was 0.295 (SD = 0.292), meaning on average, participants chose not to intervene 29.5% of the time. It is worth noting that the percentage of action per opportunity and the percentage of inaction per opportunity do not add to 100%. This is a result of participants having been exposed to multiple opportunities of a similar nature (classified under one item) and having acted in some instances and not acted in others. A correlational analysis indicated that total opportunities was not significantly related to bystander intentions. The same analysis indicated that total actions had a significant positive relationship with bystander intentions, $r(195) = 0.197$, $p = 0.006$ while action per opportunity had a non-significant positive relationship with bystander intentions $r(189) = 0.139$, $p =$

0.057. Total inactions had a significant negative relationship to bystander intentions, $r(187) = -0.213$, $p = 0.003$, as did inaction per opportunity, $r(187) = -0.272$, $p < 0.001$.

In this study, social connectedness, $r(193) = 0.2117$, $p = 0.003$, total inactions, $r(185) = -0.165$, $p = 0.025$, action per opportunity, $r(187) = 0.261$, $p < 0.001$, and inaction per opportunity, $r(185) = -0.174$, $p = 0.018$, were all correlated to social desirability. Social desirability was included as a covariate in all the analyses of variance and regression analyses where social connectedness, total inactions, action per opportunity, and inaction per opportunity were concerned.

Primary Analyses

Hypothesis 1 stated that there would be a gender difference in rape supportive attitudes, bystander intentions, and intervention behavior and that specifically, women would score lower than men on rape myth acceptance, hostile sexism, and benevolent sexism, and score higher than men on bystander intentions and intervention behavior. To test this hypothesis a series of two-way ANOVAs were run with each of the dependent variables (rape myth acceptance, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, bystander intentions, total opportunities, total actions, total inactions, action per opportunity, and inaction per opportunity) in this hypothesis and gender as well as athlete status as independent variables.

There was a significant gender difference in rape myth acceptance, $F(1, 192) = 11.102$, $p = 0.001$ with women ($M = 2.013$, $SE = 0.075$) scoring lower than men ($M = 2.469$, $SE = 0.118$). There was also a significant gender difference in hostile sexism, $F(1,192) = 15.422$, $p < 0.001$, with women ($M = 3.502$, $SE = 0.108$) scoring lower than men ($M = 4.169$, $SE = 0.169$). There was a gender difference that approached significance in benevolent

sexism, $F(1, 192) = 3.612$, $p = 0.059$, with women ($M = 3.925$, $SE = 0.099$) scoring lower than men (M = 4.201, $SE = 0.155$).

There was a significant gender difference regarding bystander intentions, $F(1, 192) = 27.225$, $p < 0.001$, with women ($M = 4.932$, $SE = 0.080$) reporting higher bystander intentions than men ($M = 4.145$, $SE = 0.125$). There was a significant gender difference regarding total actions $F(1, 192) = 4.485$, $p = 0.036$ with women ($M = 7.556$, $SE = 0.415$) reporting more actions than men ($M = 6.405$, $SE = 0.647$). There was a gender difference regarding inaction per opportunity that approached significance $F(1, 184) = 3.733$, $p = 0.055$ with men reporting more inaction per opportunity ($M = 0.383$, $SE = 0.046$) than women ($M = 0.271$, $SE = 0.029$). There was no significant gender difference regarding total opportunities, total inactions, or actions per opportunity.

In addition to gender differences, the analysis used for this hypothesis also looked at differences between athletes and non-athletes. There were no differences between athletes and non-athletes regarding rape myth acceptance, hostile sexism, or benevolent sexism. There was a significant difference between athletes and non-athletes regarding bystander intentions, $F(1, 192) = 4.813$, $p = 0.030$, with athletes ($M = 4.432$, $SE = 0.121$) reporting lower bystander intentions than non-athletes ($M = 4.864$, $SE = 0.085$). There was a significant difference between athletes and non-athletes regarding total opportunities, $F(1, 192) = 4.074$, $p = 0.045$, with athletes reporting more opportunities ($M = 9.674$, $SE = 0.690$) than non-athletes ($M = 7.850$, $SE = 0.483$). There was a difference that approached significance between athletes and non-athletes in regard to total actions $F(1, 192) = 3.709$, $p = 0.056$, with athletes reporting more total actions ($M = 8.413$, $SE = 0.629$) than non-athletes ($M = 6.959$, $SE = 0.440$). There was no significant difference between athletes and non-

athletes regarding total inactions, action per opportunity, or inaction per opportunity. There was no gender by athlete interaction effect for any of the rape supportive attitudes, bystander intention, or any of the measured bystander behaviors.

Hypothesis 1 Supplemental Analyses. Though not specifically predicted by the hypotheses as stated above, it is entirely possible that there might be effects of gender and/or athlete status on drinking behavior, social connectedness, and exposure to sexual violence education. As such, analyses of variance were used to determine if any of these supplemental main effects of drinking behavior and social connectedness exist. Exposure to sexual violence education is a dichotomous variable, so a chi-squared analysis was used to determine if there were any main effects of athlete status and gender.

There was both a gender, $F(1, 153) = 16.771$, $p < 0.001$, and athlete, $F(1, 153) = 35.184$, $p < 0.001$, effect for drinking behavior. Women reported drinking significantly less ($M = 5.508$, $SE = 0.678$) than men ($M = 10.719$, $SE = 1.086$) while athletes reported drinking significantly more ($M = 11.861$, $SE = 1.052$) than non-athletes ($M = 4.983$, $SE = 0.731$). Additionally, there was an interaction effect of gender and athlete status for drinks per week, $F(1, 153) = 6.195$, $p = 0.014$, such that male athletes ($LSM = 17.489$, $SE = 1.722$) had higher ratings of drinks per week than male non-athletes ($LSM = 6.675$, $SE = 1.33$), female athletes $LSM = 9.036$, $SE = 1.215$), and female non-athletes ($LSM = 4.641$, $SE = 0.601$. There was no gender effect for social connectedness. There was an athlete effect regarding social connectedness $F(1, 192) = 4.314$, $p = 0.039$, with athletes reporting higher rates of social connectedness ($M = 88.957$, $SE = 2.054$) than non-athletes ($M = 82.891$, $SE = 1.437$). There was no interaction effect for social connectedness. There was a significant gender difference regarding exposure to sexual violence education, $X^2(1, N = 196) = 14.984$, with women being

exposed to sexual violence education more often (81 out of 154 women, or 52.597% of women in this study) than men (8 out of 42, or 19.047% of men in this study). There was no effect of athlete status regarding exposure to sexual violence education.

Hypotheses 2 through Hypothesis 5 all concern predictors of the bystander intervention variables: bystander intention, total opportunities, total actions, total inactions, action per opportunity, and inaction per opportunity. Bivariate correlations were run first to establish significant relationships between each bystander intervention variable and all the potential predictor variables: rape myth acceptance, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, drinks per week, social connectedness, and exposure to sexual violence education (refer to Appendix A for relevant bivariate correlations). Then a multiple regression was used to determine which related variables best predicted each respective bystander intervention variable.

Hypothesis 2 stated that rape supportive attitude scores would negatively predict bystander intentions and intervention behaviors. Rape myth acceptance, $r(195) = -0.263$, $p < 0.001$, and hostile sexism, $r(195) = -0.244$, $p < 0.001$ were negatively related to bystander intentions. Benevolent sexism was non-significantly related to bystander intentions, $r(195) = -0.139$, $p = 0.052$.

Hostile sexism, $r(195) = -0.159$, $p = 0.027$, and benevolent sexism, $r(196) = -0.262$, $p < 0.001$, were significantly related to total opportunities. Hostile sexism, $r(196) = -0.177$, $p = 0.013$, and benevolent sexism, $r(196) = -0.256$, $p < 0.001$ were also significantly related to total actions. Only benevolent sexism, $r(187) = -0.163$, $p = 0.026$, was related to total inactions. Action per opportunity was not significantly related to any of the rape supportive

attitudes. Inaction per opportunity was non-significantly negatively related to benevolent sexism, $r(187) = -0.133$, $p = 0.069$.

Hypothesis 3 stated that frequency of alcohol consumption would negatively predict bystander intentions and intervention behavior. Drinks per week did negatively relate to bystander intentions, $r(156) = -0.368$, $p < 0.001$. Of the five measures of bystander behavior, drinks per week was only related to total inactions, $r(151) = 0.256$, $p = 0.002$, and inaction per opportunity $r(151) = 0.250$, $p = 0.002$.

Hypothesis 4 stated that social connectedness would positively predict bystander intentions and intervention behaviors. Social connectedness was significantly related to bystander intentions, $r(195) = 0.156$, $p = 0.030$. Social connectedness was not significantly related to any of the bystander behavior measures.

Hypothesis 5 stated that previous exposure to sexual violence education would positively predict bystander intentions and intervention behaviors. An analysis of variance indicated that there was a significant difference in bystander intentions between those who had been exposed to sexual violence education and those who had not, $F(1,194) = 9.513$, $p = 0.002$. Participants who had been exposed to previous sexual violence education responded with higher bystander intentions ($M = 4.968$, $SE = 0.089$) than did those who had not received sexual violence training ($M = 4.596$, $SE = 0.082$).

There was a significant difference between participants who had been exposed to sexual violence education and those who had not in regard to total inaction, $F(1, 186) = 4.615$, $p = 0.033$. Participants who had been exposed to sexual violence education reported fewer inactions ($M = 2.198$, $SE = 0.369$) than those who had not been exposed to sexual violence education ($M = 3.277$, $SE = 0.341$). There was also a significant difference between

participants who had been exposed to sexual violence training and those who had not in regard to action per opportunity $F(1, 188) = 8.144$, $p = 0.005$. Participants who had been exposed to previous sexual violence education were significantly more likely to act given the opportunity ($M = 0.925$, $SE = 0.018$) than those who had not ($M = 0.855$, $SE = 0.017$). There was also a significant difference between participants who had been exposed to previous sexual violence education and those who had not in regard to inaction per opportunity $F(1, 186) = 4.227$, $p = 0.041$. Participants who had been exposed to sexual violence education reported lower inaction per opportunity ($M = 0.248$, $SE = 0.031$) than those who had not been exposed to sexual violence training ($M = 0.335$, $SE = 0.029$).

A series of multiple regression analyses were run in order to determine which correlated variables from Hypothesis 2 through 5 best predicted each respective bystander intervention variable. Each multiple regression model contained only variables that are correlated to the bystander intervention variable the model was designed for. Those variables that accounted for a significant amount of variance over and above the other variables in the model were said to be the strongest or best predictors of each respective bystander intervention variable.

Of the six predictors related to bystander intentions (rape myth acceptance, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, drinks per week, social connectedness, and exposure to sexual violence education), rape myth acceptance, drinks per week, and social connectedness most strongly predicted bystander intentions (see Appendix B). The model for total opportunities included two predictors, hostile and benevolent sexism. Benevolent sexism most strongly predicted total opportunities (see Appendix C). The model for total actions also included the two predictors of hostile and benevolent sexism. Benevolent sexism most strongly predicted

total actions (see Appendix D). The model for total inactions included three predictors, benevolent sexism, drinks per week, and exposure to sexual violence education (social desirability was also included in this model). Benevolent sexism and drinks per week best predicted total inactions (see Appendix E). Though only exposure to sexual violence education was related to action per opportunity, a multiple regression was still necessary because social desirability had to be controlled for in the model. Even when controlling for social desirability, sexual violence education exposure did significantly predict action per opportunity, ß = -0.187, $p = 0.008$. The model for inaction per opportunity included three predictors: benevolent sexism, drinks per week, and exposure to sexual violence education (social desirability was also included in this model). Drinks per week best predicted inaction per opportunity (see Appendix F).

Hypothesis 6 looked to explore the relationship between athlete status and bystander intentions as well as bystander behaviors, and further to explore some possible mediators of this relationship.

A series of ANOVAs was run to establish whether athlete status is related to bystander intentions and/or intervention behaviors. As mentioned in the results of Hypothesis 1, there was a significant difference between athletes and non-athletes in regard to bystander intentions with athletes reporting lower bystander intentions than non-athletes. There was also a significant difference regarding total opportunities with athletes reporting more opportunities than non-athletes. Interestingly, total actions approached significance in regard to athlete status with athletes reporting more total actions than non-athletes. Total inactions, action per opportunity, and inaction per opportunity were not related to athlete status.

Hypothesis 6a speculated that if athletes reported lower bystander intentions than non-athletes, then rape supportive attitudes and frequency of alcohol consumption could be potential mediators of the relationship concerning bystander intentions. Athletes did indeed report lower bystander intentions, thus rape supportive attitudes and drinks per week were explored as mediators. An analysis of variance revealed that there was no significant effect of athlete status in regard to any of the rape supportive attitudes, thus eliminating them as potential mediators. There was a significant difference between athletes and non-athletes regarding drinking behavior $F(1, 156) = 35.454$, $p < 0.001$, with athletes drinking significantly more ($M = 11.861$, $SE = 1.052$) than non-athletes ($M = 5.025$, $SE = 0.734$).

To determine mediation, this study compared the simple regression of athlete status by bystander intentions to a multiple regression with athlete status and drinks per week as predictors of bystander intentions. If the variance in bystander intentions accounted for by athlete status is smaller in the multiple regression than in a simple regression, mediation is justified (Baron & Kenny, 1986). The variance accounted for by athlete status in the multiple regression ß = -0.046, $p = 0.577$, was indeed smaller than in the simple regression, ß = 0.217, $p = 0.002$, suggesting drinks per week does mediate the relationship between athlete status and bystander intentions.

Hypothesis 6b speculated that if athletes reported more bystander behaviors than non-athletes, then social connectedness and exposure to sexual violence education might be potential mediators. Because athletes did indeed report higher total opportunities and total actions than non-athletes, these potential mediators were explored. However, both social connectedness and exposure to sexual violence education were unrelated to either total opportunities or total actions, thus eliminating them as potential mediators.

Though athletes reported higher bystander opportunities it is important to note that the specific variable of total opportunities could be challenged conceptually as an actual behavior. Having more opportunities is not conceptually the same thing as acting in a prosocial manner. Perhaps athletes are more often in environments in which there are more opportunities for intervention. It is not beyond reason that these environments in which there are more opportunities to intervene may be related to alcohol consumption or sexist attitudes. As such, the mediators investigated by Hypothesis 6a were also investigated in a supplemental analysis (in case there are any nuances about opportunities that may have been captured by these variables). However, the two other potential mediators measured in this study did not qualify as mediators of the relationship between athlete status and total opportunities because there were no athlete main effects for any of the rape supportive attitudes and drinks per week was not correlated with total opportunities.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to both provide support for previously established relationships concerning college students' bystander tendencies as well as explore relatively tenuous or unexplored relationships concerning bystander interventions.

Hypothesis 1 stated there would be a gender difference in rape supportive attitudes and that women would score lower on rape myth acceptance, hostile, and benevolent sexism than men. Hypothesis 1 also suggested there would be a gender difference in bystander intentions with women reporting higher intentions than men. The results of this study generally supported Hypothesis 1 regarding rape supportive attitudes and bystander intentions and these results are consistent with existing research (Banyard, 2008; Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Banyard et al., 2009; Banyard et al., 2005; A. Brown et al., 2014; McMahon, 2010).

Hypothesis 1 also suggested a gender difference regarding bystander intervention behavior with women reporting more intervention behaviors than men. This part of the hypothesis was somewhat supported with women reporting significantly more total actions than men. This result is consistent with existing research that has found higher rates of positive bystander behavior among women than among men (Banyard, 2008; Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Banyard et al., 2005; McMahon et al., 2011). However, not all studies have established consistent gender differences. Specifically, some research has found that men report more missed opportunities for bystander intervention, but did not find any gender difference in total actions (A. Brown et al., 2014). This study found gender differences in total actions but no gender difference in missed opportunities (total inactions or inaction per opportunity), which is inconsistent with A. Brown et al., 2014. Future studies should focus

on investigating gender differences regarding different types of bystander behavior in order to more clearly delineate whether or not gender differences exist regarding bystander behavior.

Though not specifically suggested by Hypothesis 1, the model used in Hypothesis 1 included several main effects of athlete status. Athletes reported significantly more drinks per week than non-athletes and were also significantly more socially connected than non-athletes. Both of these results are consistent with existing research regarding the drinking behavior of athletes (Doumas et al., 2007; Ford, 2007) and social connectedness of athletes (Armstrong & Oomen-Early, 2009). There was also an interaction effect with gender and athlete status regarding drinks per week. The interaction effect of gender and athlete status indicated that male athletes reported more drinks per week than male non-athletes, female athletes, and female non-athletes.

Hypothesis 2 stated that rape supportive attitude scores would negatively predict bystander intentions and bystander behaviors. Hypothesis 2 was somewhat supported with at least one of the three rape supportive attitudes negatively predicting bystander intentions and some of the bystander behaviors measured in this study. These results are consistent with existing research suggesting that rape supportive attitudes are negatively related to bystander intentions and bystander behavior (Banyard, 2008; Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; McMahon, 2010).

Hypothesis 3 stated that alcohol consumption would negatively predict bystander intentions and bystander behavior. Hypothesis 3 was fairly well supported as drinks per week predicted bystander intentions as well as some of the bystander behaviors measured in this study. Drinks per week negatively predicted bystander intentions and positively predicted

total inactions and inaction per opportunity. The positive relationships observed between drinking and both total inaction and inaction per opportunity still fits the hypothesis conceptually as heavier drinkers failed to intervene more often than light drinkers. These results are consistent with existing research suggesting heavier drinkers report lower bystander intentions and more missed opportunities than lighter drinkers (A. Brown, 2013).

Hypothesis 4 stated that social connectedness would positively predict bystander intentions and bystander behavior. Hypothesis 4 was moderately supported as social connectedness positively predicted bystander intentions, however was unrelated to all of the bystander behaviors measured in this study. This hypothesis was somewhat exploratory as there have not been strong connections made between social connectedness and bystander behavior specifically concerning sexual violence. However, existing research does indicate a relationship between social connectedness and intervention in bullying situations (Ahmed, 2008). Additionally, group cohesion (a conceptually similar construct) has been related to positive bystander behaviors (Rutkowski et al., 1983) as has "a greater perceived sense of community" (Banyard, 2008, p. 90).

Hypothesis 5 stated that exposure to sexual violence education would positively predict bystander intentions and bystander behaviors. Hypothesis 5 was moderately supported. Although exposure to sexual violence education was not the best predictor of bystander intentions or bystander behaviors it was found that participants exposed to sexual violence education programming reported higher bystander intentions than participants with no previous exposure to sexual violence education programming. Exposure to sexual violence education was related to the bystander behavior measures of total inaction and inaction per opportunity and was the only correlate of action per opportunity in this study.

This is consistent with existing research stating that previous exposure to sexual violence education is related to bystander intentions and bystander behavior (Banyard, 2008; Banyard et al., 2007; Burn, 2009; McMahon, 2010).

Hypothesis 6 sought to explore the relationship between athlete status and both bystander intentions and bystander behaviors. Interestingly, despite reporting lower bystander intentions than non-athletes, athletes reported higher opportunities to act and higher total actions than non-athletes. Hypothesis 6a suggested that if bystander intentions and behaviors were lower for athletes than for non-athletes, then rape supportive attitudes and drinks per week should be investigated as potential mediators. Because bystander intentions were lower for athletes than non-athletes, rape supportive attitudes and drinks per week were investigated as potential mediators. Drinks per week proved to mediate the relationship between athlete status and bystander intentions. This result explains why athletes have lower bystander intentions than non-athletes. Athlete status influences participants' drinking behavior and drinking behavior influences bystander intentions. Athletes' lower bystander intentions are explained by the fact that they report higher rates of drinking behavior. This means that the effects of alcohol consumption on bystander intentions should be investigated more thoroughly. Future research should investigate what is it about alcohol consumption that causes more frequent consumers to be less willing to intervene. Hypothesis 6b suggested that if bystander intentions and behaviors were higher for athletes than for non-athletes, then social connectedness and exposure to sexual violence education should be investigated as potential mediators. However, neither social connectedness nor exposure to sexual violence education were related to total opportunities and total actions. Because total opportunities is not a particularly overt behavior like total actions or total inactions, it is not

unreasonable to explore rape supportive attitudes and drinks per week as mediators of the relationship between athlete status and total opportunities. However, total opportunities was not related to rape supportive attitudes or drinks per week. Additionally, the effect of athlete status on total actions may not carry as much weight because it is quite conceivable that athletes just had more actions because they had more opportunities (recall that athletes did not have significantly more actions per opportunity than non-athletes). Other possible correlates of both athlete status and bystander behavior should be explored in order to bring clarity to this relationship.

There was an interaction effect of gender and athlete status regarding drinks per week. This becomes even more important as drinks per week was established as a mediator of bystander intentions. Athletes overall reported lower bystander intentions than non-athletes. Because this relationship was mediated by drinks per week, and drinks per week are reported highest among male athletes, this suggests compelling evidence that male student-athletes should be targeted as group for bystander intervention education and training. Further, the bystander intervention education and training aimed at this population might benefit from focusing on moderating drinking behavior in particular.

In addition to testing specific hypotheses, this study also sought to explore and elaborate upon a previously established bystander behavior measure. Previous research has used a bystander behavior scale that asked the participant only if they acted in a situation like the one presented in the item; they measured the frequency of action or inaction (Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Banyard et al., 2005). This study elaborated on this idea and allowed participants to indicate whether or not they actually have had the opportunity, whether they acted given the opportunity, and whether or not they did not act given the opportunity.

Studies, like the current one, that assess opportunities improve upon measures that only assess behaviors, however existing measures that assess opportunity do not allow for the possibility that participants may have had multiple opportunities and acted on some occasions and failed to act on others (McMahon et al. 2011; Moynihan et al., 2014). The measures of frequency (total actions and total inactions) in this study produced an indication of actual behavior but did not take into account opportunity. With these frequency measures it is unclear whether participants with low total actions, for example, have lower willingness to intervene or just fewer opportunities. By dividing actions (or inactions) by opportunity there is an indication of the proportion at which participants intervene (or fail to) given the opportunity, which solves the problem that the frequency measures have. However, it is still not the single best measure to fully understand bystander behavior in particular because this measure is not sensitive to potentially important patterns (someone who had 10 opportunities and acted 5 times would have the same score as someone who had 2 opportunities and acted once). Without a good score of relative frequency, the next best solution was to look at multiple indicators of bystander behavior. Future research should further elaborate on existing measures for bystander tendencies particularly bystander behavior.

This study, like others before it, found some similar and some different correlates of bystander intentions and bystander behaviors (Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; A. Brown et al., 2014). Banyard and Moynihan found gender, higher perceived confidence in being an active bystander, and more pros than cons on decisional balance scale were all similar correlates of both bystander intent and bystander behavior. However they also found that lower rape myth acceptance and lower endorsement of peer norms supportive of coercion was related to higher bystander intentions but that higher rape myth acceptance and higher endorsement of

peer norms supportive of coercion was related to higher bystander behaviors. A. Brown et al. similarly found that more positive perceived norms regarding intervention was related to higher bystander intentions but it was not significantly related to bystander behavior. This study found similar relationships of bystander intentions and bystander behavior in the variables of gender and rape supportive attitudes. However, this study also reported different relationships in bystander intentions and bystander behavior regarding athlete status (there was a significant difference between athletes and non-athletes in some behavior measures but no differences in bystander intentions) and social connectedness (it was related to bystander intentions but not bystander behavior. Future studies should continue to investigate bystander intentions and bystander behaviors separately, and should also investigate reasons why different correlates of these two measures exist and what these differences mean.

Limitations

The sample in this study was relatively large, however was not entirely representative. A large portion of participants came from a particular university in the Deep South that may have unrepresentative ratings of rape supportive attitudes, drinking behavior, social connectedness, etc. Also there were significantly more women than men and significantly more non-athletes than athletes in this sample. Rates of drinking for this sample were relatively low with 31 participants (15.7%) not drinking at all, and as mentioned previously, very few participants met the binge drinking qualification.

Additionally, the bystander behavior measure used in this study is still in its development. Though all five measures of bystander behavior provided significant and interesting information, it is important to note that some of the bystander variables developed by this study were correlated with social desirability (total inactions, action per opportunity,

and inaction per opportunity). Future researcher might benefit from the development of a measure based off the one used in this study but with items that are less prone to socially desirable responding.

Another limitation of this study lies in design of the online survey format. Through the process of designing the online survey, several measures were subject to errors in item transcription. On the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance scale, item 6 was unintentionally omitted from the online version of the survey. On the Social Connectedness Scale-Revised, item 6 was also unintentionally omitted from the online version of the survey. On the Bystander Intentions Scale, items 25 and 26 were unintentionally combined into one item, rendering both items unusable. Additionally, the survey as a whole was quite long and time consuming. Though participants who did not finish the survey were not used in final analyses, there is no certainty that responses toward the end of the survey (notably the bystander behavior scale as it was toward the and itself particularly long) were as accurate as those at the beginning. Despite these design limitations, all measures still proved to be highly reliable.

Implications and future directions

Overall, the sample reported relatively high bystander intentions and action per opportunity and relatively low rape myth acceptance and missed intervention opportunities. These results are a promising indication for the future of bystander intervention in situations of sexual violence. Because athletes report significantly lower bystander intentions than their non-athlete counterparts, bystander intervention training should be aimed at this population in particular. The evidence in this study that athletes in general report more opportunities to intervene is reason enough to target this population for bystander intervention education.

Because they have more opportunities, they could potentially have more impact with their bystander behavior than the non-athlete population. One study in particular also suggests the student-athlete population may be especially powerful because they are a highly visible campus organization. This study also found bystander intervention training to be effective among the student-athlete population (Moynihan et al., 2010). Exploring more in depth the relationship between athlete status and bystander behavior, especially total opportunities and total actions, and why this relationship exists could help program developers tailor bystander intervention programs for this specific population. Perhaps there are different mediators of this relationship than were suggested by this study, or perhaps athletes just had more opportunities to act so they had more actions. Regardless, the results of this study implicate that the student-athlete population deserves to be the focus of research on bystander intervention tendencies, as they have the opportunity as a special population on college campuses, to affect great change.

References

Abbey, A., McAuslan, P., Zawacki, T., Clinton, A. M., & Buck, P. O. (2001). Attitudinal, experiential, and situational predictors of sexual assault perpetration. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *16*(8), 784-807.

Ahmed, E. (2008). 'Stop it, that's enough': Bystander intervention and its relationship to school connectedness and shame management. *Vulnerable Children and Youth Studies*, *3*(3), 203-213.

Armstrong, S., & Oomen-Early, J. (2009). Social connectedness, self-esteem, and depression symptomatology among collegiate athletes versus nonathletes. *Journal of American College Health*, *57*(5), 521-526.

Banyard, V. L. (2008). Measurement and correlates of prosocial bystander behavior: The case of interpersonal violence. *Violence and Victims*, *23*(1), 83-97. doi: 10.1891/0886-6708.23.1.83.

Banyard, V. L., & Moynihan, M. M. (2011). Variation in bystander behavior related to sexual and intimate partner violence prevention: Correlates in a sample of college students. *Psychology of Violence*, *1*(4), 287.

Banyard, V.L., Moynihan, M.M., Cares, A.C., Warner, R. (2014). How do we know if it works? Measuring outcomes in bystander-focused abuse prevention on campuses. *Psychology of Violence*, *4*(1), 101.

Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., & Crossman, M. T. (2009). Reducing sexual violence on campus: The role of student leaders as empowered bystanders. *Journal of College Student Development*, *50*(4), 446-457.

Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., & Plante, E. G. (2007). Sexual violence prevention through bystander education: An experimental evaluation. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *35*(4), 463-481.

Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2005). Rape prevention through bystander education: Bringing a broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention. *US Department of Justice*. Retrieved from: http://www.mcrdpi.marines.mil/Portals/76/Docs/SAPR/SAPR_Bystander%20Research.pdf.

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*(6), 1173.

Black, M.C., Basile, K.C., Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Walters, M.L., Merrick, M.T., Chen, J., & Stevens, M.R. (2011). The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 Summary Report. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Bowes-Sperry, L., & O'leary-Kelly, A. (2005). To act or not to act: The dilemma faced by sexual harassment observers. *The Academy of Management Review*, 30(2), 288-306. doi: 10.2307/20159120.

Brown, A. L. (January, 2013). Does alcohol use impair bystander intervention against violence? Poster presented at the meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, New Orleans, LA.

Brown, A.L., Banyard, V.L., & Moynihan, M, M. (2014). College students as helpful bystanders against sexual violence: Gender, race, and year in college moderate the impact of perceived peer norms. *Psychology of Women Quarterly.* Advance online publication. doi: 10.1177/0361684314526855.

Brown, A. L., & Messman-Moore, T. L. (2010). Personal and perceived peer attitudes supporting sexual aggression as predictors of male college students' willingness to intervene against sexual aggression. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *25*(3), 503-517.

Brown, A.L., Testa, M., & Messman-Moore, T. L. (2009). Psychological consequences of sexual victimization resulting from force, incapacitation, or verbal coercion. *Violence Against Women, 15*(8), 898-919. doi: 10.1177/1077801209335491.

Brown, T. J., Sumner, K. E., & Nocera, R. (2002). Understanding sexual aggression against women: An examination of the role of men's athletic participation and related variables. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *17*(9), 937-952.

Burn, S. M. (2009). A situational model of sexual assault prevention through bystander intervention. *Sex Roles*, *60*, 779-792. doi: 10.1007/s11199-008-9581-5.

Choate, L. H. (2003). Sexual assault prevention programs for college men: An exploratory evaluation of the men against violence model. *Journal of College Counseling*, *6*(2), 166-176.

Crosset, T. (1999). Male athletes' violence against women: A critical assessment of the athletic affiliation, violence against women debate. *Quest*, *51*(3), 244-257.

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24*(4) 349-354. doi: 10.1037/h0047358.

Doumas, D. M., Turrisi, R., Coll, K. M., & Haralson, K. (2007). High risk drinking in college athletes and nonathletes across the academic year. *Journal of College Counseling*, *10*(2), 163-174.

Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J.A., Schroeder, D.A., & Penner, L.A. (2006). *The social psychology of prosocial behavior*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G., (2000). U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. *The sexual victimization of college women* (NCJ 182369). Rockville, Maryland: National Institute of Justice.

Ford, J. A. (2007). Alcohol use among college students: a comparison of athletes and nonathletes. *Substance Use & Misuse*, *42*(9), 1367-1377. doi:10.1080/10826080701212402.

Foubert, J. D. (2000). The longitudinal effects of a rape-prevention program on fraternity men's attitudes, behavioral intent, and behavior. *Journal of American College Health*, *48*, 158-163.

Foubert, J. D., Langhunrichsen-Rohling, J., Brasfield, H., & Hill, B. (2010). Effects of a rape awareness program on college women: Increasing bystander efficacy and willingness to intervene. *Journal of Community Psychology, 38*(7), 813-827.

Foubert, J. D., & Perry, B. C. (2007). Creating lasting attitude and behavior change in fraternity members and male student athletes: The qualitative impact of an empathy-based rape prevention program. *Violence Against Women*, *13*(1), 70-86. doi:10.1177/1077801206295125.

Garcia, S. M., Weaver, K., Moskowitz, G. B., & Darley, J. M. (2002). Crowded minds: the implicit bystander effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *83*(4), 843.

Garrity, S. E. (2011). Sexual assault prevention programs for college•aged men: A critical evaluation. *Journal of Forensic Nursing*, *7*(1), 40-48.

Gidycz, C. A., Orchowski, L. M., & Berkowitz, A. D. (2011). Preventing sexual aggression among college men: An evaluation of a social norms and bystander intervention program. *Violence Against Women*, *17*(6), 720-742.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*(3), 491.

Humphrey, S. E., & Kahn, A. S. (2000). Fraternities, athletic teams, and rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *15*(12), 1313-1320.

Katz, J. (2006). *The macho paradox, why some men hurt women and how all men can help*. Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks Inc.

Katz, J. (n.d.). *Mentors in violence prevention (mvp): Gender violence prevention education & training*. Retrieved from http://www.jacksonkatz.com/mvp.html.

Kilpatrick, D. G., Edmunds, C. N., & Seymour, A. K. (1992). Rape in America: A report to the nation. Arlington, Virginia: National Victim Center & Crime Victims Research and Treatment Center.

Kilpatrick, D. G., Resnick, H. S., Ruggiero, K. J., Conoscenti, L. M., & McCauley, J. (2007). Drug-facilitated, incapacitated, and forcible rape: A national study. Charleston, SC: Medical University of South Carolina, National Crime Victims Research & Treatment Center.

Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology, 55(*2), 162-170.

Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C. H., Warner, T. D., Fisher, B. S., & Martin, S. L. (2009). College women's experiences with physically forced, alcohol- or other drug-enabled, and drug-facilitated sexual assault before and since entering college. *Journal of American College Health*, *57*(6), 639-647.

Latané, B. (1981). The psychology of social impact. *American Psychologist*, *36*(4), 343.

Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1969). Bystander "apathy". *American Scientist*, *57*(2), 1-10.

Latané, B., & Darley, J.M. (1970). The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help? New York, New York: Meredith Corporation.

Lee, R. M., Draper, M., & Lee, S. (2001). Social connectedness, dysfunctional interpersonal behaviors, and psychological distress: Testing a mediator model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *48*(3), 310.

Lee, R. M., & Robbins, S. B. (1995). Measuring belongingness: The social connectedness and the social assurance scales. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *42*(2), 232.

Lee, R. M., & Robbins, S. B. (1998). The relationship between social connectedness and anxiety, self-esteem, and social identity. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *45*(3), 338-45.

McMahon, S. (2007). Understanding community-specific rape myths: Exploring student athlete culture. *Journal of Women and Social Work*, *22*(4), 357-370. doi:10.1177/0886109907306331.

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

McMahon, S., & Farmer, G. L. (2009). The bystander approach: Strengths-based sexual assault prevention with at-risk group. *Journal of Human Behavior and the Social Environment, 19*(8), 1042-1065. doi: 10.1080/10911350902990304.

McMahon, S., Postmus, J. L., & Koenick, R. A. (2011). Conceptualizing the engaging bystander approach to sexual violence prevention on college campuses. *Journal of College Student Development*, *52*(1), 115-130.

Minton, R. (2012). *Sports Culture and Sexual Assault on US College Campuses: Is There a Correlation?* (Doctoral dissertation, Central European University).

Mohler-Kuo, M., Dowdall, G. W., Koss, M. P., & Wechsler, H. (2004). Correlates of rape while intoxicated in a national sample of college women. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, *65*(1), 37.

Moynihan, M. M., & Banyard, V. L. (2008). Community responsibility for preventing sexual violence: A pilot study with campus greeks and intercollegiate athletes. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, *36*(1-2), 23-38.

Moynihan, M. M., Banyard, V. L., Arnold, J. S., Eckstein , R. P., & Stapleton, J. G. (2010). Engaging intercollegiate athletes in preventing and intervening in sexual and intimate partner violence. *Journal of American College Health*, *59*(3), 197-204.

Moynihan, M.M., Banyard, V.L., Cares, A.C., Potter, S.J., Williams, L. M., & Stapleton, J. G. (2014). Encouraging responses in sexual and relationship violence prevention: What programs remain effective a year later? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1177/0886260514532719.

Murnen, S. K., & Kohlman, M. H. (2007). Athletic participation, fraternity membership, and sexual aggression among college men: A meta-analytic review. *Sex Roles*, *57*(1), 145-157. doi: 10.1007/s11199-007-9225-1.

National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. (2004). NIAA council approves definition of binge drinking. NIAA Newsletter, 3, 3.

O'Brien, J. (2001). The MVP Program: Focus on student-athletes. *Sexual violence on campus: Policies, programs, and perspectives*, 98-119.

Paulhus, D. L. (1991). Measurement and control of response bias. In J. B. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes. New York: Academic Press.

Payne, D. L., Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1999). Rape myth acceptance: Exploration of its structure and its measurement using the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *33*(1), 27-68.

Roberts, D., Redmond, L., & Tomaselli, L. (2009a, June 4). Witnesses: We broke up gang rape of girl, 17. *abcnews.go.com*. Retrieved from http://abcnews.go.com/2020/story?id=7748009&page=1.

Roberts, D., Redmond, L., & Tomaselli, L. (2009b, June 5). Alleged gang rape ends with no criminal charges but civil suit pending. *abcnews.go.com*. Retrieved from http://abcnews.go.com/2020/story?id=7757324&page=1.

Roberts, D. (Performer), Vargas, E. (Performer), Stossel, J. (Performer), Redmond, L. (Producer), Goldberg, A. (Producer), Tomaselli, L. (Producer), Paul, G. (Director), Ruff, A. B. (Director), Dauer, P. (Writer), Goldberg, A. (Writer) & Redmond, L. (Writer) (2009). The secret nightlife of teens [Television series episode]. In *20/20*. New York, New York: ABC news.

Rutkowski, G. K., Gruder, C. L., & Romer, D. (1983). Group cohesiveness, social norms, and bystander intervention. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *44*(3), 545.

Smith, D., & Stewart, S. (2003). Sexual aggression and sports participation. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, *26*(4), 384-395.

Witnesses to alleged de anza rape speak out. (2007, May 24). *ktvu.com*. Retrieved from http://www.ktvu.com/news/news/witnesses-to-alleged-de-anza-rape-speak-out/nKTyT/.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Bivariate Correlations Between Bystander Variables and Potential Predictor Variables

	Descriptives	Rape myth acceptance	Hostile sexism	Benevolent sexism	Drinks per week	Social connectedness	Bystander intentions	Social desirability
Rape myth acceptance	*M* = 2.113 *SD* = 0.750	-						
Hostile sexism	*M* = 3.648 *SD* = 1.083	0.543 *p* <0.001	-					
Benevolent sexism	*M* = 3.992 *SD* = 0.979	0.402 *p* <0.001	0.486 *p* <0.001	-				
Drinks per week	*M* = 6.592 *SD* = 6.915	0.068 *p* = 0.395	0.094 *p* = 0.240	-0.054 *p* = 0.505	-			
Social connectedness	*M* = 84.515 *SD* = 13.703	-0.133 *p* = 0.063	-0.118 *p* = 0.100	-0.043 *p* = 0.552	0.134 *p* = 0.096	-		
Bystander intentions	*M* = 4.766 *SD* = 0.857	-0.263 *p* <0.001	-0.244 *p* <0.001	-0.139 *p* = 0.052	-0.368 *p* <0.001	0.156 *p* = 0.030	-	
Total opportunities	*M* = 8.313 *SD* = 4.524	-0.051 *p* = 0.479	-0.159 *p* = 0.027	-0.262 *p* <0.001	0.087 *p* = 0.283	0.030 *p* = 0.677	0.118 *p* = 0.101	-0.112 *p* = 0.121
Total actions	*M* = 7.306 *SD* = 4.106	-0.062 *p* = 0.388	-0.177 *p* = 0.013	-0.256 *p* <0.001	0.052 *p* = 0.518	0.067 *p* = 0.354	0.197 *p* < 0.006	-0.030 *p* = 0.683
Total inactions	*M* = 2.781 *SD* = 3.458	0.056 *p* = 0.444	-0.021 *p* = 0.777	-0.163 *p* = 0.026	0.256 *p* = 0.002	-0.063 *p* = 0.393	-0.213 *p* = 0.003	-0.165 *p* = 0.025
Action per opportunity	*M* = 0.888 *SD* = 0.170	-0.077 *p* = 0.292	-0.020 *p* = 0.788	0.009 *p* = 0.905	-0.043 *p* = 0.601	0.110 *p* = 0.133	0.139 *p* = 0.057	0.261 *p* <0.001
Inaction per opportunity	*M* = 0.295 *SD* = 0.292	0.059 *p* = 0.422	-0.133 *p* = 0.069	0.015 *p* = 0.836	0.250 *p* = 0.002	-0.070 *p* = 0.341	-0.272 *p* <0.001	-0.174 *p* = 0.018
Social desirability	*M* = 15.777 *SD* = 5.125	0.015 *p* = 0.832	-0.025 *p* = 0.735	-0.009 *p* = 0.904	-0.112 *p* = 0.168	0.212 *p* = 0.003	0.112 *p* = 0.121	-

Appendix B

Table 2
Multiple Regression Predicting Bystander Intentions

Predictors	B	SE B	ß	*t*	*p*
Rape Myth Acceptance	-0.204	0.090	-0.192	-2.27	0.024
Hostile Sexism	-0.059	0.063	-0.083	-0.94	0.351
Benevolent Sexism	-0.029	0.064	-0.037	-0.45	0.655
Drinks per week	-0.039	0.008	-0.348	-4.87	<0.001
Social Connectedness	0.010	0.004	0.170	2.39	0.018
Exposure To Sexual Violence Education	-0.107	0.057	-0.138	-1.89	0.060
Overall Model Fit	$R^2 = 0.292$	$F(6, 155) = 10.262$		$p < 0.001$	

Note: Only variables found to be significantly correlated with bystander intentions were included in the multiple regression model.

Appendix C

Table 3
Multiple Regression Predicting Total Opportunities

Predictors	B	SE B	ß	*t*	*p*
Hostile Sexism	-0.173	0.332	-0.041	-0.52	0.603
Benevolent Sexism	-1.119	0.368	-0.242	-3.04	0.003
Overall Model Fit	$R^2 = 0.070$	$F(2, 194) = 7.204$	$p = 0.001$		

Note. Only variables found to be significantly correlated with total opportunities were included in the multiple regression model.

Appendix D

Table 4
Multiple Regression Predicting Total Actions

Predictors	B	SE B	ß	*t*	*p*
Hostile Sexism	-0.266	0.304	-0.070	-0.87	0.383
Benevolent Sexism	-0.938	0.336	-0.222	-2.79	0.006
Overall Model Fit	$R^2 = 0.069$	$F(2,195) = 7.156$	$p = 0.001$		

Note: Only variables found to be significantly correlated with total actions were included in the multiple regression model.

Appendix E

Table 5
Multiple Regression Predicting Total Inactions

Predictors	B	SE B	ß	*t*	*p*
Benevolent Sexism	-0.605	0.274	-0.174	-2.21	0.029
Drinks Per Week	0.110	0.040	0.220	2.76	0.007
Exposure to Sexual Violence Education	0.519	0.278	0.149	1.86	0.065
Social Desirability	-0.073	0.054	-0.106	-1.35	0.178
Overall Model Fit	$R^2 = 0.125$	$F(4,148) = 5.163$	$p < 0.001$		

Note: Only variables found to be significantly correlated with total inactions were included in the multiple regression model.

Appendix F

Table 6
Multiple Regression Predicting Inaction Per Opportunity

Variable	B	SE B	ß	*t*	*p*
Benevolent Sexism	-0.035	0.022	-0.125	-1.56	0.121
Drinks Per Week	0.009	0.003	0.220	2.73	0.007
Exposure to Sexual Violence Education	0.037	0.023	0.133	1.64	0.102
Social Desirability	-0.005	0.004	-0.098	-1.23	0.220
Overall Model Fit	$R^2 = 0.105$	$F(4,148) = 4.212$		$p = 0.003$	

Note: Only variables found to be significantly correlated with inactions per opportunity were included in the multiple regression model,

Appendix G

Demographic Questionnaire

Please answer the following demographic questions accurately and completely:

Please indicate what gender you identify with:

- o Male
- o Female

Please indicate your age in years numerically:_____

Please indicate your current academic year:

- o Freshman
- o Sophomore
- o Junior
- o Senior
- o Graduate

Do you play on a sports team for your college or university?

- o Yes
- o No

How many sports do you play for your college or university?

- o One
- o Two
- o Three or more

If you play one sport please indicate what sport you play in the primary sport field. If you play multiple sports, please indicate your primary sport (the one you participate in most, spend the most time training for, etc.) and your secondary sport (the one you participate in the second most, etc.):

primary sport	secondary sport

What division/category is your sport considered to be in for your college or university? If you play one sport please indicate what division/category it is in using the primary sport field. If you play multiple sports, please indicate what division/category your primary and secondary sports are in:

primary sport	secondary sport
o N.C.A.A o N.A.I.A o N.J.C.A.A o N.C.C.A.A o Club or intramural sport o Other _____	o N.C.A.A o N.A.I.A o N.J.C.A.A o N.C.C.A.A o Club or intramural sport o Other _____

Have you ever been exposed to a sexual violence education program? A sexual violence program might have informed you about what sexual violence is or looks like, how to prevent sexual violence, what you can do if you witness or experience sexual violence, legal aspects regarding sexual violence, etc)?:

- o Yes
- o No

If you have been exposed to a sexual violence education program, under what circumstances did you have the opportunity to participate in this program? If your particular circumstance is not identified below, please indicate what it is in the "other" field.

- o Mandatory high school program
- o As a part of a club or group in high school
- o Mandatory college or university program
- o Mandatory program as part of a residency (in dorm, apartment, etc.)
- o As part of a youth group
- o As part of a high school athletic team
- o As part of a college athletic team
- o As a job/career requirement
- o Voluntarily
- o Other _____

If you have been exposed to a sexual violence education program, did the program include information on bystander intervention? Bystander intervention is an intervention strategy that encourages bystanders to provide aid in emergency situations (like sexual violence). Bystander intervention programs describe to participants how to notice emergency events,

take responsibility for helping, determine the best course of help to provide, and finally execute a helping action.

- o Yes I have participated in a bystander intervention program for sexual violence
- o No I have not participated in a bystander intervention program for sexual violence

Daily Drinking Questionnaire (Collins, Parks, & Marlatt, 1985)

What are your typical drinking habits? Use the format below to describe your drinking pattern during a **typical week**. Please fill in a number for each day of the week indicating the average number of drinks and the average hours spent drinking that day. For days when you typically do not drink, enter a zero.

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday
How many drinks?							
How many hours?							

Appendix H

Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale- Short Form (Payne, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999)

Please circle the number that corresponds with how much you agree or disagree with the following statements:

1. If a woman is raped while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

2. Although most women wouldn't admit it, they generally find being physically forced into sex a real ''turn-on.''

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

3. If a woman is willing to ''make out'' with a guy, then it's no big deal if he goes a little further and has sex.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

4. Many women secretly desire to be raped.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

5. Most rapists are not caught by the police.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

6. If a woman doesn't physically fight back, you can't really say that it was rape.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

7. Men from nice middle-class homes almost never rape.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

8. Rape accusations are often used as a way of getting back at men.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

9. All women should have access to self-defense classes.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

10. It is usually only women who dress suggestively that are raped.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

11. If the rapist doesn't have a weapon, you really can't call it a rape.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

12. Rape is unlikely to happen in the woman's own familiar neighborhood.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

13. Women tend to exaggerate how much rape affects them.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

14. A lot of women lead a man on and then they cry rape.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

15. It is preferable that a female police officer conduct the questioning when a woman reports a rape.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

16. A woman who ''teases'' men deserves anything that might happen.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

17. When women are raped, it's often because the way they said ''no'' was ambiguous.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

18. Men don't usually intend to force sex on a woman, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

17. A woman who dresses in skimpy clothes should not be surprised if a man tries to force her to have sex.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

20. Rape happens when a man's sex drive gets out of control.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

Appendix I

Ambivalent Sexist Attitudes: Hostile and Benevolent Sexism (Glick & Fisk, 1996)

Please circle the number that corresponds with how much you agree or disagree with the following statements:

1. No matter how accomplished be is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman.

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

2. Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for "equality."

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

3. In a disaster, women ought not necessarily to be rescued before men.

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

4. Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

5. Women are too easily offended.

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

6. People are often truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the other sex.

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

7. Feminists are not seeking for women to have more power than men.

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

8. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

9. Women should be cherished and protected by men.

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

10. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

11. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

12. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores.

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

13. Men are complete without women.

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

14. Women exaggerate problems they have at work.

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

15. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash.

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

16. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

18. There are actually very few women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances.

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

19. Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility.

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

20. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

21. Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men.

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

22. Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

Appendix J

Social Connectedness Scale- Revised (Lee, Draper, & Lee, 2001)

Directions: Following are a number of statements that reflect various ways in which we view ourselves. Rate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the following scale (1 = Strongly Disagree and 6 = Strongly Agree). There is no right or wrong answer. Do not spend too much time with any one statement and do not leave any unanswered.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Mildly Disagree		Mildly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4		5	6

1.	I feel comfortable in the presence of strangers.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
2.	I am in tune with the world.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
*3.	Even among my friends, there is no sense of brother/sisterhood.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
4.	I fit in well in new situations.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
5.	I feel close to people.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
*6.	I feel disconnected from the world around me.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
*7.	Even around people I know, I don't feel that I really belong.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
8.	I see people as friendly and approachable.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
*9.	I feel like an outsider.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
10.	I feel understood by the people I know.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
*11.	I feel distant from people.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
12.	I am able to relate to my peers.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
*13.	I have little sense of togetherness with my peers.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
14.	I find myself actively involved in people's lives.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
*15.	I catch myself losing a sense of connectedness with society.....	1	2	3	4	5	6

16.	I am able to connect with other people.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
*17.	I see myself as a loner.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
*18.	I don’t feel related to most people.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
19.	My friends feel like family.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
*20.	I don't feel I participate with anyone or any group...	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix K

Bystander Intentions Scale (A. Brown, Banyard & Moynihan, 2014)

Instructions to participants: Please read the following list of behaviors and indicate how likely you are to engage in these behaviors at some point in the future.

1. Thinking through the pros and cons of different ways I might help if I see an instance of sexual violence.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

2. Speaking up when I heard someone say "she deserved to be raped."

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

3. Asking for verbal consent when I am intimate with my partner, even we are in a long-term relationship.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

4. Making sure I leave a party with the same people I came with.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

5. Talking with my friends about going to parties together and staying together and leaving together.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

6. Talking with my friends about watching each others' drinks.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

7. If a friend expresses an interest in getting someone else drunk so they could have sex with that person; I would confront that friend and try to convince them not to.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

8. Talking with my friends about sexual violence as an issue for our community.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

9. When a friend has had too much to drink, I ask them if they need to be walked home from the party.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

10. Criticize a friend who tells me that they had sex with someone who was passed out or who didn't give consent.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

11. Speaking up in class if a professor is providing misinformation about sexual assault.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

12. Telling a friend when I think their drink may have been spiked with a drug.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

13. Imagine the following situation: I see a man talking to a female friend. He is sitting very close to her and by the look on her face I can see she is uncomfortable. I ask her if she is ok or try to start a conversation with her.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

14. Stopping and checking in with my friend who looks very intoxicated when they are being taken upstairs at party.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

15. If I heard a friend talking about forcing someone to have sex with them, speaking up against it and expressing concern for the person who was forced.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

16. Asking a friend who seems upset if they are okay or need help.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

17. Expressing disagreement with a friend who says having sex with someone who is passed out or very intoxicated is okay.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

18. Indicating my displeasure when I hear sexist, racist, or homophobic jokes.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

19. Indicating my displeasure when I hear catcalls (e.g., insults, name calling, slurs, etc.).

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

20. Walking a friend home from a party who has had too much to drink.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

21. Expressing my disgust at a friend's use of pornography.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

22. Watching my friends' drinks at parties.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

23. Making sure friends leave the party with the same people they came with.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

24. Going with my friend to talk with someone (e.g. police, counselor, rape victim advocate, resident advisor) about an unwanted sexual experience.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

25. If I learned a friend was putting drugs in someone's drink, I confront the friend or alert the potential victim.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

26. Talking to my friends or acquaintances to make sure we don't leave an intoxicated friend behind at a party.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

27. Explaining how using the word rape in everyday situations is inappropriate, if I heard someone say "that _____ (video game, test, etc) raped me," or a comment like that.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

28. Speak up to someone who is making excuses for having sex with someone who is unable to give full consent.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

29. If I see a friend taking a very intoxicated person up to their room, I say something and ask what the friend was doing.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

30. Deciding with my friends in advance of going out: each person's plan for staying safe, getting home, and whether or not I will leave with anyone other than the person/people with whom I arrived.

Not at all likely 0 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely likely

Appendix L

Bystander Behavior Scale (Banyard & Moynihan, 2011)

Now please read the same list below and indicate yes or no for all the items that apply:

Item 1: Thought through the pros and cons of different ways I might help if I see an instance of sexual violence.
1a: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this?

If no → Item 2

If yes:

1b: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this but did not actually think through the pros and cons?

1c: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to think through the pros and cons and actually did?

Item 2: Spoke up if I heard someone say, "She deserved to be raped."

2a: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this?

If no → Item 3

If yes:

2b: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this but did not actually speak up?

2c: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to speak up and actually did?

Item 3: Asked for verbal consent when I am intimate with my partner, even if we were in a long-term relationship.

3a: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this?

If no → Item 4

If yes:

3b: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this but did not actually ask for verbal consent?

3c: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to ask for verbal consent and actually did?

Item 4: I talked with my friends about sexual and intimate partner violence as an issue for our community.

4a: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this?

If no → Item 5

If yes:

4b: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this but did not actually talk with friends about sexual and intimate partner violence?

4c: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to talk with friends about sexual and intimate partner violence and actually did?

Item 5: I expressed concern to a friend if I saw their partner exhibiting very jealous behavior and try to control my friend.

5a: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this?

If no → Item 6

If yes:

5b: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this but did not actually express concern to a friend about their partner's jealous and controlling behavior?

5c: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to express concern to a friend about their partner's jealous and controlling behavior and actually did?

Item 6: I told a friend if I thought their drink might have been spiked with a drug.

6a: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this?

If no → Item 7

If yes:

6b: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this but did not actually tell a friend if you thought their drink might have been spiked?

6c: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to tell a friend if you thought their drink might have been spiked and actually did?

Item 7: Talked with friends about what makes a relationship abusive and what warning signs might be.

7a: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this?

If no → Item 8

If yes:

7b: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this but did not actually talk with friends about what makes a relationship abusive and what warning signs might be?

7c: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to talk with friends about what makes a relationship abusive and what warning signs might be and actually did?

Item 8: I saw a man talking to a female friend. He was sitting very close to her and by the look on her face I could see she was uncomfortable. I attempted to start a conversation with her in an effort to gauge her level of discomfort and/or initiated some sort of distraction so she could escape the uncomfortable conversation.

8a: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this?

If no → Item 9

If yes:

8b: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this but did not actually attempt to help the female friend in this scenario?

8c: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to help the female friend in this scenario and actually did?

Item 9: I stopped and checked in with my friend who looked very intoxicated when they were being taken upstairs at a party.

9a: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this?

If no → Item 10

If yes:

9b: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this but did not actually stop and check in with your intoxicated friend when they were being taken upstairs at a party?

9c: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to stop and check in with your intoxicated friend when they were being taken upstairs at a party and actually did?

Item 10: Approached a friend if I thought they were in an abusive relationship and let them know that I was there to help.

10a: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this?

If no → Item 11

If yes:

10b: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this but did not actually approach a friend in this situation and let them know you are there to help?

10c: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to approach a friend in this situation and let them know you are there to help and actually did?

Item 11: Expressed disagreement with a friend who says having sex with someone who is passed out or very intoxicated is okay.

11a: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this?

If no → Item 12

If yes:

11b: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this but did not actually express your disagreement?

11c: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to express your disagreement and actually did?

Item 12: Went with my friend to talk with someone (e.g., police, counselor, crisis center, resident advisor) about an unwanted sexual experience or physical violence in their relationship.

12a: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this?

If no → Item 13

If yes:

12b: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this but did not actually go with your friend to talk with someone?

12c: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to go with your friend to talk with someone and actually did?

Item 13: Made sure I left the party with the same people I came with.

13a: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this?

If no → Item 14

If yes:

13b: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this but did not actually make sure to leave the party with someone you came with?

13c: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to make sure to leave with someone you came with and actually did?

Item 14: I talked with my friends about going to parties together and staying together and leaving together.

14a: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this?

If no → Item 15

If yes:

14b: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this but did not actually talk with your friends about going, staying, and leaving parties together?

14c: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to talk with your friends about going, staying, and leaving parties together and actually did?

Item 15: I talked with my friends about watching each other's drinks.

15a: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this?

If no → Item 16

If yes:

15b: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this but did not actually talk with your friends about watching each other's drinks?

15c: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to talk with your friends about watching each other's drinks and actually did?

Item 16: Watched my friends' drinks at parties.

16a: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this?

If no → Item 17

If yes:

16b: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this but did not actually watch your friends' drinks at parties?

16c: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to watch your friends' drinks at parties and actually did?

Item 17: Made sure friends left a party with the same people they came with.

17a: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this?

If no → Item 18

If yes:

17b: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this but did not actually make sure your friends left a party with the same people they came with?

17c: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to make sure your friends left a party with the same people they came with and actually did?

Item 18: If a friend had too much to drink, I asked them if they needed to be walked home from the party.

18a: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this?

If no → Item 19

If yes:

18b: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this but did not actually ask your friend if they needed to be walked home from the party?

18c: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to ask your friend if they needed to be walked home from a party and actually did?

Item 19: Asked a friend who seemed upset if they were okay or needed help.

19a: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this?

If no → Item 20

If yes:

19b: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this but did not actually ask your friend if they were okay or needed help?

19c: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to ask your friend if they were okay or needed help and actually did?

Item 20: Walked a friend home from a party who had too much to drink.

20a: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this?

If no → Item 21

If yes:

20b: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this but did not actually walk a friend home from a party who had too much to drink?

20c: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to walk a friend home from a party who had too much to drink and actually did?

Item 21: If I heard a friend insulting their partner I said something to them.

21a: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this?

If no → Item 22

If yes:

21b: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this but did not actually say something to a friend who was insulting their partner?

21c: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to say something to a friend who was insulting their partner and actually did?

Item 22: Talked to my friends or acquaintances to make sure we didn't leave an intoxicated friend behind at a party.

22a: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this?

If no → Item 23

If yes:

22b: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to talk to your friends or acquaintances to make sure you didn't leave an intoxicated friend behind at a party but did not?

22c: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to talk to your friends or acquaintances to make sure you didn't leave an intoxicated friend behind at a party and actually did?

Item 23: Indicated my displeasure when I heard sexist jokes.

23a: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this?

If no → Item 24

If yes:

23b: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this but did not actually indicate your displeasure when you heard sexist jokes?

23c: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to indicate your displeasure when you heard sexist jokes and actually did?

Item 24: Indicated my displeasure when I heard racist jokes.

24a: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this?

If no → Item 25

If yes:

24b: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this but did not actually indicate your displeasure when you heard racist jokes?

24c: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to indicate your displeasure when you heard racist jokes and actually did?

Item 25: Indicated my displeasure when I heard homophobic jokes.

25a: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this?

If no → Item 26

If yes:

25b: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this but did not actually indicate your displeasure when you heard homophobic jokes?

25c: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to indicate your displeasure when you heard homophobic jokes and actually did?

Item 26: Indicated my displeasure when I hear cat-calls.

26a: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this?

If no → next questionnaire

If yes:

26b: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to do this but did not actually indicate your displeasure when you heard cat-calls?

26c: Was there a time during the past 2 months when you had the opportunity to indicate your displeasure when you heard cat-calls and actually did.

Appendix M

Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlow, 1960)

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you personally. Please circle 'T' if the item is true for you, and 'F' if the item is false for you.

T F 1. Before voting, I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates.

T F 2. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.

T F 3. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.

T F 4. I have never intensely disliked anyone.

T F 5. On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.

T F 6. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.

T F 7. I am always careful about my manner of dress.

T F 8. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.

T F 9. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen I would probably do it.

T F 10. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.

T F 11. I like to gossip at times.

T F 12. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.

T F 13. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.

T F 14. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.

T F 15. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.

T F 16. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.

T F 17. I always try to practice what I preach.

T F 18. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud-mouthed, obnoxious people.

T F 19. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.

T F 20. When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it.

T F 21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.

T F 22. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.

T F 23. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.

T F 24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoings.

T F 25. I never resent being asked to return a favor.

T F 26. I have never been irked when people express ideas very different from my own.

T F 27. I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car.

T F 28. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.

T F 29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.

T F 30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.

T F 31. I have never felt that I was punished without cause.

T F 32. I sometimes think when people have misfortune they only got what they deserved.

T F 33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings

Hill, Deborah L. Bachelor of Arts, Northeastern State University, Spring 2012; Master of Science, University of Louisiana at Lafayette, Summer 2014
Major: Experimental Psychology
Title of Thesis: Gender, Athlete Status, and Bystander Intervention in Situations of Sexual Violence
Thesis Director: Dr. Amy Brown
Pages in Thesis: 101; Words in Abstract: 267

ABSTRACT

The prevalence of sexual violence on college campuses has reached an alarming level. With some reports indicating that almost 20% of women experience attempted or completed rape after entering college, the call for intervention is at an all-time high (Krebs et al., 2009). One of the more recent and successful interventions has come in the form of bystander intervention, which calls upon the people around when the potential for a sexually violent situation develops and encourages them to step up and intervene (Banyard, Plante, Moynihan, 2005). This study looked into how college student athletes were different than their non-athlete peers on measures of willingness to intervene and actual intervention behaviors in situations of sexual violence. Intervention behavior was measured in terms of total opportunities to intervene, total intervention actions, total inactions, the proportion of actions per opportunity, and the proportion of inactions per opportunity. For any effect of athlete status on bystander intention or behavior, these potential mediators were investigated: drinking behavior, rape supportive attitudes, exposure to sexual violence education, and social connectedness. A two-way analysis of variance indicated gender and athlete status main effects and interactions. Several regression models explored the relationships of the potential mediating variables with these effects. Athletes were less willing to intervene but reported more frequent intervention behavior than non-athletes. Drinking behavior mediated the relationship between athlete status and willingness to intervene. These results indicate the

field of bystander intervention should tailor intervention techniques to fit the student athlete population, and further to include in this intervention a discussion of how drinking behavior inhibits willingness to intervene in situations of sexual violence.

Biographical Sketch

Deborah L. Hill grew up in south Louisiana and spent two years at Centenary College of Louisiana before attending Northeastern State University in Oklahoma where she earned a Bachelor of Art degree in Psychology. She was born in Orem City, Utah, to her parents, Lorraine and Steven Hill. As an undergraduate, she maintained a 3.75 grade point average and graduated as a scholar athlete. As a graduate student she maintained a 3.8 grade point average, while speaking on a panel for sexual violence prevention and at a colloquium for humanist and existential theory. She earned her Master of Science degree in Summer, 2014.