

**Thematic Analysis of “No Zebras, No Excuses” Script:
Determining Program Efficacy Based on
Qualitative Comparison to Sexual Assault Prevention Research**

By: Emma Tuthill

Advisor: Professor Steve Thompson

Central Michigan University Honors Program

HON 499 Senior Thesis

December 15, 2014

Table of Contents

I.	Title Page.....	1
II.	Table of Contents.....	2
III.	Abstract.....	3
IV.	Introduction.....	4
V.	Current University Climate.....	8
VI.	Methods of Data Analysis.....	12
VII.	Thematic Codebook.....	13
VIII.	Theme I: Style of Program.....	15
IX.	Theme II: Timing of Program.....	17
X.	Theme III: Content of Program.....	18
	1. General information and definition.....	18
	2. Statistics.....	20
	3. Perpetrator characteristics.....	24
	4. Impact of societal and community norms.....	29
	5. Rape myths.....	31
	6. Role of bystanders.....	36
	7. Focus on empathy.....	44
	8. Prevention vs. avoidance.....	45
XI.	Limitations and Recommendations.....	46
XII.	Conclusion.....	48
XIII.	References.....	50
XIV.	Appendices.....	56

Abstract

Although the statistics vary slightly, the generally agreed-upon incidence rate of sexual assault at universities in the United States is between 20 to 25 percent of college women (Banyard & Moynihan, 2007, p.463; Exner & Cummings, 2011, p.655; Burn, 2009, p.779; Foubert, 2013, p. 242). A study conducted at the University of New Hampshire surveyed both men and women with the same measures and found that 19.6 percent of women and 8.2 percent of men had experienced “unwanted sexual experiences” in the past 6 months (Banyard, Ward, Cohn, Plante, Moorhead, & Walsh, 2007, p. 59). Despite these high numbers, only 40 percent of universities provide sexual assault training for students or faculty, and only 60 percent of universities conduct educational programming related to safety that even mentions the issue of sexual assault, as required under the Clery Act (Gonzales, Schofield, Schmitt, 2002, p. 6-7).

In light of these facts, the goal of this paper is to address how well “No Zebras, No Excuses” compares to the major themes in existing research about effective—and ineffective—bystander and sexual assault prevention programming in universities across the country. This paper also explores research about the prevalence and causes of sexual aggression in the United States, particularly sexual assault. While not explicitly related to prevention programs, research about sexual aggression in general provides important insights on societal changes that must be made to end both sexual aggression and bystander behavior, and should therefore be reflected in effective educational programming. “No Zebras, No Excuses” is analyzed in relation to the three main components of a bystander and sexual aggression prevention education program: style, timing, and content of the program. Overall, the message and presentation of No Zebras, No Excuses encompasses the majority of the important themes addressed in the body of research analyzed, with room for continued improvement upon a strong foundation.

Introduction

Sexual violence is at epidemic rates in the United States. Sexual aggression—which includes sexual assault, intimate partner violence, stalking, and harassment—occurs at such high rates that the United States is considered to be a “rape prone society” (Tatum & Foubert, 2009, p. 196). According to the 2010 National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS), approximately 1 in 5 women and 1 in 71 men have been raped in their lifetime, with 1 in 21 men being “made to penetrate someone else;” approximately 1 in 6 women and 1 in 19 men have been stalked in their lifetime; and approximately 1 in 3 women and 1 in 4 men have experienced some type of intimate partner violence in their lifetime (Black, Basile, Breiding, Smith, Walters, Merrick, Chen, & Stevens, 2011, p. 1). The same study conducted the following year, in 2011, reported similar statistics. 19.3 percent of women and 1.7 percent of men reported having been raped in their lifetime; 43.9 percent of women and 23.4 percent of men reported having experienced another form of “unwanted sexual experience;” 15.2 percent of women and 5.7 percent of men reported having experienced stalking in their lifetime; and 22.3 percent of women and 14.0 percent of men reported having experienced physical intimate partner violence in their lifetime (Breiding, Smith, Basile, Walters, Chen, & Merrick, 2014, p. 1).

In addition to the physical, emotional, and physiological injury inflicted by sexual violence, survivors often experience Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) as a result of their experiences; other side effects include being more likely “to report having asthma, diabetes, and irritable bowel syndrome,” as well as “frequent headaches, chronic pain, difficulty with sleeping, activity limitations, poor physical health, and poor mental health” (National intimate partner and sexual violence survey, 2010, p. 1-2). Survivors are also more likely to suffer from substance abuse and alcoholism, particularly men experiencing the latter (Banyard, Ward, Cohn, Plante, Moorhead, & Walsh, 2007, p. 55). Furthermore, approximately “5 percent of rape survivors become pregnant” as a result of their sexual assault (Foubert &

Newberry, 2006, p. 133), and survivors of rape in general have higher rates of eating disorders, “heavy smoking, high-risk drinking, cocaine use, drinking and driving, and considering and attempting suicide” as well as “chronic headaches, fatigue, sleep disturbance, and recurrent nausea” (Foubert & Newberry, 2006, p. 133). With so many individuals in the United States experiencing any and all forms of sexual aggression, as well as these subsequent side effects—among others—public attention must be focused on this issue in order to support survivors and end this epidemic.

The aforementioned statistics regarding the victimization of women are generally accepted by most researchers. However, the statistics surrounding victimization of men are, unfortunately, varied and inconsistent. A 1991 study by Koss and Harvey reported that approximately 1 in 10 of all sexual assaults that occur are committed against men (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004, p. 62). The 2010 National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) places the statistic of male survivors at 1 in 71 (Black, Basile, Breiding, Smith, Walters, Merrick, Chen, & Stevens, 2011, p. 1). Lisak et al (1996) reported child sexual abuse of males at 45 percent (Carr and VanDeusen, 2004, p. 282). The variance in these statistics may be a result of the definition of sexual assault used, which is not consistent across state lines. For instance, the federal definition of sexual assault was changed to: “The penetration, no matter how slight, of the vagina or anus with any body part or object, or oral penetration by a sex organ of another person, without the consent of the victim” as recently as 2012 (Attorney General Eric Holder announces revision of the uniform crime report’s definition of rape, 2012). A survey conducted by the CDC in 2011 demonstrated this discrepancy. In this study, rape included “completed or attempted forced penetration or alcohol- or drug-facilitated penetration, and sexual violence other than rape [included] being made to penetrate a perpetrator, sexual coercion, unwanted sexual contact, or noncontact unwanted sexual experiences” (Breiding, Smith, Basile, Walters, Chen, & Merrick, 2014, p. 3) Following these statistics, 19.3 percent of women and 1.7 percent of men reported having experienced rape, while 43.9

percent of women and 23.4 percent of men had experienced another form of “non-rape” sexual violence (Breiding, Smith, Basile, Walters, Chen, & Merrick, 2014, p. 2). Furthermore, “Although legal definitions are often broad in scope, members of society usually define rape as vaginal, oral, or anal intercourse against a person’s will” (Humphrey and Kahn, 2000, p. 1313); as a generally-accepted definition—regardless of its exclusivity—this definition may be used without questioning the inherent assumptions in research, contributing to this confusion about prevalence of sexual assault committed against men. Therefore, whatever the statistics, it can hopefully be agreed that too many men and women are experiencing sexual violence in their lifetimes, particularly in their college years.

According to Fisher, Cullen, and Turner (2000), colleges “have become hot spots for criminal activity,” particularly sexual assault (n.p.). As such, this paper primarily focuses on sexual assault for a narrower, more manageable discussion of the prevailing research, while still addressing the full spectrum of sexual aggression. Although the statistics vary slightly, the generally agreed-upon incidence rate of sexual assault at United States universities is between 20 to 25 percent of college women (Banyard & Moynihan, 2007, p.463; Exner & Cummings, 2011, p.655; Burn, 2009, p.779; Foubert, 2013, p. 242). An even more staggering finding is that college women, particularly those ages 16 to 24, are between three to four times more likely to experience sexual assault than the general population (Humphrey & Kahn, 2000, p. 1313; Gidycz, Layman, Rich, Crothers, Gylys, Matorin, & Jacobs, 2001, p. 1120). Furthermore, the “lifetime incident rates for college women [is] 50% or more” (Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007, p. 463). The 2011 NISVS reported that, for all types of sexual aggression by an intimate partner, 71.1 percent of women and 58.2 percent of men who experienced this type of violence were victimized prior to the age of 25 (Breiding, Smith, Basile, Walters, Chen, & Merrick, 2014, p. 2). Foubert (2013) also states that 1 in 6 men have been the survivor of sexual abuse prior to age 18 (p. 242). This means that both men and women are most likely to experience victimization prior to college—which will affect their

functioning during their time at college—or while they are attending college. Some discrepancies in statistics regarding college men and women may result from post-research comparison, rather than comparative studies that survey both men and women at the same time. In order to best remedy this research flaw, a study conducted at the University of New Hampshire surveyed both men and women with the same measures and found that 19.6 percent of women and 8.2 percent of men had experienced “unwanted sexual experiences”—a broad, inclusive definition—in the past 6 months (Banyard, Ward, Cohn, Plante, Moorhead, & Walsh, 2007, p. 59). Despite a lack of precise rates, the issue of sexual aggression, specifically sexual assault, negatively affects both college women and men.

There are several characteristics of college environments that contribute to these high rates of sexual aggression. First and foremost is the party culture on many—or most—college campuses in the United States. The availability of alcohol to college students and the acceptance of partying can provide an environment where perpetrators have easy access to alcohol, which is used as a tool to intoxicate and assault survivors (Lawyer, Resnick, Bakanic, Burkett, & Kilpatrick, 2010, p. 453-458; Abbey, Clinton, McAuslan, Zawacki, & Buck, 2002, p. 99). In fact, one of the most common methods of perpetration of sexual assault involves the purposeful intoxication and incapacitation of targets through alcohol (Lawyer, Resnick, Bakanic, Burkett, & Kilpatrick, 2010, p. 453-458). The use of alcohol is involved in approximately 50 percent of sexual assaults in college environments (Abbey, Clinton, McAuslan, Zawacki, & Buck, 2002, p. 99). Therefore, “the emerging picture for drug-related assaults is that women are at highest risk for incapacitated drug-facilitated sexual assaults in the context of a house party and in the company of someone they know” (Lawyer, Resnick, Bakanic, Burkett, & Kilpatrick, 2010, p. 459). Coupling this knowledge that sexual assaults most often take place in private settings with people the survivor is supposed to trust with the fact that specifically male bystanders are less likely to intervene in private settings (Carlson, 2008, p. 11-14) means that perpetrators are often able to victimize their targets

with immunity. Additionally, cultural attitudes shape campus culture regarding sexual assault. There is often an attitude of acceptance surrounding the purposeful use of alcohol to obtain sex, with “thirty-five percent of the sample [having] said that their friends approve of getting a woman drunk to have sex with her, and twenty percent reported having friends who have gotten drunk or high to have sex with her” in a study by Carr and VenDeusen (2004, p. 284). Therefore, a lack of knowledge about the importance of the definition of consent, including the fact that it cannot be given while “mentally incapacitated” (750.520a Definitions), plays a role in this peer acceptance of sexual assault on college campuses.

Finally, the presence of Greek life on campus is also related to the issue of sexual assault. “High risk” fraternities, where there are higher rates of hostility and degradation focused toward women, may create microcosms of continually-reinforced support for sexual violence in comparison to low-risk fraternities or the general student population (Humphrey & Kahn, 2000, p. 1315). While the role of fraternities in rape culture is often discussed, it is forgotten that members of fraternities and sororities are also considered to be at greater risk for victimization than the general college population (Anderson & Whiston, 2005, p. 384). Therefore, while perpetrators and survivors in Greek life do not encompass all sexual assaults that occur in college environments, the high risk factors of certain fraternities—and their exclusive presence on college campuses—may contribute even slightly to these higher rates.

Current University Climate

As a result of such high victimization rates on college campuses, there has been federal legal action to address this situation. One approach—The Campus Sexual Assault Victims’ Bill of Rights—focuses on providing assistance to survivors of sexual aggression. The Campus Sexual Assault Victims’ Bill of Rights necessitates the existence of internal reporting and disciplinary procedures for sexual assault cases on universities campuses, as well as the full disclosure of varying options to all students (Campus

sexual assault victims’ bill of rights, 2013). The Student Right-to-Know Act and the Campus Security Act, also called the Clery Act, takes a second approach that focuses on proving some type of educational program in the hopes of preventing future acts of sexual aggression (About the Jeanne Clery Act, 2013). The Clery Act also requires that statistics regarding sexual assaults that occur within a certain perimeter of campus be reported to students and the general public annually (Gonzales, Schofield, & Schmitt, 2002, p. 1).

Despite the fact that these policies have existed since the early 1990s, universities have failed to adequately implement them. In fact, only 40 percent of universities provide sexual assault training for students or faculty, and only 60 percent of universities conduct educational programming related to safety that even mention the issue of sexual assault, as required under the Clery Act (Gonzales, Schofield, Schmitt, 2002, p. 6-7).; of those that do present educational programs, two-thirds ignore the reality of acquaintance rape (Gonzales, Schofield, Schmitt, 2002, p. 7), even though between 66 to 90 percent of perpetrators are known to survivors of sexual assault (Burn, 2009, p. 779; Franiuk, 2010, p. 104; Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000). Not only are these universities failing to adhere to their legal obligations, they are misrepresenting the issue of sexual aggression at the peril of their students by ignoring the overwhelming prevalence of acquaintance rape.

Most recently, the Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act (SaVE) has been implemented as an amendment to the Clery Act, which requires the changes necessary to bring universities to full compliance with the law (The campus sexual violence elimination act, 2013). The four main areas of the Campus SaVE Act provide a new focus on transparency, rights of survivors, internal code of conduct proceedings, and educational programming. These components were required to be completed by October 2014 (The campus sexual violence elimination act, 2013). Currently, dozens United States universities are under investigation for inadequate adherence to these policies and violating Title IX, which prevents

discrimination based on sex in an educational environment; sexual aggression is included under sex-based discrimination (Title IX, n.d.). Hopefully these investigations and a pressing deadline for new, improved policies related to sexual aggression will force universities to place a new focus on protecting current and potential survivors of sexual violence.

Central Michigan University (CMU) is generally considered above average in adherence to policies like Title IX and the Clery Act. There are approximately 40 Sexual Aggression Peer Advocates, who volunteer their time to help survivors of sexual aggression (SAPA). These students undergo a background check and an extensive 3-hour-long interview process in order to be accepted; they receive 50 hours of training in the issue of sexual aggression, as well as reflective listening and resources on campus, at the beginning of every school year. SAPA’s are trained to be advocates during any legal and medical proceedings that survivors might choose to pursue.

SAPA runs a 24/7 completely confidential crisis phone and chat line. Only the SAPA on call and the program director have access to the information disclosed by the contact on the crisis line. Only if the contact is a minor or in imminent danger to themselves or others, confidentiality can be broken to contact proper authorities. Aggregate data is reported to the university for funding purposes, but no one outside of SAPA has access to any confidential information shared by clients. A current goal for SAPA is to also hold direct, in-office service hours for anyone who might feel more comfortable talking in person. The confidentiality component of SAPA is crucial, even in light of new focus on Title IX; the mandatory reporting structure of Title IX often forces survivors to go through a reporting process that they might not want to be involved in. SAPA provides a safe, confidential place for survivors to talk and receive help without having to go forward with any formal reporting process.

Even outside of SAPA, Central Michigan University’s Office of Student Conduct focuses on the importance of confidentiality, even to the point of allowing the survivor to use a pseudonym during

hearings. The survivor has the choice not to face the assailant if they so choose. The Office also focuses on the importance of recognizing the necessity of a preponderance of evidence, rather than evidence beyond a reasonable doubt, for disciplinary action. Universities are not a part of the justice system and, therefore, should not be bound to the same intensive course of action in fulfilling their primary duty of protect students. Requiring a preponderance of evidence allows universities to better fulfill this role. Finally, the Office also ensures that survivors have the right to a rape shield during the university hearing, meaning that the past sexual activity of the survivor plays no role in this hearing. The policies for sexual aggression cases, which again include harassment, stalking, intimate partner violence, and sexual assault, are clearly outlined in the Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Disciplinary Procedures Sections 3 (Responsibilities of Students) and 4 (Official University Sanctions). According to the CMU Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Disciplinary Procedures, sexual assault is defined as:

3.2.7.1 Sexual Assault. Sexual assault includes, but is not limited to, inflicting sexual contact upon another person or sexually penetrating any person without that person's consent. Conduct will be considered without consent if no clear consent is given, or when the assaulted person is unconscious or otherwise without the physical or mental capacity to consent. Initiating sexual contact on someone under the influence of alcohol or drugs is considered "without consent" (Responsibilities of students)

According to the Official University Sanctions portion of the code, sexual assault is considered a Grave Offense and, therefore, has a mandatory sentencing of suspension. This mandatory sanction treats all forms of sexual assault with the seriousness the act deserves, while still providing a survivor with a range of choices during the hearing process. However, while the federal policies surrounding Title IX continue to change, so too do Central Michigan University's policies.

Additionally, as part of the mandatory freshman and transfer student orientation at the beginning of each academic year, CMU's Sexual Aggression Peer Advocates put on the sexual assault prevention program entitled “No Zebras, No Excuses.” The name of the program is derived from the bystander behavior that zebras exhibit when one of the herd is singled out, attacked, and eaten by a lion in plain

sight. As such, the main focus of the program is engaging the audience to stop situations of sexual aggression, rather than be bystanders like these zebras. The program is comprised of a series of seven scenes, each addressing a different facet of the spectrum of sexual aggression, including harassment, stalking, intimate partner violence, and sexual assault. Each subsequent scene increases in intensity throughout the hour-long program, presenting real-life scenarios in which sexual aggression can occur. In between each scenario, SAPA educators walk into the aisles of the theater and provide more information on the type of sexual aggression in each scene, as well as what bystanders can do to intervene or prevent sexual aggression from happening.

Methods of Data Analysis

The goal of this paper was to address how well “No Zebras, No Excuses” compares to the major themes in existing research about effective bystander and sexual assault prevention programming in universities across the country. In my thematic analysis, I also explored research about the prevalence—and causes of this prevalence—of sexual aggression in the United States, specifically sexual assault. While not explicitly related to prevention programs, research about sexual aggression in general provides important insights on societal changes that must be made to end both sexual aggression and bystander behavior. These themes can be translated into necessary components of an effective bystander and sexual assault prevention education program, as this type of programming is one way to affect broader societal change.

Themes were determined through the repetition of key ideas either stressed as being important to understanding the issue of sexual aggression or specifically necessary for educational programming. To determine these themes, I used the technique key words in context (KWIC) in order to find repetition of both terms and concepts in the literature (Wutich et al., 2014, p. 547). Inductive coding (Wutich et al.,

2014, p. 543) was used to find themes in the first half of the research articles; once a codebook was determined from these sources, deductive coding (Wutich et al., 2014, p. 542) was used to determine whether the same themes existed in the second half of the research articles. Subthemes, as indicated in the codebook, were named through in vivo coding (Wutich et al., 2014, p. 541), or naming based on the actual phrasing found in the literature. Once I determined the major themes in the literature, I was able to categorize them into three larger groups, which reference the structure of a bystander or sexual aggression prevention education program: style of the program, timing of the program, and content of the program. All of the subthemes detail the important elements that should be included in each overarching theme. Overall, the most focus was placed on the content of the education program, while style and timing were still important components of a program’s efficacy.

Thematic Codebook

Style of program	Timing of program	Content of program
Theatrical production	Continued exposure throughout college/ “booster” programs	General information and definitions
Single-gender audience	Proactive education	Statistics: • Incidence rate • Perpetration rate • Low report rate
Cohesive peer group audience		Perpetrator characteristics: • Gender • Relationship to survivor • Motivation • Power/sex connection • Rape myth endorsement • Method of perpetration • Role of alcohol • Serial Perpetration
		Impact of societal and community norms • Normative connection between power and sex

		• Traditional masculinity/rape culture • Backlash hypothesis
		Rape myths • Excusing perpetrator • Blame of survivor • Characteristics of those who adhere to rape myths • Connection with other oppressive belief systems (e.g. racism) • Connection between attitudes and behavior • Myths internalized by survivors • Persistence of attitudes over time
		Role of bystanders • Success of focus on audience as potential helpers rather than potential victims and perpetrators • Bystanders have more opportunities to help own friends • Intervention as function of relationship to survivor and/or perpetrator • Peer acceptance as one of most important factors in rape myth attitudes and willingness to rape • Types of intervention • Barriers to intervention • Skill set for bystander intervention • Formal commitment to intervene
		Empathy-focused
		Prevention vs. avoidance • Education changes/prevents attitudes and behaviors • Programs not effective when focusing on survivors/avoidance tactics

Theme I: Style of Program

Several themes emerged regarding the styling of sexual assault prevention programs. The first of these is presenting a sexual assault prevention program in theatrical format, including vignettes that depict the reality of sexual assault (Black, Weisz, Coats, & Patterson, 2000, p. 594-595). This type of performance potentially allows for a greater emotional connection between the audience and the presented scenarios, moreso than a purely educational program (Black, Weisz, Coats, & Patterson, 2000, p. 602). Deming, Covan, Swan, and Billings (2013) state that education should “[bridge] legal definitions with real contexts,” such as through theatrical representations of sexual aggression (p. 482). “No Zebras, No Excuses” succeeds in this theme in that it is a theatrical performance, supplemented by informational components discussing the facts around sexual aggression.

Through the combination of these two components, the audience is better able to notice and interpret sexual aggression in their everyday lives by seeing it depicted in vignettes performed by students. The scenarios depicted in “No Zebras, No Excuses” are based on characteristics of the types of sexual aggression encountered by SAPA, and they reflect known statistics and facts regarding how sexual aggression often occurs in a college environment. Additionally, the harsh language often used throughout the program allows students to understand the intensity of the subject being discussed, as well as how sexual aggression will manifest itself in their daily lives, rather than presenting a sterile depiction of such traumatic events. Finally, the program connects each scenario of sexual aggression to its legal definition (See Appendices B, C, D, & E). For example, after a scenario in which a male student is sexual assaulted under the influence of alcohol, SAPA educators in the aisles discuss the legal definition of criminal sexual conduct in Michigan, as well as the fact that Michigan is a consent-focused state.

The second theme regarding the style of educational programs is presenting to single-gender audiences (Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007, p. 464; Exner & Cummings, 2011, p. 657; McMahon &

Farmer, 2011, p.79). The reasoning behind this presentation style primarily related to differences in knowledge and attitudes relating to sexual aggression, with women typically more prepared to absorb the information presented in educational programs (Exner & Cummings, 2011, p. 656). Although a specific reason was not given for this disparity, it could exist because women are generally more likely to be raped and might feel that educational programs regarding rape are more pertinent as a result (Burn, 2009, p.782). “No Zebras, No Excuses” does not perform to single gender audiences, as the program is directed at an audience of all genders as potential bystanders, rather than potential victims or perpetrators associated with either gender. SAPA is also making a focused effort to use more gender neutral language in programming in order to be inclusive of student who do not identify as male or female.

Finally, since “No Zebras, No Excuses” is performed during freshman and transfer student orientation, most of the audience lives in residence halls. The audience of “No Zebras, No Excuses” is divided by residence halls, which coincides with the potential efficacy of programming for “cohesive peer groups” (Gidycz, Orchowski, & Berkowitz, 2011, p. 722). Having a “cohesive peer group” audience is the third major theme regarding style of programming (Gidycz, Orchowski, & Berkowitz, 2011, p. 722). In this study by Gidycz, Orchowski, and Berkowitz (2011), male students who participated in the residence-hall based educational programming believed that their peers would be willing to intervene in a situation of sexual violence, which is “noteworthy in light of previous research suggesting that men’s own willingness to intervene is strongly associated with their perceptions of how other men might act in similar situations” (Gidycz, Orchowski, & Berkowitz, 2011, p. 735). Gidycz, Orchowski, and Berkowitz’s (2011) study focused specifically on the peer influence of men, but all students in peer groups and close environments like residence halls have the ability to impact each other’s attitudes and behaviors. Since residence halls are not only the homes for freshmen college students but also a place to make friends, it stands to reason that residents comprise a population of potential bystanders in situations of sexual

aggression. Therefore, by educating specific residence halls as a group, “No Zebras, No Excuses” has the potential to create not only proactive bystander support systems, but an atmosphere that is not conducive to rape supportive attitudes in a given residence hall. Finally, the presentation of sexual aggression prevention programming during orientation—like “No Zebras, No Excuses”—is regarded as a “promising practice” by Gonzales, Schofield, and Schmitt’s (2002) report on sexual assault for the US Department of Justice (p. 12).

Theme II: Timing of Program

The overwhelming consensus noted in research regarding the timing of educational programming is the necessity of long-term education; bystander and sexual assault prevention education needs to be continued over time in order to maintain the change in rape supportive attitudes and bystander willingness to intervene even a few months after attending an educational program (Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007, p. 478; Hayes-Smith & Levett, 2010, p. 347; Burn, 2009, p. 780; Gidycz, Layman, Rich, Crothers, Gylys, & Matorin, 2001, p. 1121; Gidycz, Orchowski, Berkowitz, 2011, p. 735; Anderson & Whiston, 2005, p. 384). Banyard, Moynihan, and Plante’s (2007) research suggests a “booster” program several months later in order to reinforce the concepts learned in the initial program. In this study, positive changes in attitudes about sexual aggression declined slightly, but overall were maintained a year after an initial educational program; the researchers credited this long-term effectiveness to the booster program that students received two months after the initial program (p. 478). “No Zebras, No Excuses” does not have follow-up or booster programs, suggesting an area for improvement. SAPA does offer educational programming for classrooms by request, as well as programs specific to awareness months, but these programs do not reach all students.

The second theme regarding timing is ensuring that the programming is proactive. In order to be proactive, educational programs must reach students before they encounter high-risk scenarios in order to provide them with a specific skill set related to sexual aggression to intervene in such scenarios (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004, p. 68; Hayes-Smith & Levett, 2010, p. 348; Lee, Guy, Perry, Sniffen, & Mixson, 2007, p. 16). Considering the fact that college itself is a high-risk environment for sexual aggression, the beginning of freshman year is the best timing for proactive education. “No Zebras, No Excuses” accomplishes this by being presented prior to classes starting, as well as in the midst of Central Michigan University’s “welcome weekend,” during which many freshman experience their first college party. Specifically, parties are high risk environments because of the presence of alcohol, which is used as a tool by perpetrators in many sexual assaults (Lawyer, Resnick, Bakanic, Burkett, & Kilpatrick, 2010, p. 453-458; Abbey, Clinton, McAuslan, Zawacki, & Buck, 2002, p. 99). Finally, proactive programming includes “positive actions that students can take to demonstrate a commitment to addressing sexual violence regardless of whether they have witnessed an explicit behavior along the continuum of sexual violence” (McMahon & Banyard, 2011, p. 10). Scene 7 of “No Zebras, No Excuses” (See Appendix G) ends with the SAPA educators each making statements about the simple, proactive things that they can do—such as “I will believe survivors when they tell me their stories”—encouraging the audience to do the same.

Theme III: Content of Program

General information and definitions

First and foremost, the content of educational programs should be generally informative about the issue of sexual aggression, as well as focused on defining the various types of sexual aggression (Burn, 2009, p. 780; Gonzales, Schofield, & Schmitt, 2002, p. 12-13). According to Humphrey and Kahn (2000),

“Although legal definitions are often broad in scope, members of society usually define rape as vaginal, oral, or anal intercourse against a person’s will” (p. 1313), which is most likely the definition that researchers use to discuss sexual assault statistics. However, as Central Michigan University is located in the state of Michigan—and because Michigan’s state code pertaining to rape is quite progressive—“No Zebras,” No Excuses uses the state Criminal Sexual Conduct code for consistency and relevance. “No Zebras, No Excuses” follows up every theatrical representation of sexual aggression with SAPA educators discussing the legal definition of that act, grounding seriousness of the issue in the fact that these acts are not only intrinsically harmful, but also criminal (See Appendices B, C, D, & E). For example, Michigan’s definition of Criminal Sexual Conduct (Michigan Penal Code 328-1931-LXXVI) is referenced during No Zebras, No Excuses (See Appendix C). Criminal Sexual Conduct includes sexual contact, which is defined as follows:

(q) “Sexual contact” includes the intentional touching of the victim’s or actor’s intimate parts or the intentional touching of the clothing covering the immediate area of the victim’s or actor’s intimate parts, if that intentional touching can reasonably be construed as being for the purpose of sexual arousal or gratification, done for a sexual purpose, or in a sexual manner for:

- (i) Revenge.
- (ii) To inflict humiliation.
- (iii) Out of anger (750.520a Definitions).

The Criminal Sexual Conduct code also includes sexual penetration, which is defined as:

(r) “Sexual penetration” means sexual intercourse, cunnilingus, fellatio, anal intercourse, or any other intrusion, however slight, of any part of a person’s body or of any object into the genital or anal openings of another person’s body, but emission of semen is not required (750.520a Definitions).

Because of the use of alcohol by so many sexual assailants at universities, the SAPA educators also reference this component of the code as well (See Appendix C), discussing mental incapacitation:

(k) “Mentally incapacitated” means that a person is rendered temporarily incapable of appraising or controlling his or her conduct due to the influence of a narcotic, anesthetic, or other substance administered to that person without his or her consent, or due to any other act committed upon that person without his or her consent (750.520a Definitions).

In addition to discussing the legal definitions of harassment, sexual assault, stalking, and domestic violence, the SAPA educators also focus on consent as the most important factor in determining whether or not an act is sexual assault (See Appendix C). The importance of consent is paramount to the definition of sexual assault, and its inclusion in sexual assault prevention programs is essential (Foubert & Newberry, 2006, p. 143). Consent is defined as “*the presence of a yes, not the absence of a no,*” and the importance of “*expressed consent*” is emphasized during “No Zebras, No Excuses” (See Appendix C). In a study by Franiuk (2010), the attendance of an educational activity and discussion about sexual assault demonstrated an increase in the understanding of the term consent, as well as its importance in defining sexual assault, from 10 percent pre-education to 86 percent post-education (p. 106). A statistical increase like this one is significant and indicates the benefits of educational programming. Therefore, making the importance of consent explicit, rather than simply implied, during “No Zebras, No Excuses” provides an opportunity for students to understand the concept of consent and the role it plays in sexual aggression.

Statistics

Another theme related to content of sexual assault prevention programs would be the incidence rate of sexual assault. As previously stated, between 20 to 25 percent of women will be the victim or survivor of a completed act of sexual assault while in college (Banyard & Moynihan, 2007, p.463; Exner & Cummings, 2011, p.655; Burn, 2009, p.779; Foubert, 2013, p. 242). This incidence rate is three to four times higher than that of the general population of women in the United States (Humphrey & Kahn, 2000, p. 1313; Gidycz, Layman, Rich, Crothers, Gylys, Matorin, & Jacobs, 2001, p. 1120). A comparative study with an inclusive definition of sexual assault found that that 19.6 percent of women and 8.2 percent of men had experienced “unwanted sexual experiences” in the past 6 months (Banyard, Ward, Cohn, Plante, Moorhead, & Walsh, 2007, p. 59). Although these rates are lower for men, a single individual of any

gender experiencing sexual assault is already too many. Sexual aggression is an epidemic in the United States, particularly on college campuses, and it must be addressed as such by universities.

The first scene of “No Zebras, No Excuses” is a Jeopardy game discussing facts about sexual assault. During this scene, the character playing Alex Trebek counts the number of people in the front row and states, *“The question is: What is the number of women who will be faced with sexual assault in their lifetime? The answer is one out of two. [COUNT THE WOMEN IN THE FRONT ROW.] Out of the _____ women in the front row, _____ of you will be faced with sexual assault”* (See Appendix A). This statement reflects research that points to “lifetime incident rates for college women of 50% or more,” while about half of these encounters will result in completed sexual assaults (Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007, p. 463).

After the first scene, the SAPA educators perform an exercise asking the audience members to close their eyes and visualize four women that they care about. They then tell the audience that—statistically—one of these four women will be the survivor of a completed act of sexual assault in her lifetime (See Appendix A). This activity reveals the high rate of sexual assault in this country by relating it to each audience member’s own life, drawing on the empathy of audience members. Additionally, after the scene where a male student is assaulted while intoxicated, the SAPA educators discuss the prevalence of sexual assault against males, as well as the fact that the legal definition of sexual assault in Michigan is not gendered (See Appendix C).

In addition to incidence rate, perpetration rate is another important theme to be discussed in sexual assault prevention programs. According to a United States Department of Justice Report from 2000, men are perpetrators in 99 percent of cases of sexual assault (Franiuk, 2010, p. 107; Foubert & Newberry, 2006, p. 133). This was corroborated in the 2011 NISVS study, where 99 percent of perpetrators committing rape against women were males, and approximately 95 perpetrators of other forms of non-

wanted sexual experiences being male as well (Breiding, Smith, Basile, Walters, Chen, & Merrick, 2014, p. 5). Approximately 80 percent of rapes committed against male survivors were committed by other men; however, male survivors who were made to penetrate, experienced sexual coercion, and had any other form of unwanted sexual contact were perpetrated against by women at rates of between approximately 55 and 83 percent (Breiding, Smith, Basile, Walters, Chen, & Merrick, 2014, p. 5).

Combining the results of several studies, between 8 and 23 percent of college men have reported actually “committing acts that met the legal definition of rape,” most of the time without admitting they had committed any crime (Burgess, 2007, p. 974; Gidycz, Layman, Rich, Crothers, Gyls, Matorin, & Jacobs, 2001, p. 1121; Black, Weisz, Coats, & Patterson, 2000, p. 590). Studies have shown that between 35 and 48 percent of men “express[ed] some probability of raping if they could be assured of not being caught or punished” (Burgess, 2007, p. 974; 980). In all but one scenario—stalking of a woman by a woman (See Appendix D)—all perpetrators of the scenes in “No Zebras, No Excuses” are men, including the scene where a man is assaulted (See Appendix C).

Additionally, rates from several studies indicate that between 66 to 90 percent of perpetrators are known to survivors of sexual assault (Burn, 2009, p. 779; Franiuk, 2010, p. 104; Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000). Although most sexual assault prevention programs ignore the reality that most sexual assaults are committed by those known to the survivor or victim (Gonzales, Schofield, Schmitt, 2002, p. 7), “No Zebras, No Excuses” does not present any scenarios in which a complete stranger is the perpetrator. Instead, the program focuses on depicting real-life perpetrators of sexual aggression, including professors (See Appendix B), sexual partners (See Appendix F), and the so-called “nice guy” (See Appendix C). The “Nice Guy” is an rapist profile developed by Thompson (1990), and is named as such because this type of predator lures in targets through his faux “nice” personality. The sexual assault of a female student in Scene 3 of “No Zebras, No Excuses” demonstrates an example of how this perpetrator targets:

Drugger: Come on,____, you look ready. I think it's time to go back to my place. [HE BEGINS TO MOVE HER STAGE RIGHT. _____LAUGHS & MUMBLES.]

Female Friend 1: _____, where are you going? [_____ ISN'T COHERENT.]

Drugger: It's okay. She's had too much to drink. I'm going to drive her home.

Female Friend 2: Don't worry, _____(FEMALE FRIEND 1'S NAME) . _____ (DRUGGER'S NAME) is a really nice guy.

Male: A very nice guy! (See Appendix C).

In this scene, the perpetrator is able to use others' perception of him as a “nice guy” to convince the bystanders at the party to ignore his actions and let the female student leave with him.

The third theme related to statistics is the report rate of sexual assault. Most survivors of sexual assault do not report their assault to police or other professionals. The report rate ranges from approximately 4 to 36 percent (Lisak & Miller, 2002, p. 73; Orchowski & Gidycz, 2012, p. 266; Rennison, 2002, p. 1), which is still less than half, even at the highest rate found in research. Additionally, most survivors who do disclose will disclose to their friends, ranging from disclosure rate of 28 to 88 percent (Black, Weisz, Coats, & Patterson, 2000, p. 590; Orchowski & Gidycz, 2012, p. 265). During Scene 6 of “No Zebras, No Excuses,” a female student is sexually assaulted by a sexual partner. The second half of the scene is comprised of two monologues, in which the survivor and perpetrator discuss their thoughts about the act to the audience. One of the survivor's thoughts is, *“I can't tell my friends, they will never believe me. I can't go home; I can't tell my parents. Where am I gonna go? Should I go to the police?”* (See Appendix F). This phrase mirrors the fears and reality of “the second assault,” or negative reactions to survivors' disclosure—both to friends and professionals ((Orchowski & Gidycz, 2012, p. 266). The prevalence of “second assault” responses is one major reason the disclosure rate is so low, even preventing survivors from feeling comfortable enough to tell their family, friends, and others they should be able to trust (Orchowski & Gidycz, 2012, p. 266). However, at the end of the scene, the survivor does disclose to a peer who reacts positively—hopefully encouraging current and future survivors in the audience to

disclose to people they trust. This scene also demonstrates to the potential bystanders, family, and friends of current survivors how to empathetically respond when a survivor discloses to them.

During the perpetrator’s monologue in Scene 6, he states, “*So what if she does tell people. They aren't going to believe her; no one is ever going to believe her. Everyone knows that bitches like that lie. Chicks always say ‘no’ when they don't mean it - right fellas?*” (See Appendix F). Often, survivor’s stories are disbelieved because of the “common patriarchal views [that] perceive sexual assault as nothing more than ‘a lie’ or a ‘woman’s attempt to get back at a man,’” which is depicted through the perpetrator’s own views of the sexual assault (Deming, Covan, Swan, & Billings, 2013, p. 466). However, after this scene, the SAPA educators reveal to the audience that the false report rate for sexual assault is the same as any other violent crime, which is about 4 to 6 percent (See Appendix F). Trends in research suggest the actual false report rate is between 2 to 8 percent, meaning that the statistics used in No Zebras, No Excuses is actually conservative (Lonsway, Archambault, & Lisak, 2009, p. 2). In order to drive the reality of this point home, the SAPA educators tell the audience that disbelieving a survivor tells that person that it is easier to believe they are the one of those few false reporters than to believe they are telling the truth (See Appendix F). Overall, “No Zebras, No Excuses” covers incidence, perpetration, and low report rate consistently throughout the program.

Perpetrator characteristics

In order to identify potential perpetrators of sexual aggression, one of the necessary themes in a sexual assault prevention program is a discussion of the common characteristics shared by perpetrators. As previously stated, men are perpetrators in 99 percent of cases of sexual assault (Franiuk, 2010, p. 107; Foubert & Newberry, 2006, p. 133). The 2011 NISVS report stated that, for rape—“completed or attempted forced penetration of alcohol- or drug-facilitated penetration” (Breiding, Smith, Basile,

Walters., Chen, & Merrick, 2014, p. 3)—men were predominantly perpetrators against both men and women; however, assaults where male survivors were made to penetrate or experienced sexual coercion were committed predominantly by women, and unwanted sexual contact and noncontract unwanted sexual experiences against men were perpetrated “more evenly” by both men and women (Breiding, Smith, Basile, Walters, Chen, & Merrick, 2014, p. 1). Therefore, differences in definitions of sexual assault impact the characteristics of who is most likely to be a perpetrator, so it is important to allow audience members to see both male and female perpetrators.

Furthermore, in cases of sexual assault, between 66 and 90 percent of perpetrators are known to the survivor (Burn, 2009, p. 779; Franiuk, 2010, p. 104; Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000). Additionally, “the more intimate the relationship, the more likely it is for a rape to be completed rather than attempted” (Gonzales, Schofield, & Schmitt, 2002, p. 3). Therefore, while our society still maintains the myth of rapists as strangers in dark alleys, potential survivors actually have the most to fear from people that they know and trust. In all of the scenes in “No Zebras, No Excuses,” the perpetrators of all forms of sexual aggression, not just sexual assault, are at least acquaintances with the survivor, if not close to them; furthermore, all but one of the perpetrators presented in the play are male.

Perpetrators have several motivations: a feeling of entitlement to sexual gratification while consciously ignoring the necessity of consent of the other party involved, “anger. . . , vindictiveness,” and finally a desire for power and control (Angelone, Mitchell, & Lucent, 2012, p. 2584). This last motivation is especially pertinent because a study conducted by Chapleau and Oswald (2010) found that “the stronger the mental association between power and sex, the more participants endorsed rape myths and reported a higher likelihood that they would rape” (p. 75). This correlation between power and sex is troubling because, while power is a motivator for sexual assailants, it is also considered to be a normal component of the traditional sexual script in United States. The “traditional sexual script” in this society is one where

sex is considered to be something that women “have” and submissively “give” to men, who are in “power over sexual relations, thus reducing females to unequal sexual participants” (Tatum & Foubert, 2009, 196; Franiuk, 2010, p. 105; Lee, Guy, Sniffen, & Mixson, 2007, p. 18). When sex is seen as something that women “possess,” this analogy can be further extrapolated to note that men who feel entitled to sex may also feel that they are entitled to “take” it from women—through sexual assault—if it is not “given” willingly. Therefore, “many women see assault experiences as fitting their perception of how sex is supposed to be between men and women” (Franiuk, 2010, p. 105). Furthermore, in sexual assaults perpetrated against males, the “more common occurrence [is] of heterosexual perpetrators who use rape and battery to exert power and control over another male” (Foubert & Newberry, 2006, p. 135). This message is important because homophobic attitudes are often reflected in societal discussions about sexual assault of men, and this reminder that sexual assault is about power and control—not sex—can help to mitigate this problem (Foubert & Newberry, 2006, p. 135).

The very first topic discussion by the SAPA educators after Scene 1 of “No Zebras, No Excuses” is this connection between sexual aggression and power and control: *“Whether talking about sexual assault, stalking, harassment, IPV, all have one thing in common: power and control. Sexual assault uses the same body parts as sex, but it is an act of power and control over another human being”* (See Appendix A). One of the most important themes regarding the motivation of perpetrators is the fact that sexual aggression is about power and control, and “No Zebras, No Excuses” brings this issue to the forefront of the program.

In the same vein, perpetrators often have high endorsement of rape myths, like the belief that power is a natural component of all sexual relationships (Chapleau & Oswald, 2010, p. 67; 75). Rape myths are commonly-held, inaccurate beliefs about sexual assault and other forms of sexual aggression that either excuse the behavior of perpetrators or unjustly place blame on survivors (Burgess, 2007, p.

974). Several studies discuss the correlation between either proven or potential sexually-aggressive behavior and rape myths (Burgess, 2007, p. 974; Smith & Welchans, 2000, p. 1257; McMahon & Banyard, 2011, p. 6; Hayes-Smith & Levett, 2010, p. 338; Carr & VanDeusen, 2004, p. 281). One such rape myth that perpetrators often believe—again connected to the concept of power and control—is that women secretly want to be forced to have sex (Burgess, 2007, p. 986-988). There are several other characteristics that have been found to have correlations to some form of sexual aggression. Displaying negative, hostile, or sexist views of women in general (McMahon & Banyard, 2011, p. 6; Carr & VanDeusen, 2004, p. 281), and a greater acceptance of more traditional or rigid gender roles (Carr & VanDeusen, 2004, p. 281; Tatum & Foubert, 2009, p. 196) have all been found to have a correlation to either potential or actual sexually-aggressive behavior. After Scene 7, the SAPA educators discuss these various characteristics of perpetrators: “*athletic, body-conscious, outwardly confident, “nice,” and views women as sexual conquests*” first and foremost (See Appendix F). While correlational, not causational, these relationships are still important to note, either as a way to identify behaviors and attitudes that may result in sexually aggressive behavior or to identify characteristics that sexually aggressive individuals espouse, signifying who is most likely to be a sexual perpetrator.

Method of operation of sexual perpetrators is also an important theme to discuss in order for audience members to be able to identify potential perpetrators in their college experience. A study by Carr & VanDeusen (2004) showed that verbal coercion—such as threats—is used more often than physical force or violence (p. 284). One of the most common methods of perpetration is purposeful intoxication of targets through alcohol (Lawyer, Resnick, Bakanic, Burkett, & Kilpatrick, 2010, p. 453-458). In fact, alcohol is involved in approximately 50 percent of sexual assaults in college environments (Abbey, Clinton, McAuslan, Zawacki, & Buck, 2002, p. 99). As such, a theme among the sexual assault prevention research was the specific mention of the need to include a discussion about alcohol in rape prevention

programs (Foubert & Newberry, 2006, p. 136-143; Hayes-Smith & Levett, 2010, p. 336). In the previously-mentioned study by Carr & VanDeusen (2004), 12 percent of the sexually aggressive men used alcohol to facilitate sexually assaulting someone, but approximately three times as many individuals said that it was socially-acceptable to intoxicate someone in order to have sex with them (p. 284). Furthermore, in a study by Burgess (2007), a discussion of rape myths revealed that:

Endorsement of these items essentially translated to accepting the notion that “anything you can do to achieve sex with a woman” is okay. This included beliefs that alcohol improved the sexual experience, the belief that there were no and/or minimal dangers in mixing alcohol and sex, and even falsely professing love and/or commitment was okay to have sex in the moment (p. 989).

These statistics indicate not only a lack of knowledge about the fact that, legally, consent cannot be given when incapacitated by alcohol, but that perpetrators willfully choose to intoxicate their targets (Carr & VanDeusen, 2004, p. 284). In addition to purposeful intoxication, perpetrators also select and isolate their victims through a premeditated targeting sequence, which may even be discussed with bystanders before the assault (McMahon & Banyard, 2011, p. 7). The role of alcohol is mentioned several times throughout “No Zebras, No Excuses.” In Scene 1, it is correctly identified as the number one date rape drug (See Appendix A). Scene 3 of “No Zebras, No Excuses” presents two scenarios in which a male and a female student are drugged by a perpetrator. The male student, specifically, is drugged with alcohol. The following dialogue not only discusses the intentional intoxication of the student, but also the peer support for alcohol-facilitated assault:

Male: Well that girl had been asking about you all night, and I knew you would puss out, so I told her to get you drunk and then you couldn’t say no.

Assaulted Male: Couldn’t say no? Man why the fuck would you do that? I didn’t want that to happen.

Male: Ok stop being a little bitch. You got drunk, you got some ass, what man wouldn’t want that, Why the fuck are you complaining? Besides, she was a hot chick, so reattach your balls and say thank you (See Appendix C).

Finally, after a scene depicting a sexual assault, the SAPA educators discuss the entire targeting sequence of the most common familiar predator: “Nice Guy” (See Appendix F). This official rapist profile

is aptly named because so many people express surprise about perpetrators’ identities because they were such “nice guys.” The sequence begins with the perpetrators finding a victim, typically in a social setting where someone else knows about the assault. The perpetrator uses alcohol as a tool to intoxicate and incapacitate their selected victim, then isolates that individual away from the social setting. If consent is not given for sex, the perpetrator’s sequence continues on to intimidation, coercion, or threat typically only escalating to physical force if met with resistance. As a final point, the SAPA educators discuss that the perpetrator completes the sequence by attempting to ensure that the survivor does not tell friends or professionals about the assault (Thompson, 1990; see Appendix F).

Finally, another important theme in relationship to perpetrator characteristics is that a substantial number of sexual assaults are committed by serial perpetrators (Gidycz, Layman, Rich, Crothers, Gyls, Matorin, & Jacobs, 2001, p. 1132; Carr & VanDeusen, 2004, p. 279; Lisak & Miller, 2002, p. 80). In a study about repeat offending conducted by Lisak and Miller (2002), 120 rapists were identified out of a pool of 1,822 men. Approximately 60 percent of these rapists were serial offenders, with an average of almost 6 rapes per offender (Lisak & Miller, 2002, p. 78-80). Even beyond sexual assaults, these perpetrators had committed other serial acts of violence as well, “including their 483 acts of rape, these 120 individuals admitted to a total of 1,255 different acts of interpersonal violence” (Lisak & Miller, 2002, p. 78). For this reason, discussing the specific, often highly-predictable characteristics of perpetrators, as done in “No Zebras, No Excuses,” is essential for identifying potential perpetrators that are serial offenders.

Impact of societal and community norms

The characteristics that perpetrators embody and the rape myths that they internalize to justify their actions do not exist in a vacuum. Instead, they are a part of larger societal norms about sex and sexual

aggression, which is a theme that is important to a broader discussion of sexual assault prevention (Lee, Guy, Perry, Sniffen, & Mixson, 2007, p. 15). According to Tatum and Foubert (2009), the United States is, in fact, a “rape prone” society because of the societal adherence to “masculine ideologies and the endorsement of ‘macho personalities’ [that] particularly encourage sexual assault” (p. 196). As discussed in terms of perpetrator characteristics, power-based relationships are considered an intrinsic part of a traditional sexual script in the United States (Franiuk, 2010, p. 105; Tatum & Foubert, 2009, 196). This connection between power and sex runs so deep that sexual assault is seen as normative by survivors, preventing many of them from labelling their experiences (Deming, Covan, Swan, & Billings, 2013, p. 466). Despite the fact that this mentality—and many others regarding sexual aggression—are entirely fictional, rape myths are characterized by their incredible persistence, even in the face of such a large body of research disputing them. One reason that this might be the case is called a “backlash hypothesis;” this hypothesis states that, as gender equality and acceptance of more egalitarian gender roles for men and women advance, sexual aggression intensifies in an initial backlash (Hayes-Smith & Levett, 2010, p. 340).

This social acceptance of rape myths and normative view of sexual assault can be described as a “rape culture,” in which overt sexual aggression is simply one part of a spectrum of acts related to traditional gender roles (Lee, Guy, Perry, Sniffen, & Mixson, 2007, p. 15). One aspect of the traditional male gender role is hypermasculinity. Some tenants of this traditional masculinity are the use of aggression or violence—rather than compassion or empathy—to solve problems, being assertive, having a large physical stature, never appearing weak, belief in male superiority and dominance particularly during sex, and being able to drink heavily (Carlson, 2008, p. 6-8; Tatum & Foubert, 2009, p. 196). In addition, this hypermasculinity is defined against anything considered to be feminine or homosexual, like crying or intimacy (Carlson, 2008, p. 6; 14). This general acceptance of violence as inherent to masculinity is often

attributed to the belief that gender is an entirely biological category, thereby excusing violent behavior because of male hormones (Carlson, 2008, p. 12).

Such a mentality is dangerous because “if men are supposed to be aggressive, cannot be seen as weak, and must sexually pursue women, then does it not follow that rape is the ‘logical’ outcome of this gender enforced dynamic?” (Carlson, 2008, p.14). Therefore, sexual assault cannot be ended until these broader, underlying societal attitudes are deconstructed, but anthropologist Sanday (1996) argues that this is an achievable goal. Rape-free societies can and do exist, and they are characterized by egalitarian views of gender (Suarez & Gadalla, 2010, p. 2028). It is promising, then, that more liberal and egalitarian views toward women and gender roles in general are correlated with less acceptance of rape myths and victim-blaming, and that educational programs can encourage and affect these types of positive changes (Angelone, Mitchell, & Lucente, 2012, p. 2596-2597; Gidycz, Layman, Rich, Crotty, Gyls, Matorin, & Jacobs, 2001, p. 1123). Beyond simply educating about sexual aggression, “No Zebras, No Excuses” also seeks to end the societal factors that contribute to and excuse sexual violence. The performance begins and ends with a focus on encouraging the audience to follow Ghandi’s mantra to “be the change you want to see in the world” (See Appendices A & G), which means influencing community and even societal change through change on a personal level.

Rape myths

The term rape myth was coined as early as 1980 by Burt, who defined rape myths as “prejudicial and stereotyped beliefs about rape and situations surrounding rape” (Burgess, 2007, p. 974). Rape myths primarily depict the perpetrator as a male and the victim as a female. While sexual aggression typically occurs in a gendered way, rape myths *only* allow for this singular view of rape. Therefore, Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1994) later redefined rape myths as “attitudes and beliefs that are generally false yet widely

and persistently held and that serve to deny and justify male sexual aggression against women” (McMahon, 2010, p. 4). One of the most reliable measures through which to measure the acceptance of rape myths is the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale, which is divided into the following seven categories: “she asked for it; it wasn’t really rape; he didn’t mean to; she wanted it; she lied; rape is a trivial event; rape is a deviant event” (McMahon & Farmer, 2011, p. 72).

Overall, these categories are reflections of two mentalities—one that excuses the perpetrator and one that blames the victim. Although these ideas are not mutually exclusive, they both have varying components. Male perpetrators are more likely to be blamed if they are “physically unattractive,” menially employed, “or commit an interracial sexual assault” (Angelone, Mitchell, Lucent, 2012, p. 2584). This is problematic because most perpetrators in familiar sexual assaults tend to be more “athletic, body-conscious, outwardly confident, and ‘nice’ guys” (See Appendix F; Thompson, 1990). Although perpetrators should and do deserve *all* the blame in a sexual assault, very little blame is likely to be placed on the average perpetrator by society; when people espouse rape myths that make them “more likely to excuse the man than outright blame the woman for the sexual assault, excusing the man for his behavior creates a climate in which unwanted sexual contact is tolerated,” in this case using gendered language to describe perpetrators and survivors (Deming, Covan, Swan, & Billings, 2013, p. 474). Therefore, excusing the perpetrator is equally as dangerous as blaming the survivor. The SAPA educators during “No Zebras, No Excuses” focus on reminding the audience that the sole blame for sexual aggression rests on the perpetrators. After Scene 7, they discuss the difference between judgment and responsibility. The SAPA educators tell the audience members that it may not be sound judgment to go alone to a party, but if a perpetrator makes a conscious choice to assault someone, the assault is the sole responsibility of that person who chose to hurt someone else; behavior is a function of choice (See Appendix F).

In addition to perpetrators being excused for their actions, female survivors are blamed if they are “physically attractive, dress provocatively, are sexually promiscuous,” as well as if they knew the perpetrator, were “intoxicated at the time of the sexual assault,” or were alone in a social setting (Angelone, Mitchell, & Lucent, 2012, p. 2584; Koelsch, Brown, & Boisen, 2012, p. 568). This is troubling considering that between 66 and 90 percent of perpetrators are known to the survivor (Burn, 2009, p. 779; Franiuk, 2010, p. 104; Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000), and one of the most common methods of perpetration is the intoxication of targets through alcohol and isolation (Lawyer, Resnick, Bakanic, Burkett, & Kilpatrick, 2010, p. 453-458; Koelsch, Brown, & Boisen, 2012, p. 572). Therefore, it is rare for a survivor of sexual assault to *not* be blamed, considering that the factors for which women are blamed are characteristic of most sexual assaults. Further blame of survivors exists in the false belief that women lie about sexual assault or ‘cry rape’ (McMahon & Farmer, 2011, p. 74). However, trends in research show that, in contrast to the myth of false reports by vindictive women, the actual false report rate for sexual assault is between 2 to 8 percent (Lonsway, Archambault, & Lisak, 2009, p. 2). As previously state, this low false report rate is addressed in “No Zebras, No Excuses” with a conservative estimate of 4 to 6 percent (See Appendix F). Rape myths are named as such because they have no basis in the reality of sexual aggression, but rather they reflect mentalities designed to maintain the status quo of societal norms and traditional gender roles. The forced sex scene in “No Zebras, No Excuses” also assists in breaking down rape myths by letting the audience hear how these rape myths sound—directly from the perpetrator’s mouth:

Male: Shit that was fun. Add another dumb bitch to my list.

Female: I can't believe this is happening; it isn't fair! I shouldn't have even gone over there.

Male & Female: It was great/horrible!

Male: Freshmen are so easy!

Female: I can still feel him on me.

Male: She kept playing that dumbass game where she says No but means Yes. I hate when girls play that shit.

Female: I didn't say yes, I know I didn't.

Male: I can't wait to tell the guys.....

Female: I can't tell my friends, they will never believe me. I can't go home; I can't tell my parents. Where am I gonna go? Should I go to the police?

Male: I hope she doesn't start that shit about “not wanting it”...she's just afraid to look like a slut.

Female: What he did was wrong!

Male: So what if she does tell people. They aren't going to believe her; no one is ever going to believe her. Everyone knows that bitches like that lie. Chicks always say "no" when they don't mean it - right fellas?

Female: Who would believe that I was raped?

[BLACKOUT.] (See Appendix F).

The audience not only hears the perpetrator's perspective in direct opposition to the survivor's description of what happened, but they are also able to realize how these rape myths fly in the face of the reality of sexual assault.

The societal norms that rape myths uphold stem from a cultural promotion of male dominance. As such, men typically have higher rape-myth acceptance and maintenance than women (Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007, p. 478; McMahon, 2010, p. 10; McMahon & Farmer, 2011, p. 79; Suarez & Gadalla, 2010, p. 2012; Smith & Welchans, 2000, p. 1261). Other characteristics besides gender have been demonstrated as correlated with rape-myth acceptance as well. One of these is an adherence to traditional gender roles, which, again, maintains male dominance in society (Angelone, Mitchell, & Lucente, 2012, p. 2586-2587; Suarez & Gadalla, 2010, p. 2012); reflecting the engrained sexism of traditional masculinity, “college men who adhere[d] to traditional gender roles also tended to dislike and/or avoid things feminine,” as traditional masculinity is typically defined *against* all things considered feminine (Burgess, 2007, p.988). Additionally, an acceptance of other oppressive belief systems—such as racism—has been correlated to an acceptance of rape myths (Suarez & Gadalla, 2010, p. 2025-2027). “No Zebras, No Excuses” addresses other oppressive belief systems in one of the harassment scenarios where a male student is being harassed with homophobic slurs (See Appendix B). This scene is addressed as a scenario equal in weight to sexual harassment, in which bystanders—in this case the student's friend—must intervene.

While most of these rape myths are focused on female survivors, rape myths also contribute to negative effects for male survivors. As stated above, traditional masculinity in America is typically defined in opposition to femininity (Burgess, 2007, p.988). If sexual assault is considered something that only happens to women, then, men may not be able to define sexual assault committed against them as such. Furthermore, in a society where male dominance in traditional sexual scripts is considered normative (Franiuk, 2010, p. 105; Tatum & Foubert, 2009, p.196), men may be reluctant to view themselves as victims or survivors of sexual violence—particularly when they have been assaulted by a woman—as this experience does not fit in with their gender role socialization (Banyard, Ward, Cohn, Plante, Moorhead, & Walsh, 2007, p. 54). Therefore, many may be less likely to label their experiences as sexual assault or to report or disclose this experience to others, which could be a further contributor to such varying statistics regarding the rates of sexual assault perpetrated against men.

Not only do these rape myths maintain inaccurate mentalities regarding sexual assault and broader social injustices, they have also been connected to sexual aggression itself. In fact, adherence to rape myths has been correlated with potential and actual perpetration of rape and sexual assault (Smith & Welchans, 2000, p. 1257; McMahon & Banyard, 2011, p. 6; Hayes-Smith & Levett, 2010, p. 338; Carr & VanDeusen, 2004, p. 281). Furthermore, rape myths are internalized by survivors, which often prevents them from either identifying or seeking help for a sexual assault (Hayes-Smith & Levett, 2010, p. 338-339). Some women may even believe that they own men sex or that men have the right to demand or force sex in certain scenarios, like consenting to other sexual acts (Deming, Covan, Swan, & Billings, 2013, p. 467). Traditional, power-based sexual scripts that define men as dominant and women as submissive (Franiuk, 2010, p. 105; Tatum & Foubert, 2009, p. 196) also prevent both female and male survivors from realizing and labeling their experiences of victimization. Therefore, rape myths are dangerous because they directly harm survivors and allow perpetrators to excuse or justify their actions, both in their own

eyes and in the eyes of society. Educational programs, like “No Zebras, No Excuses” need to deconstruct rape myths through demonstrating the reality of sexual assault in order to both end sexual assault and protect survivors. Considering that rape myths are persistent over time—even after attending educational programs—continual education about rape myths to counteract mixed social messages is an area in which SAPA could continue to improve (Anderson & Whiston, 2005, p. 384; Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007, p. 478).

Role of bystanders

In recent years, sexual assault prevention programs have shifted from a focus on safety-related behaviors to a focus on bystander intervention. Bystander-focused programs engage the audience as “potential helpers” than as potential victims or perpetrators (McMahon & Dick, 2011, p. 4; Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004, p. 69); this method of educational programming has been quite effective, especially given that men are not only less likely to intervene as bystanders for several reasons, but they also are more likely to rebel against the ideal that they could be potential perpetrators, leading them to ignore the entirety of the program; focusing on men as helpers, rather than perpetrators, encourages them to not only care about the issue, but also to engage in ending it (McMahon & Dick, 2011, p. 4-15; Exner & Cummings, 2011, p. 657; Brown & Messman-Moore, 2009; p. 504). Focusing on bystander intervention is also important because it engages everyone, and since sexual aggression is a societal problem, the solution must involve communities—not just individuals (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004, p. 66; Exner & Cummings, 2011, p. 655; Gidycz, Orchowski, & Berkowitz, 2011, p. 722).

“No Zebras, No Excuses” is a program with a central focus on the need for bystander intervention. There are bystanders present when over one third of sexual assaults occur, meaning that one third of sexual assaults could potentially be prevented by the intervention of said bystanders (McMahon &

Banyard, 2011, p. 9; Banyard & Garnhart, 2013, p. 477). In the majority of the scenes depicting sexual aggression in “No Zebras, No Excuses,” there are either bystanders who stand up and make a difference or who stand by and let the sexual aggression happen. For example, in the scene where a female student is drugged with GHB before being sexually assaulted, the perpetrator announces his plans to a male and female bystander. The male bystander becomes an active participant in facilitating the assault, and the female bystander simply lets the assault happen without standing up to the perpetrator or informing the target of his plans (See Appendix C). However, in a scenario where a female student is stalked by her ex-girlfriend, another friend steps in and stands up to the stalker by saying: *“Hey, leave her alone. She’s told me how you’ve been stalking her for weeks, calling day and night. She told my girlfriend that you have threatened her. What’s wrong with you?”* (See Appendix D). This scenario was one of high risk, but another scene from “No Zebras, No Excuses” demonstrates a way bystanders can successfully intervene in lower-risk scenarios (McMahon & Banyard, 2011, p. 6-9):

Joker 1: Yea, get some!

Joker 2: Dude, how long have you been playing this game.

Joker 1 : Like six straight hours. I’m kicking some ass.

Joker 2 : Yea right man, you suck dick just like our roommate Josh.

Joker 1: Whatever! I’ve been giving it to these fags all day

Josh would probably love to get in on this action, wouldn’t you queer.

Joker 2: He is the king of all butt pirates aren’t you sergeant circle jerk.

Protector: Knock it off! He did nothing to you.

Joker 1 : Bitch, shut the fuck up! If you don’t like it you can leave (See Appendix B).

After this scene, the “protector” successfully removes the target of the harassment from the scenario, at least for the time being, demonstrating that bystanders can intervene at any point on the spectrum of sexual aggression.

Although audience members—particularly men—may reject the idea that they could be at risk for either victimization or perpetration of sexual assault, they are more willing to acknowledge that their friends are at risk (Foubert & Newberry, 2006, p. 134; Brown & Messman-Moore, 2009, p. 504) Because

they acknowledge their friends could be victims or perpetrators, bystanders are often more likely to intervene, or acknowledge the need to intervene, if they know the victim or perpetrators; as such, intervention as primarily a function of the bystander’s relationship to the potential victim or perpetrator is especially true of men (McMahon & Dick, 2011, p. 14; Koelsch, Brown, & Boisen, 2012, p. 572; Burn, 2009, p. 788; Bennett, Banyard, & Garnhart, 2014, p. 492). According to Bennett, Banyard, & Garnhart (2014), “This [finding] is particularly key given that bystanders are more likely to have the opportunity to help friends, and indeed in the current study, the mean level of helping friends was higher than that for strangers” (p. 492). The results of this study suggested that barriers to intervention perhaps play a stronger role in preventing bystanders from helping strangers, rather than friends (Bennett, Banyard, & Garnhart, 2014, p. 492). Therefore, engaging bystanders by encouraging them to help their friends and to recognize that even strangers are friends of their peers may be the most effective way to prevent sexual assaults through direct intervention.

In “No Zebras, No Excuses,” the SAPA educators perform an exercise asking the audience members to close their eyes and visualize 4 women that they care about. They then tell the audience that—statistically—one of these four women will be the survivor of a completed act of sexual assault in their lifetime (See Appendix A). After the audience re-opens their eyes, the SAPA educators then state that they will look out for the 1 in 4 women envisioned by the audience members, and they ask the audience members to do the same for their 1 in 4 women. Additionally, one of the very last lines of the last scene of “No Zebras, No Excuses” is: *“Bad things can happen- to anyone, anywhere. Watch your friends’ backs- don’t be afraid to stand up for what’s right”* (See Appendix G). This statement directly engages the audience members to intervene as bystanders and to look out for their friends. Finally, the audience is encouraged to intervene for others’ friends as well in the statement: *“It’s up to us to make a change. Most times, when a sexual assault happens, someone else knows about it and more than anything I wish that*

those people that were there that night had had the courage to do something. Maybe I didn't know them. Maybe I didn't matter to them. But she matters to me” (See Appendix F).

Bystander intervention among peers is also important because willingness to intervene tends to be correlated with whether or not sexually aggressive attitudes and behavior are accepted by individuals within those peer groups (Bennett, Banyard, & Garnhart, 2014, p. 478; Carlson, 2008, p. 6; Lee, Guy, Perry, Sniffen, & Mixson, 2007, p. 18; Brown & Messman-Moore, 2009, p. 504). Specifically, “men's own willingness to intervene is strongly associated with their perceptions of how other men might act in similar situations” (Gidycz, Orchowski, & Berkowitz, 2011, p. 735). While peer pressure can be negatively influential by potentially encouraging acceptance of sexual aggression, it can also be an active force of change. Considering that peer group attitudes are most impactful in changing both attitudes and behaviors, it again stands to reason that individuals can make the most change in their own peer groups. Societal change can begin with the impact of just one individual willing to intervene, instead of being a bystander, in a peer group. Engaging this importance of peer acceptance, the SAPA educators also stress in the final scene that *“For every person who thinks it's funny to bash women, there are seven others who are just as offended as we are. Take a stand and you'll be surprised who will stand with you”* (See Appendix G).

There are several ways for bystanders to intervene. Bystander intervention can generally be divided into three levels: primary, secondary, tertiary (McMahon & Banyard, 2011, p. 7-9; Lee, Guy, Perry, Sniffen, & Mixson, 2007, p. 15; McMahon, Allen, & Postmus, 2013, p. 59-65). Primary intervention is before, secondary is during, and tertiary is after an act of sexual aggression has occurred (McMahon & Banyard, 2011, p. 3-4). For example, in Scene 3 of “No Zebras, No Excuses,” primary intervention should have been used by either the male or female bystanders to stand in and prevent the drugging and assault of a female student that they were fully aware was taking place (See Appendix C).

Secondary intervention could have taken place through any of the students at the party preventing the target from leaving with the perpetrator, as he isolated the student in order to assault her; instead, they let her leave with him. Finally, tertiary intervention did occur in this scene of “No Zebras, No Excuses.” A friend of the survivor not only expresses his anger that no one intervened earlier, but he also supports his friend and asks how he can help her:

Angry Male: [ADLIBS ANGRILY TO AUDIENCE AS HE APPROACHES STAGE. LIGHTS UP WHEN HE REACHES STAGE.] That’s my friend. She was raped by this guy I know. He drugged her. What kind of sick son of a bitch would do this? No real man needs drugs or alcohol to get a woman in bed....and no real man would stand by and watch this happen. And what about the assholes at the party, how come they didn't do anything to stop this? [HE TAKES A DEEP BREATH. MOVES SLOWLY TOWARDS _____. HE PUTS HIS ARM AROUND HER. HIS VOICE SOFTENS] How can I help?
[LIGHTS FADE. ALL EXIT.] (See Appendix C).

There were several points during this scene that anyone at the party could have intervened—but they did not, and someone was assaulted as a result. Therefore, it is important to discuss all levels of bystander intervention during educational programming, especially primary to actually *prevent* assaults (Lee, Guy, Perry, Sniffen, & Mixson, 2007, p. 15).

Types of circumstances that require intervention can be divided into high and low risk. High risk scenarios involve potential and occurring acts of sexual aggression. Low-risk scenarios involve microaggressions, which are characterized by more “subtle, intentional, or unintentional acts that communicate hostile, derogatory, or sexualizing insults toward women generally and rape survivors specifically” (McMahon & Banyard, 2011, p. 9). Low-risk scenarios can also be described as proactive, or scenarios in which no one is in imminent danger of sexual aggression, but bystanders can still intervene in behaviors that make justify or excuse sexual aggression or violence (McMahon, Allen, & Postmus, 2013, p. 59). Low risk-scenarios include “sexually degrading language, sexually violent media images, pornography, and harassment” (McMahon & Banyard, 2011, p. 6). Although these types of situations are generally more common, and bystanders are also more often present in lower-risk scenarios, bystanders

are also less likely to intervene in lower-risk scenarios (McMahon & Banyard, 2011, p. 8; McMahon, 2010, p. 9; McMahon, Allen, & Postmus, 2013, p. 65). It is suggested that this lack of intervention in lower-risk scenarios exists because—although these types of behaviors are part of broader rape culture—individuals do not realize that these behaviors are harmful or connected to sexual aggression and, therefore, do not see a need to intervene (McMahon, Allen, & Postmus, 2013, p. 65). As a result, it is important that bystander education programs address both high and low-risk scenarios. “No Zebras, No Excuses” does so in Scene 3, which addresses harassment (See Appendix B). The first scenario in this scene involves a high risk scenario of sexual harassment by a college professor, but the second scenario involves a lower-risk situation in which a male student is being verbally degraded by his roommates. His friend intervenes as a bystander, telling his roommates to stop (See Appendix B). These are the types of scenarios that college students need to realize do require intervention. Finally, considering that bystander intervention exists on a spectrum, “No Zebras, No Excuses” itself is bystander intervention by educating thousands of college students each year about sexual aggression and ways to prevent it.

Just like there are many types of bystander intervention, there are also many barriers to bystander intervention at every level. In order for bystanders to be able to successfully overcome barriers in order to prevent sexual aggression, these barriers need to be discussed and deconstructed during educational programs. In order for bystanders to successfully intervene, they must be able to follow the “model created by Latane and Darley (1970),” through which they notice an act, interpret it as something that should be stopped, take personal responsibility for stopping said act, decide how to intervene, and then act (Burn, 2009, p. 780). One factor that can prevent noticing is a lack of knowledge about what sexual aggression actually looks like. Isolation, as part of perpetrators’ targeting sequences, can also prevent noticing sexual aggression if individuals aren’t aware of the red flags leading up to that isolation (Burn, 2009, p. 781-782; Koelsch, Brown, & Boisen, 2012, p. 572). The main reason that people do not identify

sexually-aggressive situations they *do* notice as high risk is a lack of understanding about consent and the definition of sexual aggression (Burn, 2009, p. 781-782; Koelsch, Brown, & Boisen, 2012, p. 572).

There are several reasons for failing to take responsibility to intervene in sexually-aggressive situations. These typically stem from broader societal issues, like adherence to rape myths, peer opinions, and a misplaced focus on survivor responsibility for their own assault (Burn, 2009, p. 782; Koelsch, Brown, & Boisen, 2012, p. 573). Distancing, or diffusion of responsibility, also impacts bystanders’ willingness to take personal responsibility for intervention; when there are “other bystanders present, the cost of non-intervention was lowered, meaning that if no one acted, then no specific individual could be blamed for their non-intervention” (Carlson, 2008, p. 4). As such, individuals must be personally motivated to intervene in order to overcome the barrier created by distancing.

People can fail to take action and intervene for multiple reasons as well. One, again, could be perceptions about peer or social support for intervention, specifically for male bystanders (Gidycz, Orchowski, & Berkowitz, 2011, p. 735). Fear of physical violence, making the wrong decision, or “social consequences” is another barrier to taking action (Burn, 2009, p. 782; Koelsch, Brown, & Boisen, 2012, p. 573). Additionally, lacking a skill set for intervention presents another barrier (Burn, 2009, p. 782; Koelsch, Brown, & Boisen, 2012, p. 573; Bennett, Banyard, & Garnhart, 2014, p. 491). In order to prevent this, educational programs should provide “concrete, specific skill development” or a “playbook” for the audience so they feel prepared to intervene (McMahon & Dick, 2011, p. 14; Gonzales, Schofield, & Schmitt, 2002, p. 13). “No Zebras, No Excuses” accomplishes this by presenting realistic, confronting representations of sexual aggression that students will more than likely encounter during college. After Scene 1, the SAPA educators summarize and discuss the previously-stated steps necessary for intervening as a bystander. They are listed as: “*notice, interpret, and take positive action*” (See Appendix A). In order to illustrate these steps in a scenario that most students could identify with, the SAPA educators provide

shoplifting as an example for bystander intervention. The SAPA educator describes *noticing* someone in a store putting something into their pocket in the aisle without paying for it first. They then explain to the audience that, based on our general knowledge about what shoplifting looks like, it is difficult to not *interpret* this action as shoplifting. The SAPA educator then states to the audience that any *action* taken after noticing and interpreting the shoplifting is a choice. Even doing nothing is a conscious choice. Finally, the SAPA educator tells that audience that the scenes and information presented throughout “No Zebras, No Excuses” will provide the audience with the knowledge of what sexual aggression looks like, how it is legally defined, and how bystanders can intervene in the various scenarios. After this performance, the audience will no longer be able to claim ignorance about what sexual assault looks like, so doing nothing when someone is about to be assaulted is now a *choice* (See Appendix A).

A final theme related to bystander intervention is the need for a commitment to intervene. This type of commitment could be personal and internalized or as formal as signing a pledge (Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007, p. 466). A commitment to intervention hopefully encourages individuals to achieve that sense of personal responsibility to help prevent sexual aggression, regardless of how many other bystanders are present (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004, p. 69). When the SAPA educators conduct the 1 in 4 exercise (See Appendix A), they tell the audience that will look out for the 1 in 4 women envisioned by the audience members; they also ask the audience members to internally commit to do the same for their 1 in 4 women. Although audience members are not asked to formally make this commitment, the request to look out for everyone else’s 1 in 4 uses empathy to help audience members realize that if they expect others to protect their friends and family, they must do the same for everyone else. Finally, “No Zebras, No Excuses” ends with the following dialogue by SAPA educators:

JOSH: We’ve given you the skills.

EMILY: What will you do? Now is the time for you to decide.

ALEX: I will support a friend who has been raped what will you do?

[ALL BEGIN MOVING TOWARDS THE BACK OF THE HOUSE. ACTORS ON STAGE]

DON'T MOVE UNTIL BLACKOUT.]

ANDY: *I will be there for someone who is being abused.* What will you do?

JASMINE: *I will not stand by and let others get hurt.* What will you do?

ANI: *I will believe survivors when they tell me their stories.* What will you do?

ALEX: *I will be the change we need to see.* What will you do?

ALL: What will you do? (See Appendix G).

This dialogue provides the audience with specific commitments that the SAPA educators will do and asks the audience members whether or not they will make the same commitments. While these questions are rhetorical, they inform audience members that they must now make a conscious choice to either act or do nothing, with a full knowledge of the consequences of doing nothing.

Focus on empathy

Another theme that is essential for inclusion in a sexual assault prevention program is a focus on empathy for survivors (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004, p. 71; Burn, 2009, p. 780-782). Empathy needs to be encouraged particularly for men, who may view it as a feminine characteristic, because empathy is necessary for a willingness to both intervene as a bystander and to support survivors (Carlson, 2008, p. 15; Koelsch, Brown, & Boisen, 2012, p. 572). Sexual assault prevention programs have been shown, in most cases, to increase the empathy of audience members in general (Gidycz, Layman, Rich, Crothers, Gyls, Matorin, & Jacobs, 2001, p. 1123; McMahon, 2010, p. 4; Foubert & Newberry, 2006, p. 143). Strikingly, educational programs specifically depicting a male survivor can increase men's empathy for all survivors, as well as “confront[ing] preexisting homophobic assumptions held by audience members” (Foubert & Newberry, 2006, p. 135).

“No Zebras, No Excuses” does include a scene in which a male is a survivor of sexual assault, after which SAPA educators discuss the prevalence of sexual assault against men (See Appendix C). In addition to including a male survivor of assault and an LGBTQ survivor of stalking (See Appendix D), “No Zebras, No Excuses” has several explicit components that encourage empathy with survivors in

general. After the forced sexual assault scene, the survivor has a monologue that allows the audience to hear her inner thoughts and feelings about what happened to her (See Appendix F). What better way to learn to empathize with survivors than to hear them share their stories (See Appendix F)? Finally, in the last scene of “No Zebras, No Excuses,” the SAPA educators engage the audience in empathizing:

EMILY: You have to have self-respect. You have to care for yourself before you can care for other people. Other people have the same fears as you, they have the same problems. Can you put yourself in their shoes?

REV: How would you like it if it was someone you loved that was raped?

ANDY: Would you want someone you cared about to get hurt? (See Appendix G)

These questions encourage the audience members to think about and empathize with their friends, family, and survivors in general by literally asking them to place themselves in a survivor’s shoes.

Prevention vs. avoidance

Educational programs regarding sexual assault typically have one of two focuses: prevention or avoidance. Programs that focus on avoidance typically discuss safety measures that those at risk for sexual assault—typically women—can take to avoid being targeted for sexual assault. However, these types of programs do not end rates of sexual assault, they simply displace a perpetrator’s focus onto another target that may not know these safety skills. Programs that primarily focused on ways that women can avoid rape “did not affect sexually aggressive behavior in men or reduce a woman’s risk of victimization” (Breitenbecher & Scarce, 1999, p. 471; Gidycz, Layman, Rich, Crothers, Cylys, Matorin, & Jacobs, 2001, p. 1132; Koelsch, Brown, Boisen, 2012, p. 564). Programs that focus on these types of safety and avoidance skills don’t even increase the willingness of bystanders to intervene (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004, p. 68), let alone decrease perpetration rates.

However, in programs that focus on changing societal norms regarding sexual aggression and bystander intervention, at least some positive change has been demonstrated pre- and post-programming

in perpetration rates. A study by Foubert and Newberry (2006) revealed that almost three-fourths of men who reported some likelihood of committing an act meeting the definition of sexual assault reported a lower likelihood after a prevention program (p. 145). Although a socially-desirability bias could have influenced these responses, the change occurred in people who had *already* reported some likelihood of committing sexual assault, despite social disapproval of criminal behavior, like sexual assault.

Even more importantly, in a study by Gidycz, Orchowski, and Berkowitz (2011), “men with a history of SA [sexually aggressive] behavior in the program group were also less likely than men with a history of sexual aggression in the control group to feel that SA behavior was reinforcing at the 4-month follow-up,” and “men also reported engaging in less sexual aggression if they were in the program compared with the control group” (p. 735). It is promising to know that rates of sexual aggression have the potential to be decreased in the present through education, rather than only in the future through societal change. “No Zebras, No Excuses” is entirely a prevention-based program. The program encourages bystanders to intervene in any scenario, while educating the audience about the many facets of the issue of sexual aggression.

Limitations & Recommendations

While the goal of this research project was to be as comprehensive as possible in examining literature surrounding the issue of sexual aggression, there are several limitations to this specific research project. First, the entire body of research surrounding sexual assault and sexual aggression was not used in this paper to find themes; the body of research used was limited in order to be as recent as possible and to focus on prevailing research and relatively well-known scholarly voices. Additionally, as the goal of this paper was to analyze the efficacy of “No Zebras, No Excuses” the content of the research primarily focused on themes surrounding sexual assault, which is the area of sexual aggression that CMU Sexual Aggression Peer Advocates are most often confronted with.

Another limitation of the paper is the heteronormative focus of the existing research. While it is true that the majority of the incidences that SAPA encounters are perpetrated by men against women, it is also true that anyone of any gender, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, disability status, socioeconomic status, etc., can perpetrate or be a survivor of sexual aggression. Therefore, future research should specifically focus on these other patterns in how sexual aggression is committed. Because discussions and research surrounding sexual aggression typically rely on gendered language and research methods, survivors who identify as male, transgender, transsexual, intersex, or non-gender binary may feel invisible from the discussion, discouraging them from coming forward with their stories. “No Zebras, No Excuses” includes both male survivors and LGBT survivors of sexual aggression in the vignettes (Appendix C; Appendix D); however, progress continually needs to be made in the field of sexual violence research and within SAPA in order to be intentionally inclusive. Furthermore, individuals who are part of a minority group in society, either because of sexual orientation, gender identity, disability status, race, or ethnicity, are often subject to higher-than-average rates of victimization, including sexual violence. While women are also a marginalized group in society, research must be expanded to include specific focuses on how other marginalized groups are affected and how these varying society categorizations intersect.

Finally, this research project focuses on qualitative thematic analysis of the efficacy of “No Zebras, No Excuses.” Quantitative survey data has been collected, interviewing approximately 3,000 freshman and transfer students at CMU pre-, post-, and longitudinally following attendance at “No Zebras, No Excuses.” This survey data needs to be analyzed to either strengthen or refute the results of this qualitative research and, therefore, provide guidance for the future of “No Zebras, No Excuses.”

Conclusion

Overall, the message and presentation of “No Zebras, No Excuses” encompasses the majority of the important themes addressed in sexual assault and sexual aggression prevention research. While every sub-category in the theme relating to program content was at least addressed, there is still room for improvement, particularly in the area of inclusivity and diversity. While a female perpetrator is represented in the stalking vignette (See Appendix D), this is the only time a female perpetrator is addressed. The 2011 NISVS study stated that in cases where male survivors were made to penetrate or experienced sexual coercion, women were predominantly the perpetrators, and unwanted sexual contact and noncontract unwanted sexual experiences against men were perpetrated “more evenly” by both men and women (Breiding, Smith, Basile, Walters, Chen, & Merrick, 2014, p. 1). Therefore, it is important to demonstrate to the male students in the audience that men can be sexually assaulted by women, and that female perpetrators against men are equally to blame as male perpetrators against women.

Furthermore, the diversity of “No Zebras, No Excuses” is typically only related to the availability and diversity of cast members. Research has shown that an acceptance of other oppressive belief systems, such as racism, has been correlated to an acceptance of rape myths (Suarez & Gadalla, 2010, p. 2025-2027). While “No Zebras, No Excuses” does address homophobia (See Appendix B), it does not overtly address racism or other oppressive attitudes, such as transphobia or ableism. Because the diversity of the cast is less controllable than the content of the program, these themes can be added to be inclusive of the diversity of the current and potential survivors in the audience.

Secondly, the style of the program presentation was a series of theatrical vignettes, directed at students living in residence halls, as supported by bystander prevention education research. However, the audience was not single-gender. Some research suggests that bystander prevention and sexual assault education programs should be presented in front of single-gender audiences because women tend to have a

higher level of readiness for the material than men (Exner & Cummings, 2011, p. 567). However, the encompassing nature of “No Zebras, No Excuses” is designed for individuals with no background knowledge of the issue of sexual aggression. Hopefully the basic nature of the material presented in No Zebras, No Excuses helps to negate any discrepancies in levels of readiness in the audience. The program is also designed to reach a large, diverse audience all at once, also reflecting the diversity of survivors of sexual aggression. An attempt to divide all freshman and transfer students into two audiences would exclude those who do not identify with the gender binary. Therefore, the intermingled audience of “No Zebras, No Excuses” and the varying gender relationships of the actors in the vignettes may reach more people than a program directed at only men or women would.

Finally, “No Zebras, No Excuses” has both strengths and weaknesses in the timing of the program. Its primary weakness is that there are no mandatory follow-up or booster programs to continue bystander and sexual assault prevention education throughout college. SAPA does provide several programs for classes upon request, as well as programs for awareness months that are open to the public. Nonetheless, students who do not take courses in the social sciences may have no further exposure to SAPA programming. However, “No Zebras, No Excuses” is presented prior to classes for all freshman and transfer students, and, as such, is proactive. While many audience members may have already experienced some form of sexual aggression, “No Zebras, No Excuses” is presented prior to their entrance into a high-risk college environment. The quantitative survey data that has not yet been analyzed does have a longitudinal component and may, therefore, be able to shed light on whether or not “No Zebras, No Excuses” is effective over extended periods of time or whether booster programs are needed. Despite the limitations of the program, the ultimate goal of Sexual Aggression Peer Advocates is to teach college students how to end sexual aggression, and “No Zebras, No Excuses” embodies the necessary themes to work toward accomplishing this goal.

References

- Abbey, A, Clinton, A.M., McAuslan, P., Zawacki, T., & Buck, P.O. (2002). Alcohol-involved rapes: are they more violent? *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26: 99-109.
- About the Jeanne Clery act. (2013). *Jeanne Clery Act Information*. Retrieved from <http://cleryact.info/clery-act.html>.
- Anderson, L.A. & Whiston, S.C. (2005). Sexual assault education programs: a meta-analytic examination of their effectiveness. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 29: 374-388.
- Angelone, D.J., Mitchell, D., & Lucente, L. (2012). Predicting perceptions of date rape: an examination of perpetrator motivation, relationship length, and gender role beliefs. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 17(13): 2582-2602.
- Attorney general Eric Holder announces revisions to the uniform crime report's definition of rape. (2012). *U.S. Department of Justice Office of Public Affairs*. Retrieved from <http://www.fbi.gov/news/pressrel/press-releases/attorney-general-eric-holder-announces-revisions-to-the-uniform-crime-reports-definition-of-rape>.
- Banyard, V.L., Plante, E.G., & Moynihan, M.M. (2004). Bystander education: bringing a broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 32(1): 61-79.
- 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., Ward, S., Cohn, E.S., Plante, E.G., Moorhead, C., & Walsh, W. (2007). Unwanted sexual contact on campus: a comparison of women's and men's experiences. *Violence and Victims* 22(1): 52-70.

- Bennett, S., Banyard, V.L., & Garnhart, L. (2014). To act or not to act, that is the question? Barriers and facilitators of bystander intervention. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(3): 476-496.
- Black, B., Weisz, A., Coats, S., & Patterson, D. (2000). Evaluating a psychoeducational sexual assault prevention program incorporating theatrical presentation, peer education, and social work. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 10(5): 589-606.
- Black, M.C., Basile, K.C., Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Walters, M.L., Merrick, M.T., Chen, J., & Stevens, M.R. (2014). The national intimate partner and sexual violence survey fact sheet. *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey 2010 Summary Report*.
- Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Basile, K.C., Walters, M.L., Chen, J., & Merrick, M.T. (2011). Prevalence and characteristics of sexual violence, stalking, and intimate partner violence victimization—national intimate partner and sexual violence survey, United States, 2011. *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 63(8): 1-18.
- Breitenbecher, K.H. & Scarce, M. (1999). A longitudinal evaluation of the effectiveness of a sexual assault education program. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 14(5): 459-478.
- 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.
- Burgess, G.H. (2007). Assessment of rape myth and beliefs in college men: development, reliability, and validity of the rape attitudes and beliefs scale. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22(8): 973-993.
- Burn, S.M. (2009). A situational model of sexual assault prevention through bystander intervention. *Sex Roles*, 60: 779-792.

- Campus sexual assault victims’ bill of rights. (2013). *Jeanne Clery Act Information*. Retrieved from <http://cleryact.info/campus-sexual-assault-victims--bill-of-rights.html>.
- Carlson, M. (2008). I’d rather go along and be considered a man: masculinity and bystander intervention. *Journal of Men’s Studies*, 16(1): 3-17.
- Carr, J.L. & VanDeusen, K.M. (2004). Risk factors for male sexual aggression on college campuses. *Journal of Family Violence*, 19(5): 279-289.
- Chapleau, K.M. & Oswald, D.L. (2010). Power, sex, and rape myth acceptance: testing two models of rape proclivity. *Journal of Sex Research*, 47(1): 66-78.
- Deming, M.E., Covan, E.K., Swan, S.C., & Billings, D.L. (2013). Exploring rape myths, gendered norms, group processing, and the social context of rape among college women: a qualitative analysis. *Violence Against Women*, 19(4): 465-485.
- Exner, D. & Cummings, N. (2011). Implications for sexual assault prevention: college students as prosocial bystanders. *Journal of American College Health*, 59(7): 655-657.
- Fisher, B.S., Cullen, F.T., & Turner, M.G. (2000). The sexual victimization of college women. *National Institute of Justice*.
- Franiuk, Renae. (2010). Discussing and defining sexual assault: a classroom activity. *College Teaching*, 55(3): 104-108.
- Foubert, J.D. (2013). Integrating religiosity and pornography use into the predication of bystander efficacy and willingness to prevent sexual assault. *Journal of Psychology & Theology*, 41(3): 242-251.
- Foubert, J. & Newberry, J.T. (2006). Effects of two versions of an empathy-based rape prevention program on fraternity men’s survivor empathy, attitudes, and behavioral intent to commit rape or sexual assault. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47(2): 133-148.

- Gidycz, C.A., Layman, M.J., Rich, C.L, Crothers, M., Gylys, J., Matorin, A., & Jacobs, C.D. (2001). An evaluation of an acquaintance rape prevention program: impact on attitudes, sexual aggression, and sexual victimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16(11): 1120-1138.
- 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.
- Gonzales, A.R., Schofield, R.B., & Schmitt, G.R. (2005). Sexual assault on campus: what colleges and universities are doing about it. *National Institute of Justice*.
- Hayes-Smith, R.M. & Levett, L.M. (2010). Student perceptions of sexual assault resources and prevalence of rape myth attitudes. *Feminist Criminology*, 5(4): 335-354.
- Humphrey, S.E. & Kahn, A.S. (2000). Fraternities, athletic teams, and rape: importance of identification with a risky group. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 15(12): 1313-1322.
- Koelsch, L.E., Brown, A.L, & Boisen, L. (2012). Bystander perceptions: implications for university sexual assault prevention programs. *Violence and Victims*, 27(4): 563-579.
- Lawyer, S., Resnick, H., Bakanic, V., Burkett, T., & Kilpatrick, D. (2010). Forcible, drug-facilitated, and incapacitated rape and sexual assault among undergraduate women. *Journal of American College Health*, 58(5): 453-460.
- Lee, D.S., Guy, L., Perry, B., Sniffen, C.K.,& Mixson, S.A. (2007). Sexual violence prevention. *The Prevention Researcher*, 14(2): 15-20.
- Lisak, D. & Miller, P.M. (2002). Repeat rape and multiple offending among undetected rapists. *Violence and Victims*, 17(1): 73-84.
- Lonsway, K. A., Archambault, J., & Lisak, D. (2009). False reports: moving beyond the issue to successfully investigate and prosecute non-stranger sexual assault. *The Voice*, 3(1): 1-11.

McMahon, S. (2010). Rape myth beliefs and bystander attitudes among incoming college students.

Journal of American College Health, 59(1): 3-11.

McMahon, S., Allen, C.T., & Postmus, J.L. (2014). Measuring bystander attitudes and behavior to prevent sexual violence. *Journal of American College Health*, 62(1): 58-66.

McMahon, S. & Banyard, V.L. (2011). When can I help? A conceptual framework for the prevention of sexual violence through bystander intervention. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 13(1): 3-14

McMahon, S. & Dick, A. (2011). “Being in a room with like-minded men”: an exploratory study of men’s participation in a bystander intervention program to prevent intimate partner violence. *The Journal of Men’s Studies*, 19(1): 3-18.

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

Official university sanctions. (n.d.). *Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Disciplinary Procedures*. Retrieved from <https://www.cmich.edu/ess/studentaffairs/Pages/Official-University-Sanctions.aspx>.

Orchowski, L.M. & Gidycz, C.A. (2012). To whom do college women confide following sexual assault? A prospective study of predictors of sexual assault disclosure and social reactions. *Violence Against Women*, 18(3): 264-288.

Rennison, C.M. (2002). Rape and sexual assault: reporting to police and medical attention, 1992-2000. *U.S. Department of Justice*.

Responsibilities of students. (n.d.). *Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Disciplinary Procedures*. Retrieved from <https://www.cmich.edu/ess/studentaffairs/Pages/Responsibilities-of-Students.aspx>.

Smith, P. & Welchans, S. (2000). Peer education: does focusing on male responsibility change sexual assault attitudes? *Violence Against Women*, 6(11): 1255-1268.

- Suarez, E. & Gadalla, T.M. (2010). Stop blaming the victim: a meta-analysis on rape myths. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25(11): 2010-2035.
- Tatum, J.L & Foubert, J.D. (2009). Rape myth acceptance, hypermasculinity, and SAT scores as correlates of moral development: understanding sexually aggressive attitudes in first-year college men. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(2): 195-209.
- The campus sexual violence elimination act. (2013). *Jeanne Clery Act Information*. Retrieved from <http://cleryact.info/campus-save-act.html>.
- The Michigan penal code (excerpt) act 328 of 1931 chapter LXXVI rape. (n.d.). *Michigan Legislative Website*. Retrieved from <http://www.legislature.mi.gov/%28S%28cbe1f145ummlw2bgmvwtjfnz%29%29/mileg.aspx?page=getObject&objectName=mcl-328-1931-LXXVI>.
- Thompson, S. M. (1990). “Date rape: the crime and the criminal profile.” *Michigan Police Chiefs Journal*.
- Title IX. (2013). *Know Your IX*. Retrieved from <http://knowyourix.org/title-ix/>.
- Wuitch, A., et al. (2014.) Text analysis. *Handbook of Methods in Cultural Anthropology* (2nd ed.). H. R. Bernard and C. C. Gravlee (Eds.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Appendix A



NO ZEBRAS: FRESHMAN ORIENTATION SCRIPT

[PRE-SHOW, ZEBRA/LION VIDEO. TRACK 1 UP. FADES WHEN STEVE COMES ON STAGE. LIGHTS UP INTRODUCES SHOW, LIGHTS FADE, STAGE DARK.]

SCENE 1: JEOPARDY

TRACK 2: “JEOPARDY THEME” UP.

[CONTESTANTS ENTER RIGHT DURING BLACKOUT & TAKE PLACES STAGE LEFT.

Voiceover: This is Jeopardy! [LIGHTS UP.] And now your host, Alex Trebec!

[ALEX ENTERS TO APPLAUSE FROM AUDIENCE & SHAKES CONTESTANTS’ HANDS & RETURNS TO PODIUM. MUSIC FADES TO PAUSE.]

Alex: Good morning/evening/afternoon. Let's welcome our three new contestants. Would you please introduce yourselves? Starting with contestant number one?

Flake: Hi, my name is ____, with an I. I'm from Ionia, with an I. I like to drink and party, and you are so cool, Alex.

Alex: You're absolutely correct!

Dude: Yeah, I'm Dude. I'm from San Diego, CA. This is my 6th, no, 7th year at CMU.

Alex: Congratulations, Dude, only a couple more years to go.

Dude: Man, I don't do summer school.

Alex: Thank you, Dude. And contestant number 3?

SAPA: Hi, Alex. I'm _____ and I'm a senior from _____. I'm a member of SAPA, also known as Sexual Aggression Peer Advocates.

Alex: _____, why don't you tell us about SAPA?

SAPA: Well, SAPA is a group of students on campus that are trained in supporting survivors of sexual violence. We run a confidential crisis line 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and also online Wednesday nights. We're always here to listen. We basically help survivors and friends in any way possible.

Alex: SAPA sounds like an amazing program. Thank you, _____. All right! Now let's take a look at our categories. (They all look toward the audience at an invisible game board.) We have College Anxiety; Drug Dangers; Alcohol 101; Bet You Didn't Know This; and Surprise Endings. Now, let's play Jeopardy! _____, you won the toss. Choose your category.

Flake: I'd like to buy a vowel, how about a C!

Dude: Hey, this isn't the price is right! Tell her Regis!

Alex: [STARE OF DISBELIEF] The name's Trebec and its jeopardy...?

Flake: I'll take College Anxiety for 100, Alex.

Alex: Okay. Here's your answer. There are _____ of these at Central Michigan University this fall.

Flake: Uh, parties?

Alex: Sorry.....no, _____. The correct question is: How many new students will be experiencing college life for the first time at CMU this fall. Ok, Dude, it is your turn...pick a category.

Dude: I'll take exit for 100.

Alex: Up there! [GESTURES TOWARD THE BOARD.]

Dude: Okay, How about Alcohol 101 for 1000-seeing as how it's my major.

Alex: Uh, okay. Here's your answer: It takes a woman this many drinks to have the same BAL as a man.

Dude: 1 for 1. Adlib....

Alex: Very good math skills, Dude. But the correct question is: What is one half? Adlib.....Dude, you might want to think about changing you're major.

Dude: Wait a minute, will this affect my GPA?

Alex: Just what is your GPA, Dude?

Dude: This semester I got it up to a 1.3!

Alex: I don't think this will affect it at all, Dude. In fact, I'm sure you will be receiving an application for Western Michigan University's Honors Program real soon. Moving right along, _____, what's your category?

SAPA: I'll take Drug Dangers for 400.

Alex: And here's your answer: This is the most common legal date rape drug.

SAPA: What is alcohol?

Alex: I'm sorry; _____ the answer we were looking for was GHB.

SAPA: And I'm sorry Alex, GHB is the most common illegal date rape drug, alcohol is the most common legal date rape drug.

Alex: Judges? Actually, that is correct. Thank you. Now, who's next? [FLAKE WAVES] Ok, _____, let's try it again. Pick a category?

Flake: Let's try, um, Bet You Didn't Know This, um, for 2000 Alex.

Alex: _____, I bet there are a lot of things you don't know. [DUDE MOCKS] Alright, the answer is: One out of two [DUDE WAVES HIS HAND.]

Flake: Ummmm, I think I know it! What's - how many classes I passed last semester.

Alex: That may be the case, _____, but that isn't the answer we are looking for. Wait, it seems that Dude knows the answer.

Dude: I know this, it's - How many skunky beers are in a warm six-pack?

Alex: I feel sorry for your mother... [SHAKES HIS HEAD] The question is: What is the number of women who will be faced with sexual assault in their lifetime? The answer is one out of two. [COUNT THE WOMEN IN THE FRONT ROW.] Out of the _____ women in the front row, _____ of you will be faced with sexual assault. We have time for one more. Ok, _____ (insert SAPA's Name), take us out in style.

SAPA: I'll take Surprise Endings for 10,000.

Alex: To be the next Jeopardy champion, here is your answer: One a minute, one every three minutes.

SAPA: What is the number of women who are beaten and raped every day? One is beaten every minute and one is raped every three minutes.

Alex: Our champion has given us a surprise ending. I'd like to joke about this, but I can't. It's just too serious. It should surprise, shock, and scare each and every one of you. And it could happen to any of you sitting out there [PAUSE.] Thanks for playing Jeopardy. Try to remember these questions and answers. You never know when you might come face to face with these situations. [JEOPARDY MUSIC BACK UP, THEN FADE OUT WITH LIGHTS, ALL EXIT.]

Educators in Aisles:

- **Whether talking about sexual assault, stalking, harassment, IPV, all have one thing in common: power and control**
 - **Sexual assault uses the same body parts as sex, but it is an act of power and control over another human being**
- **Sexual aggression is not a women's issue**
- **1 in 4 exercise**

- **1 in 4 women will be the survivor of a completed act of sexual assault at some point in her lifetime**
- **Ask audience to close eyes and think about 4 women they care about**
- **To prevent being a bystander:**
 - **Notice**
 - **Interpret**
 - **Take positive action**
 - **Shoplifting example: Once you notice the act, interpret it as shoplifting, you cannot be ignorant. “Ignoring” the act becomes a choice.**
 - **Ghandi: We must be the change we want to see in the world.**

[LIGHTS OUT AT MIKE DROP.]

Appendix B**SCENE 2: SEXUAL HARASSMENT****SITUATION #1: On Stage With Desk and Chairs. Professor & Student At His Office**

[STAGE BLACK, PROFESSOR WAITS IN ROOM, LIGHTS UP. DR.FOLEY NOTICES FEMALE STUDENT THEN GOES TO DOOR TO GREET FEMALE.]

Dr. Foley: Oh, come on in, _____.

Female Student: Hey, thanks for meeting with us Dr. Foley. Things have just been so hectic.

Dr. Foley: No problem _____, why don't you have a seat?

[HE GUIDES HER TO CHAIR WITH HAND ON WAIST.]

Female: Where are the other lab assistants? I thought Noah and Jen would be here.

Dr. Foley: I'm sure they're just running late. So, how did lab go today, any problems?

Female: Oh, where do I begin? First this student dropped a beaker of acid on her foot and started screaming, we had to...

Dr Foley [CUTS HER OFF]: I am sure you handled everything with ease. Although you do look a little stressed.

Female: Well I guess so; it's just nice to know that you're here to help me.

Dr Foley: That's what they pay me for. [HE TOUCHES HER SHOULDER] Besides, I'm sure you can repay me somehow.

Female: Where do you think Noah and Jen are?

Dr. Foley: Oh they must have had something come up. [DR. FOLEY MOVES BEHIND FEMALE BEGINS TO RUB HER SHOULDERS.]

Dr Foley: For now: just relax.

Female: [WITH HESITATION] I'm not sure I'm comfortable with this...

Dr Foley: Why aren't you comfortable?

Female: Because you're my professor?

Dr. Foley: It's just a shoulder rub, what's the big deal?

Female: I don't know...

Dr. Foley: There's no need to be shy, I've seen the way you look at me in class. Why do you think I made you lab assistant?

[HE BEGINS TO KISS FEMALE ON THE BACK OF THE NECK. SHE TRIES TO PULL AWAY.]

Female: Maybe we should call Jen and Noah?

Dr. Foley: Let's not worry about them right now... [BLACKOUT & MUSIC OUT.]

SITUATION #2: Students in a Residence Hall

[IN AUDIENCE, IN FRONT OF STAGE. LIGHTS OUT, TRACK 3: “CENTRAL GIRLS” UP, FADES OUT AFTER 0:18 AS LIGHTS FADE UP.]

Ass Slapper: Hey _____ (FRIENDS NAME), you still having that party tonight?

Slapper Friend: Yeah! It’s gonna be awesome, at least three kegs and jungle juice.

Slapper: Sounds awesome, I just hope that freshman _____ (FEMALE NAME) comes!

Friend: I know exactly who you’re talking about. She has got a tight ass.

Slapper: I know... she wants me.

Friend: You know it.

Slapper: Here she comes.... [FEMALE PASSES THE GUYS IN THE HALLWAY, THEY MAKE COMMENTS ABOUT HOW SHE LOOKS, SLAPPER LEANS ACROSS HALLWAY BLOCKING HER WAY.]

Slapper: Hey _____ (FEMALE) are you coming to _____’s (FRIEND) party tonight?

Female: No I don’t think so.

Slapper: You should think about it, it’s gonna be tight, just like that ass! [HE SLAPS FEMALE ON THE BUTT AS SHE BREAKS THROUGH.]

Female: Don’t touch me, I told you to leave me alone.

Slapper: You know you want me.

Female: I want you... to leave me alone! [SHE WALKS AWAY.]

Slapper: Why do you have to be such a bitch? Man, she is just a cock tease. [BOTH BOYS LAUGH & ARE JOVIAL.]

Slapper: If it’s not her, it’ll be another freshman.

Friend: Yeah, they’re a dime a dozen. [BLACKOUT.]

SITUATION #3: Center Stage, Male Students in Residence Hall Room

[LIGHTS COME UP]

Joker 1: Yea, get some!

Joker 2: Dude, how long have you been playing this game.

Joker 1 : Like six straight hours. I’m kicking some ass.

Joker 2 : Yea right man, you suck dick just like our roommate Josh.

Joker 1: Whatever! I’ve been giving it to these fags all day

Josh would probably love to get in on this action, wouldn’t you queer.

Joker 2: He is the king of all butt pirates aren’t you sargeant circle jerk.

Protector: Knock it off! He did nothing to you.

Joker 1 : Bitch, shut the fuck up! If you don’t like it you can leave.

[BLACKOUT.]

Educators in Aisles:

- **Definition of harassment: any unwanted behavior in a work or educational setting that could and actually does affect a person or persons negatively**
 - Expands beyond sexual harassment
 - Factors for determining whether an act is harassment:
 - Repeated
 - Impact on individual(s) is more important than intent than harasser
 - Any reasonable person would be impacted in the same way
- **What could you do?**

[LIGHTS OUT AT MIKE DROP.]

Appendix C

SCENE 3: DRUGGING

SITUATION #1 MALE ASSAULTED WHILE INTOXICATED

[LIGHTS COME UP ON TWO MALES TALKING TO THE SIDE OF THE STAGE (WHERE SPEAKERS LIGHTS ARE SET UP)]

Male: Man that shit was crazy last night, how much did you have to drink?

Assaulted Male: I don't know. I can't remember much.

Male: (laughing) You could barely walk, it was hilarious. But look, all I know is, I deserve wing man of the year honors after last night.

Assaulted Male: What are you talking about?

Male: Well that girl had been asking about you all night, and I knew you would puss out, so I told her to get you drunk and then you couldn't say no.

Assaulted Male: Couldn't say no? Man why the fuck would you do that? I didn't want that to happen.

Male: Ok stop being a little bitch. You got drunk, you got some ass, what man wouldn't want that, Why the fuck are you complaining? Besides, she was a hot chick, so reattach your balls and say thank you.

Assaulted Male: It wasn't a girl!

Educators in Aisles:

- **1 in 8 males assaulted in the military**
- **Definition of sexual assault: anytime anyone does anything of a sexual nature without the expressed consent of the individuals involved**
 - **Consent is the presence of a yes, not the absence of a no**
 - **Michigan is a consent-focused state**
 - **In Michigan, a person cannot give consent under the influence of drugs or alcohol**
 - **In Michigan, the age of consent is 16 years old**

[LIGHTS GO OUT]

SITUATION # 2 FEMALE DRUGGED AT PARTY

[A FEW ACTORS ALREADY AT PARTY PLAYING DRINKING GAME TRACK 4: “HOUSE PARTY” UP, THEN LIGHTS UP. DRUGGER & CO-PILOT APPROACH AUDIENCE, MUSIC FADES BUT DOESN'T GO OUT. DRUGGER TAKES CO-PILOT ASIDE & SHOWS HIM THE DRUG.]

Drugger: Look what I've got. [SHOWS CO-PILOT THE VILE.]

Co-Pilot: Do my eyes look that bad?

Drugger: No, man, its GHB.

Co-Pilot: Wow, you put scoop in a Visine container?

Drugger: Yeah, one dose of this and _____ won't remember a thing that happens and the fact that she's drinking, makes it even better.

Co-Pilot: She won't remember anything?

Drugger: Not a thing. _____ already knows what is going on, so you go back and distract _____ and I'll slip some of this in her drink....I'm getting laid for sure! CO-PILOT RETURNS TO THE GROUP.]

Co-Pilot: Hey, ____! Tell us what happened at that party last night.

[____ DISTRACTS _____. WHILE THEY ARE TALKING, DRUGGER OFFERS TO REFILL _____ GLASS INTO WHICH HE SLIPS GHB]

Drugger: Hey everyone....grab your drink for a toast....Here's your drink, _____. [HANDS HER THE DRINK & PROPOSES A TOAST.] To another wild Welcome Weekend and all the new freshmen! Everybody drink up!

[MUSIC LOUDER FOR A FEW SECONDS, THEN MUSIC & LIGHTS OUT.]

[LIGHTS UP SLOW. MUSIC TRACK 5: “MARG. VILLE” COMES UP, FADES AS LYRICS BEGIN. EVERYONE DANCES & DRINKS – GENERAL PARTY ATMOSPHERE. _____ BEGINS TO FEEL THE EFFECTS OF THE DRUG. DRUGGER PULLS ANNE ASIDE & THEY DANCE, HE SPINS HER; SHE STUMBLES & FALLS.]

Drugger: Come on, ____, you look ready. I think it's time to go back to my place. [HE BEGINS TO MOVE HER STAGE RIGHT. _____ LAUGHS & MUMBLES.]

Female Friend 1: ____, where are you going? [____ ISN'T COHERENT.]

Drugger: It's okay. She's had too much to drink. I'm going to drive her home.

Female Friend 2: Don't worry, _____ (FEMALE FRIEND 1'S NAME) . _____ (DRUGGER'S NAME) is a really nice guy.

Male: A very nice guy!

[MUSIC GROWS LOUDER, & THEN STOPS ABRUPTLY. AS DRUGGER & _____ EXIT STAGE LEFT, ANGRY ASILE MALE ENTERS FROM BACK OF HOUSE, OTHERS FREEZE WHEN MUSIC STOPS ABRUPTLY. HOUSE LIGHTS UP LOW, FOLLOWING HIM TO STAGE. STAGE LIGHTS DOWN AS ANGRY ASILE MALE MAKES HIS WAY SLOWLY TO THE STAGE. _____ IS ON STAGE CRYING.]

Angry Male: [ADLIBS ANGRILY TO AUDIENCE AS HE APPROACHES STAGE. LIGHTS UP WHEN HE REACHES STAGE.] That's my friend. She was raped by this guy I know. He drugged her. What kind of sick son of a bitch would do this? No real man needs drugs or alcohol to get a woman in bed....and no real man would stand by and watch this happen. And what about the assholes at the party, how come they didn't do anything to stop this? [HE TAKES A DEEP BREATH. MOVES SLOWLY TOWARDS _____. HE PUTS HIS ARM AROUND HER. HIS VOICE SOFTENS] How can I help? [LIGHTS FADE. ALL EXIT.]

Educators in Aisles:

- Sexual assaults like this happen every night on a campus like CMU
- There are three kind of people:
 - Perpetrators
 - People with the courage to intervene
 - Zebras (bystanders)

[LIGHTS UP]

[LIGHTS OUT AT MIKE DROP.]

Appendix D

SCENE 4: STALKING

[STAGE BLACK, TRACK 6: “WHY DO YOU HIDE” UP, FADES TO PAUSE AFTER 0:30. LIGHTS UP. STAGE BACKLIT.] STALKEE & FRIEND START WALKING ACROSS STAGE FROM RIGHT. STALKER IS OFF STAGE TO THE RIGHT. TWO FRIENDS ARE UPSTAGE LEFT.]

Stalker: _____, STOP! I need to talk to you for a minute.

Stalkee: (*to friend*): Oh.....here we go again. I'll catch up with you in a minute. What do you want?

Stalker: _____ (Stalkee's Name), I want you to know I love you more than anything in the whole world. I just want us to be together.

Stalkee: _____... (Stalker's Name)

Stalker: We belong together.

Stalkee: No we don't. I broke up with you.

Stalker: We didn't break up sweetheart. People who love each other don't break up. We are just having a few problems. Don't you know we are the perfect couple?

Stalkee: We are not a couple!

Stalker: Yes we are! We're meant to be together. [STALKEE TURNS AWAY; STALKER GRABS HER & TURNS HER AROUND.] Don't walk away from me. I love you!

[FRIEND COMES IN-BETWEEN THEM.]

Friend: Hey, leave her alone. She's told me how you've been stalking her for weeks, calling day and night. She told my girlfriend that you have threatened her. What's wrong with you? [STALKER PUSHES HIM AWAY.]

Stalker (*to friend*): Shut up! [SHOVES FRIEND] This has nothing to do with you! [STALKER GRABS STALKEE BY THE ARM.]

Stalker (*to stalkee*): You'll be sorry, _____ (*Stalkee's Name*). Don't push me away again. You are really starting to piss me off. I just want to be with you and if that can't happen, someone might have to tell everyone you're a Lesbian.

Stalkee: You wouldn't do that.

Stalker: Be a shame if your parent's found out.

Stalkee: [CUTS HER OFF] This ends here, _____ (Stalker's Name). Don't threaten me because I talked to the police and if you keep following me and calling me, I'll have you arrested. Do you understand?

Friend: Come on _____ (*stalkee*), let's go. [SHE WALKS AWAY, ESCORTED BY HER FRIEND.]

Stalker: No, I don't understand. I'll never let you go...._____ (*stalkee*), I love you, this isn't over. (BLACKOUT. MUSIC TRACK 6 BACK UP, THEN OUT AFTER 0:15.)

Educators in Aisles:

- **Definition of stalking:** Any behavior that would cause a person to feel molested, intimidated, threatened, frightened, harassed, or terrorized
 - **Factors for determining whether an act is stalking:**
 - **Repeated**
 - **Impact on individual(s) is more important than intent than harasser**
 - **Any reasonable person would be impacted in the same way**

- **Provide examples**
- **What could you do?**

[LIGHTS UP] [LIGHTS OUT AT MIKE DROP.]

Appendix E**SCENE 5: VIOLENCE & ABUSE**

[STAGE BLACK, TRACK 7: FADES

[FEMALE (GIRLFRIEND) GETTING READY TO GO OUT. LIGHTS UP. MALE (BOYFRIEND) ENTERS STAGE RIGHT.]

Boyfriend: Hey Babe (Or any natural greeting)

Girlfriend: Hey I'm glad your home

Boyfriend: I missed you

Girlfriend: (giggles) I can't believe that were actually living together

Boyfriend: I know. It's crazy. I'm just glad you didn't let your parents talk you out of it. I don't know why they hate me

Girlfriend: They don't hate you, they just think we're moving too fast. (SHE BEGINS DOING UP HER HAIR. TURNS TO HIM.) so, what do you think?

Boyfriend: (Shake head and look annoyed) I've told you a hundred times before, I like when you wear your hair down. (TAKE CLIP OUT OF HER HAIR)

Girlfriend: Oh, well, okay. (SHE BEGINS PUTTING ON LIP STICK)

Boyfriend: Are we still going out tonight? (STILL WITH AN ANNOYED VOICE)

Girlfriend: Oh, I already made plans to go out with a couple of friends tonight. But, you should get dressed and come out with us, it'll be fun!

Boyfriend: (REMOVE ARM FROM AROUND HER SHOULDER) I have been gone at work all day and I come home and just want to spend a little bit of time with you.

Girlfriend: That's sweet but I already promised Christy that I'd go out with her and Steve tonight.

Boyfriend: (INTERRUPTING) Who the fuck is Steve!!

Girlfriend: He's just one of Christy's friends. (STAND UP AND START BACKING UP)

Boyfriend: Oh so you get all dressed up to hang out with Steve? (STAND UP AND GET IN HER FACE)

Girlfriend: No, I... (HE CUTS HER OFF)

Boyfriend: You know what?... Sometimes you are a real slut.

Girlfriend: How could you say that to me?

Boyfriend: What am I supposed to say when I get home and your all skanked up to hang out with some other guy. I can't believe you. (TURN BACK AND WALK AWAY)

Girlfriend: Wait...Where are you going?

Boyfriend: I'm going out. There are plenty of girls that I can call. I bet one of them actually wants to spend some time with me.

Girlfriend: You wouldn't do that.

Boyfriend: You just watch me. (HE BEGINS TO WALK OUT)

Girlfriend: (GOES AFTER HIM AND GRABS ARM) Wait.

Boyfriend: (TURN AGGRESSIVELY) NICKI! How many times do we have to do this? You should know better by now. You know how pissed I get when I think about losing you!

Girlfriend: I know. I'm sorry. So let's just stay in tonight.

Boyfriend: Fine.

Girlfriend: (PULLS OUT CELL PHONE, AND DIALS. BEGINS TO WIPE OFF LIPSTICK IN MIRROR) ____? Hey it's me. I'm gonna have to cancel for tonight... Yeah, I'm just not feeling up to going out tonight...

(LIGHTS DOWN)

[MUSIC TRACK 8: “SOUNDS OF VIOLENCE” IN BLACKOUT. ACTORS ON STAGE IN BLACKOUT, FREEZE. LIGHTS UP, LIGHTS BACKLIGHT STAGE DIMLY. FEMALE FRIEND _____ COMES DOWNSTAGE, STAGE RIGHT. SHE DELIVERS HER LINES IN THE AUDIENCE. MALE (BOYFRIEND) COMES DOWNSTAGE ON LEFT.]

Friend: I didn't know. I really didn't know. I am her best friend, of all people, I should have known. Sure she had some bruises and I remember one time she had a black eye, and there was the time she sprained her arm, but she said she just fell down. How could anyone have known that he was beating her? I thought he loved her. [PAUSE. SEES COUPLE AND MALE FRIEND AS THEY MOVE DOWNSTAGE.] There's the big man now. [LIGHTS UP. SHE COMES TO STAGE, PAUSE.] Hey _____ (*Boyfriend's Name*)! How could you do it? How could you push her down those steps, like she was a rag doll? You could have killed her. How could you be such an asshole? [SHE ROUGHLY TAPS HIS CHEST, HE SLAPS HER HAND ASIDE.]

Girlfriend: _____, don't.

Boyfriend: What the hell are you talking about?

Friend: [TO GIRLFRIEND] How can you defend him after what he did?

Boyfriend: [GRABS GIRLFRIENDS'S ARM] What did you say to her?

[FRIENDS COME DOWN WHEN ALTERCATION BEGINS, THEY STAY WITH _____.]

Boyfriend: I'll teach you to open your mouth again! [RAISES HAND TOWARDS GIRLFRIEND...]

Friend: Don't touch her! [PULLS GIRLFRIEND AWAY. MALE FRIEND INTERCEDES.]

Male Friend: What are you doing, man!?

Boyfriend: [PULLS AWAY. THROUGH CLENCHED TEETH] That lying bitch! Just wait till you get home. I'll put you in your fucking place!!

Male Friend: Back off, _____! (*MALE BOYFRIEND'S NAME*)

[LIGHTS FADE QUICKLY TO BLACK, ALL EXIT.]

Educators in Aisles:

- Discuss lyrics to “Love the Way You Lie”
- Definition of domestic violence/intimate partner violence: willful intimidation, physical assault, battery, sexual assault, and/or other abusive behavior perpetrated by an intimate partner against another.
 - Red flags (quick involvement in a relationship, e.g.)
 - Leaving is the most dangerous time; it takes an average of 8 tries to successfully leave
- What could you do?

[LIGHTS UP]

[LIGHTS OUT AT MIKE DROP.]

Appendix F

SCENE 6: FORCED SEX

[MUSIC TRACK 9: “OMINOUS CRESCENDO”. STAGE BACKLIT, DIM. FEMALE & MALE ARE SITTING ON THE COURCH TOGETHER.]

Female: No, no, don't.

Male: You know you want it.

Female: No, get away. NO!!

[MALE GRABS FEMALE & THROWS HER TO THE COUCH, WHEN THEY HIT- MUSIC STOPS + BLACKOUT! FEMALE & MALE SLOWLY COME APART & GET OFF THE SOFA. MALE GOES STAGE LEFT & FEMALE GOES RIGHT. TWO SPOTS LIGHTS UP DIM.]

Female: I didn't want this. I thought we were just making out. I didn't want him to do this to me. I thought he was such a nice guy. Did I do something to lead him on? Oh my god.

Male: Shit that was fun. Add another dumb bitch to my list.

Female: I can't believe this is happening; it isn't fair! I shouldn't have even gone over there.

Male & Female: It was great/horrible!

Male: Freshmen are so easy!

Female: I can still feel him on me.

Male: She kept playing that dumbass game where she says No but means Yes. I hate when girls play that shit.

Female: I didn't say yes, I know I didn't.

Male: I can't wait to tell the guys.....

Female: I can't tell my friends, they will never believe me. I can't go home; I can't tell my parents. Where am I gonna go? Should I go to the police?

Male: I hope she doesn't start that shit about “not wanting it”...she's just afraid to look like a slut.

Female: What he did was wrong!

Male: So what if she does tell people. They aren't going to believe her; no one is ever going to believe her. Everyone knows that bitches like that lie. Chicks always say "no" when they don't mean it - right fellas?

Female: Who would believe that I was raped?

[BLACKOUT.]

[LIGHTS STAY OUT. MUSIC TRACK 10: “SAPA CALL”]

Educators in Aisles:

- **Judgment vs. responsibility**
 - It may not be the best judgment to go alone to a party, for example, but it is the responsibility of the perpetrator who made the choice to hurt another person.
- **“Nice guy” profile**
 - Given this profile name because survivors frequently use that phrase to describe their attacker
 - Personality characteristics:

- Athletic, body-conscious, outwardly confident
 - Well-liked by both men and women
 - Chameleon of charming, “nice” characteristics
 - Distinction between “nice” and “good”; nice is face you put on, good is an intrinsic personality characteristic
 - Views women as sexual conquests/ “scores”
- “Nice guy” targeting sequence:
 - Target
 - Social setting
 - Approach
 - Gets closer to victim and desensitizes to intrusion
 - Alcohol as tool
 - Separation of victim
 - Continues “nice guy” facade
 - Attempts consensual sex
 - If “yes,” the date ends
 - If “no,” the sequence continues
 - Intimidation
 - Ignores/escalates in response to resistance
 - Threatens victim
 - Sexual violation
 - Termination
 - Goal in leaving is to prevent survivor from telling friends/family and police
- Report rate
 - Only 5% of survivor will report to the police
 - About 1/3 of survivors will never tell anyone
 - Sexual assault has the same false report rate as any other violent crime (4-6%)
 - However, because so few sexual assault cases come into the criminal justice system, the actual false report rate is closer to 1 in 1,000
 - When you disbelieve a survivor that discloses, you are telling them that they are that 1 in 1,000
- What could you do?
 - Never make assumptions
 - Recognize that the behavior of the perpetrator is a function of their choice to hurt someone; all of the responsibility for the sexual assault belongs to the perpetrator
 - Believe survivor
 - Offer choices to give survivor back power and control in their lives
 - Just listen rather than giving advice
 - Condemn offensive behavior
 - It takes courage to do the right thing

[LIGHTS UP]

[LIGHTS OUT AT MIKE DROP.]

Appendix G**SCENE 7: FINAL SCENE - GROUP**

[MUSIC TRACK 11: LIGHTS UP LOW. Survivor is sitting in the dim light with friend kneeling beside her. Friend stands and walks to center stage. MUSIC FADES AS SHE APPROACHES CENTER STAGE.]

ANI: This is my friend. She was raped at a party three months ago. There were people there. They knew what was going on, but they didn't do anything to stop it. Since then she just hasn't been the same. Everyone blamed her. No one believed her. I should've been there to watch out for her. How could this happen?

ALEX: Why didn't I say something? I know she is not my friend, but I should have said something. I just let him do that to her. I wish I could take it all back. But I can't. What if it were me? I wouldn't want someone to just let me get raped. Next time, I won't keep quiet. Next time, I'll do the right thing.

JOSH: It's up to us to make a change. Most times, when a sexual assault happens, someone else knows about it and more than anything I wish that those people that were there that night had had the courage to do something. Maybe I didn't know them. Maybe I didn't matter to them. But she matters to me.

[ONE AT A TIME THEY COME FROM THE WINGS. MOVING INTO LINE AT STAGE FRONT.]

REV: For many of you, this is your first experience in college. Maybe you've never seen anything like this, maybe you've never heard anyone talk about it, but it happens. It happens every day.

[Stage LIGHTS UP FULL. ACTORS BEGIN TO GET ANGRY- IT BUILDS.]

NICK: Bad things can happen- to anyone, anywhere. Watch your friends' backs- don't be afraid to stand up for what's right.

ANDY: Or is that too much responsibility? Are you content to follow the crowd, regardless of the consequences, regardless of who gets hurt in the end? [PAUSE] And if you hear or see someone messing with someone's drink - do something about it.

JOSH: Have the integrity to do the right thing.

JASMINE: Stalking

QUINN: Possessiveness

JASMINE: Abuse

QUINN: Violence

JASMINE: Rape

EMILY: You have to have self-respect. You have to care for yourself before you can care for other people. Other people have the same fears as you, they have the same problems. Can you put yourself in their shoes?

REV: How would you like it if it was someone you loved that was raped?

ANDY: Would you want someone you cared about to get hurt?

ALEX: Be aware of what is happening to you and your friends. Pay attention to what is going on around you.

ANI: You can't be just one of the crowd and let your friends be hurt. You are adults now. Start taking some responsibility!

NICK: For every person who thinks it's funny to bash women, there are seven others who are just as offended as we are. Take a stand and you'll be surprised who will stand with you.

JOSH: Respect each other. Be responsible to each other.

[HOUSE LIGHTS UP] THE ACTORS BEGIN TO LEAVE STAGE, GOING UP BOTH AISLES THROUGH AUDIENCE. LINES FOLLOWING DIRECTED AT AUDIENCE, FAST PACED AS

ACTORS MOVE THROUGH AUDIENCE.]

EMILY: You are on your own now. Your choices come with consequences.

QUINN: Your parents aren't here to clean up your messes.

REV: This world is a scary place. Not because of those that hurt others, but because of those who sit back and do nothing.

QUINN: So what will you do?

ANDY: We can make a difference. We can be the change in the world.

NICK: All it takes is one voice.

JASMINE: You're an adult. With right comes responsibility.

QUINN: You are not the exception.

JOSH: We've given you the skills.

EMILY: What will you do? Now is the time for you to decide.

ALEX: I will support a friend who has been raped what will you do?

[ALL BEGIN MOVING TOWARDS THE BACK OF THE HOUSE. ACTORS ON STAGE DON'T MOVE UNTIL BLACKOUT.]

ANDY: *I will be there for someone who is being abused.* What will you do?

JASMINE: *I will not stand by and let others get hurt.* What will you do?

ANI: *I will believe survivors when they tell me their stories.* What will you do?

ALEX: *I will be the change we need to see.* What will you do?

ALL: What will you do?

[BLACKOUT. WHILE DARK, TRACK 12: “RESPECT” UP. ALL ACTORS EXIT TO BACK OF THEATER, CHANGE TO T-SHIRTS & RETURN TO STAGE. HOUSE LIGHTS UP, MUSIC FADES OUT.]