

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY  
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

DEVELOPING AN INTERVENTION TO INCREASE PROSOCIAL INTENTIONS  
RELATED TO SEXUAL MISCONDUCT

KARI HARTBAUER  
SPRING 2015

A thesis  
submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements  
for a baccalaureate degree  
in Psychology  
with honors in Psychology

Reviewed and approved\* by the following:

Andrew Peck  
Associate Director of Undergraduate Studies, Professor of Psychology  
Thesis Supervisor

Cynthia Huang-Pollock  
Professor of Psychology  
Honors Adviser

\* Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

## **Abstract**

Sexual misconduct is a widespread social problem. Increased attention to the matter has recently been brought to campus communities. College students are at highest risk of sexual assault during their first few weeks of school (West Virginia Foundation for Rape Information & Services, 2014). Unfortunately, it is challenging to find a suitable intervention for campus communities and many sexual misconduct interventions fail (Yeater and O'Donohue, 1999). This study aims to develop and test an effective intervention which can be put into place before or during students' first few weeks on campus. Drawing on previous research, I use Moral Foundations Theory to design messages that match participants' moral motivations to increase prosocial intentions related to sexual misconduct. I hypothesized that participants who read congruent messages would be view as more persuasive and results in more prosocial intentions. Based on research that incongruent messages were viewed as less persuasive (Herek, Gillis, Glunt, Lewis, Welton, and Capitano, 1998), I hypothesized that participants who read incongruent messages would view the message as less persuasive and report fewer prosocial intentions.

*Keywords:* college campus, sexual misconduct, student orientation, sexual assault, rape, moral foundations, persuasion

### **Acknowledgments**

First and foremost, I would like to thank my mentor and thesis supervisor, Dr. Peck for working with me for the past three years. His guidance and patience are unparalleled and this thesis would not be possible without his dedication. I owe a huge thank you to the Penn State Researching Interventions for Social Misconduct (PRISM) lab for not only their time and effort aiding in collecting the data necessary for this study, but for being an extremely helpful resource through this process. In addition, I would like to express my sincerest gratitude for my truly amazing family and friends for being a fantastic support system. Thank you all for making this possible.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<a href="#">Abstract</a> .....	i
<a href="#">Acknowledgments</a> .....	ii
<a href="#">Introduction</a> .....	1
<a href="#">Methods</a> .....	5
<a href="#">Results</a> .....	7
<a href="#">Discussion</a> .....	13
<a href="#">Appendix A</a> .....	16
Appendixes B .....	18
<a href="#">Appendix B.1</a> .....	18
<a href="#">Appendix B.2</a> .....	19
<a href="#">Appendix B.3</a> .....	20
<a href="#">Appendix C</a> .....	21
<a href="#">Appendix D</a> .....	22
<a href="#">Appendix D.1</a> .....	24
<a href="#">References</a> .....	25

## Developing an Intervention to Increase Prosocial Intentions Related to Sexual Misconduct

### **Introduction**

Sexual assault is a widespread societal problem. According to a report done by the White House Council on Women and Girls in 2014, approximately 22 million American women and 1.6 million men have been raped. Rape is not a onetime experience for many; over a third of women who were raped as minors are also raped as adults (Yuan, Koss, & Stone 2006). The potential consequences for rape survivors are many, and affect emotional (Yuan, Koss, & Stone, 2006; Felitti, Anda, Nordenberg, Williamson, Spitz, Edwards, Koss, & Marks, 1998), cognitive (Centers for Disease and Control Prevention, 2014; Yuan et. al, 2006), physical (Basile, Black, Simon, Arias, Brener, & Saltzman, 2006; Champion, Foley, DuRant, Hensberry, Altman, & Wolfson, 2004; Jewkes, Sen, & Garcia-Moreno, 2002; Raj, Silverman, & Amaro, 2000), social (Centers for Disease and Control Prevention, 2014; Morrison, Quadara, & Boyd, 2007), and financial (White House Council on Women and Girls Rape and Sexual Assault, 2014) aspects of survivors' lives.

Recent attention has been brought to sexual assault in campus communities. One in five female college students will be sexually assaulted (Krebs, Lindquist, Warner, Fisher, & Martin, 2007) and 5% of the female population of a university will be raped every year (Kilpatrick, Resnick, Ruggiero, Conoscenti, & McCauley, 2007; Mohler-Kuo, Dowdall, Koss, & Wechsler, 2004). Worse yet, these statistics might be under representative as only 2% of incapacitated sexual assault survivors and only 13% of forcible rape survivors report the crime to campus or local law enforcement (Krebs et. al, 2007).

Given that research has shown higher risk for sexual assault in the first few weeks of school (West Virginia Foundation for Rape Information & Services, 2014), intervention

programs should ideally be implemented during student orientation programs, or before students arrive on campus. Creating an effective intervention for student orientation programs is a challenge. Meta-analytic results have shown that more than 80% of college sexual violence prevention programs have mixed or null results (Anderson & Whiston, 2005; Morison, Hardison, Mathew & O'Neil, 2004). Although it is well known that student orientation programs often use peer led groups, peer-led sexual violence prevention programs are not as beneficial as similar programs led by professional instructors (Vladutiu, Martin, & Macy, 2011; Anderson & Whiston, 2005; Yeater & O'Donohue, 1999; Lonsway, 1996, 2000; Schewe & O'Donohue, 1993). Also, although student orientation programs are designed to be brief and include all incoming students, sexual assault reduction programs with the most positive results include multiple sessions, sometimes carrying on throughout an entire semester, and use single-gender audiences (Vladutiu et al., 2011).

The large number of failed sexual violence prevention programs also show that it is difficult to persuade students to change pre-existing attitudes and beliefs about sexual assault. Research into the *confirmation bias* (see Nickerson, 1998) shows that forcing attitude change isn't easy because people are likely to accept evidence which supports their pre-existing beliefs and undervalue information which contradicts them (Kunda, 1990). Research into social attitudes (Marks & Fraley, 2006) has shown that people are also more likely to recall information that is consistent with their pre-existing beliefs than information that isn't. Consequently, interventions that try to force attitude change by presenting people with information that is incongruent with their pre-existing beliefs are not ideal. In fact, they might make things worse. Nyhan and Reifler (2014) found evidence of a *backfire effect*. When participants in several studies were forced to read information that was opposed with their pre-existing beliefs, their pre-existing beliefs

became stronger rather than weaker. These cognitive processes may help to explain why interventions that include rape survivors who recount their experiences result in an *increased* likelihood of sexual aggression and rape myth acceptance (Bachar & Koss, 2001; Breitenbecher, 2001).

Given that people are more likely to accept and remember information that is congruent with their beliefs, it should be possible to frame information in ways that are more persuasive. Research has shown that framing messages to identify with people's personal characteristics can increase persuasion (Briñol & Petty, 2006). Personalization doesn't have to be extensive. Burnkrant and Unnava (1998) found that changing the pronouns in a message from the third person ("one" or "he" and "she") to the second person ("you") was sufficient in increasing the impact on participants. Participants who received a personalized message recalled more information and found it to be both more interesting and more credible. Similarly, Herek, Gillis, Glunt, Lewis, Welton, and Capitano (1998) found similar results framing messages to participants' cultural heritage. Herek et al. (1998) discovered that messages which were culturally specific to the audience were more likely to be remembered and were evaluated as more credible and more favorable than multicultural messages.

Finding a way to frame persuasive messages to connect with the beliefs of a diverse population of college students can be tricky. One solution may be to cut across demographic characteristics by targeting moral motivations. Research has shown some success with this approach, particularly with Moral Foundations Theory (see Silver and Abell, in press). Moral Foundations Theory (MFT) includes five core moral motivations (loyalty, authority, purity, care, and fairness) which affect people's considerations (Graham, Haidt, & Nosek, 2009). People who are highly motivated by loyalty feel a strong sense of unity with a group and often develop a

“one for all, and all for one” mentality. Individuals who are highly motivated by authority value leadership and defer to legitimate authority. People who are highly motivated by purity value the sanctity of the body, which can be violated by immoral activities and contaminants. Those who are highly motivated by care show empathy towards those in pain and value kindness, gentleness, and nurturance. Those who are motivated by fairness support social justice and human rights (Graham et al., 2009).

These moral motivations tend to cluster into individual and group orientations. People who have a group orientation value group cohesiveness and tend to be highly motivated by loyalty, authority, and purity. People who have an individual orientation are more concerned with the well-being of individuals than group cohesiveness and are more highly motivated by care and fairness (Silver and Abell, in press). People with an individual orientation are less likely to engage in deviant behaviors that result in harm to others (e.g. hurting someone in a fight) and are more likely to engage in deviant behaviors that do not affect others directly (e.g. smoking marijuana, viewing pornography). People with a group orientation are more likely to abstain from deviant behavior in general. However, they are more likely than people with an individual orientation to engage in deviant behaviors which result in harm to others. Some people, however, are motivated by components of both orientations. For example, Graham, Nosek, and Haidt (2009) found that people who are liberal tend to have an individual orientation, whereas people who are conservative tend to be motivated by components of both.

Other researchers have used MFT to promote prosocial behavior. In a series of studies Kidwell, Farmer, and Hardesty (2013) showed that people increased their recycling efforts after reading a pro-recycling message framed to match their moral orientation. This was not the case for people who received a neutral message or who received a message framed to mismatch their

moral orientation. This study also showed that messages framed using the MFT framework can impact behaviors outside of the lab.

The goal of this project is to integrate and extend these lines of research to test the effects of anti-sexual misconduct messages that could be used in college student orientation programs. Although Kidwell, Farmer, and Hardesty (2013) measured message effectiveness by measuring prosocial behavior, measuring sexual misconduct behaviors presents many practical difficulties. Instead, I chose to measure prosocial intentions that could reduce sexual misconduct. I hypothesized that participants who read a message that was congruent with their moral orientation would be more influenced by that message. Specifically, I expected those participants to report the message as more persuasive and also to show more prosocial intentions than participants who read a message that was neutral or incongruent with their moral orientation. I also hypothesized that participants who read a message that was incongruent with their moral orientation would demonstrate evidence of the backfire effect, viewing their message as the least persuasive and reporting the lowest level of prosocial intentions.

## **Method**

### **Participants**

Four hundred and forty students, three hundred and sixty-six males, at The Pennsylvania State University participated. Participants were recruited through capstone courses in the College of Engineering and volunteered as part of a class activity. Seventy-one percent of participants were Caucasian, seventeen percent were Asian, three percent were Hispanic/Latino, and two percent were Black/African-American. This is fairly consistent with the overall student population, except that the sample had a much higher percentage of males and Asian students (Penn State Fact Book, 2014).

## Materials and Procedure

After filling out an informed consent form, participants reported demographic information and completed the Moral Foundation Questionnaire (MFQ) (Haidt, 2009). The Moral Foundation Questionnaire (MFQ) includes 30 statements and asks participants to indicate, on a 6-point Likert scale, the extent to which they use each of the five moral foundations discussed above (care, fairness, loyalty, authority, and purity) to make decisions (See Appendix A). Responses to the MFQ can be used to determine participants' moral orientations.

Next, participants read one of three messages. The control message was about the University's Healthcare Pharmacy (See Appendix B.1) and was neutral in that it was not framed to match either moral orientation. The second and third messages were anti-sexual misconduct messages. Both began by explaining that there is an initiative to stop sexual misconduct on campus, explained that sexual misconduct can take many forms, and briefly discussed consent. The remainder of the second message was framed to match the individual orientation (See Appendix B.2), and the remainder of the third message was framed to match the group orientation (See Appendix B.3). Participants were asked to evaluate their message on several dimensions using a 7-point Likert scale (See Appendix C). These dimensions, used by Kidwell et al. (2013), were used to determine persuasiveness (how clear, how compelling, how credible, did it flow, was the message easy to follow, how plausible, was the message easy to relate to).

Participants then completed the Bystander Attitudes Scale, originally created by Banyard, Moynihan, and Plante (2005), and modified by McMahon, Allen, Postmus, Peterson, and Hoffman (2013). The revised scale (BAS-R) is a 16-item scaled designed to measure pro-social intention

pertaining to the prevention of rape culture and sexual assault. Responses were given on a 5-point Likert scale.

## Results

### MFQ

Four hundred and fifteen participants completed the MFQ. Consistent with other research (Silver and Abell, in press; Graham, Haidt, & Nosek, 2009), my analysis showed a high level of reliability for the MFQ ( $\alpha=.81$ ). Overall, participants indicated strongest motivations for components of the individual orientation: fairness ( $M = 3.41, SD = .63$ ) and care ( $M = 3.29, SD = .78$ ). Participants indicated weaker motivations for components of the group orientation: loyalty ( $M = 3.1, SD = .69$ ) and authority ( $M = 3.00, SD = .64$ ). Motivations were weakest for purity ( $M = 2.57, SD = .86$ ).

The questionnaire allows researchers to calculate a progressiveness score to determine the overall moral orientation of a sample or an individual. To calculate the progressiveness score for my sample, I subtracted the average individual orientation score ( $M = 3.35, SD = .60$ ) from the average group orientation ( $M = 2.90, SD = .60$ ). The progressiveness score for my sample was  $.45$  ( $SD = .71$ ), reflecting that the sample was slightly more individually oriented. One challenge using progressiveness scores, however, is that it is hard to interpret scores near zero without more information. Scores near zero could indicate a sample (or an individual) with motivations that include components of both individual and group orientations, as is the case with my sample. Alternatively, scores near zero could reflect a sample (or an individual) that is not motivated much by the components of either orientation.

Instead of using a progressiveness score to assign participants into orientation groups, I took an alternative approach to account for those who were motivated, or who were not motivated, by components across orientations. The first category included one hundred and

forty-six (one hundred and eight male) participants who showed an individual orientation only. These participants had an average score above 3 for components of the individual orientation and an average score of 3 or lower for components of the group orientation. The second category included one hundred and fifty-four (one hundred and thirty-four male) participants who were motivated by components of both orientations. These participants had average scores above 3 for both orientations. The third category included ninety-four (eighty-four male) participants who were not motivated by either orientation. These participants had scores of 3 or lower for both orientations. The fourth category included twenty-one (twenty male) participants who showed a group orientation only. These participants had an average score above 3 in the group orientation and 3 or lower for the individual orientation.

#### Message Condition

To test my hypotheses, I needed to determine whether a participant's moral orientation matched or mismatched the message they read. To do this, participants were divided into one of three message conditions (control, match, or mismatch). Participants who received a neutral message were included in the control group. For the remaining participants, those who received a message framed to match their orientation were included in the match condition. Because participants who are motivated by components of both orientations could find congruency in either anti-sexual misconduct message, they were included in the match condition. Participants in the individual orientation who received a message framed to the group orientation, or vice versa, were included in the mismatched condition.

I hypothesized that when participants received a message framed to match to their moral orientation, the participants would find the message more persuasive. The data supported this

hypothesis. Four hundred and twenty-eight participants completed the message evaluation survey. Consistent with other research (Kidwell et al., 2013) analyses showed that the scale was highly reliable ( $\alpha=.87$ ). Overall, participants evaluated their message positively ( $M = 5.18, SD = 1.02$ ). An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) showed a main effect of match condition on message evaluation score,  $F(2, 406) = 4.00, p = .019$ . Follow up analyses revealed that the message was most persuasive when it matched participants' moral orientation ( $M = 5.43, SD = 1.06$ ) than when participants received either the control message ( $M = 5.10, SD = .89$ ) or the incongruent message ( $M = 4.9, SD = 1.04$ )  $ps < .02$ . No significant message evaluation score differences were found between participants who received the control message and participants who received the incongruent message,  $p > .05$ , failing to show evidence of a backfire effect, or my second hypothesis.

Message evaluation also varied with type of message  $F(2, 427) = 4.51, p = .02$ . Bonferroni pair-wise comparisons revealed a small, but marginally significant difference, between evaluations of the individual orientation message ( $M = 5.40, SD = 1.02$ ) and the control message ( $M = 5.09, SD = .88$ )  $p = .55$ . There was also a small significant difference between evaluations of the group orientation message ( $M = 5.07, SD = 1.12$ ) and the individual orientation message,  $p = .34$ . The slight preference for the individual orientation message is probably a factor of the fact that more participants in the sample were more motivated by individual-level orientations.

### Prosocial Intentions

Consistent with previous research (see McMahon et al., 2013) the BAS-R reliable ( $\alpha=.81$ ). To evaluate the effect of message condition on prosocial intentions, I recoded relevant

items and calculated the average BAS-R scores for participants. I ran an ANOVA on these BAS-R scores to test the effects of moral orientation X gender X message condition. Results showed a main effect of message condition  $F(3, 3.97) = 3.08, p = .047$ , a main effect of moral orientation,  $F(3, 3.97) = 4.22, p = .006$ , and a main effect of gender,  $F(1, 397) = 18.84, p < .001$ . Females ( $M = 3.96, SD = .49$ ) reported higher intentions scores than did males ( $M = 3.56, SD = .55$ ). The results did not reveal any significant interactions.

Follow up analyses also showed some support for my first hypothesis. Participants in the matched condition reported slightly higher prosocial intentions ( $M = 3.72, SD = .56$ ) than those in the control message condition ( $M = 3.55, SD = .54$ ), and this difference was statistically significant  $p = .027$ . The analysis also showed a marginally significant difference between the prosocial intentions of participants in the matched and mismatched conditions ( $M = 3.57, SD = .55$ ),  $p = .082$ . The data failed to support my second hypothesis, which predicted a backfire effect. BAS-R scores for participants in the mismatched condition were not significantly lower than those of participants in the control condition.

To explore the main effect of moral orientation on prosocial intentions, I used Bonferroni pairwise comparisons. Participants in the individual orientation category had higher intentions scores ( $M = 3.77, SD = .47$ ) than participants in the neither orientation category ( $M = 3.36, SD = .53$ ), or participants in the both orientation category ( $M = 3.36, SD = .53$ ),  $ps < .01$ . Participants in the group orientation category ( $M = 3.68, SD = .59$ ) also showed slightly higher intentions scores than participants in the neither category,  $p < .001$ . There was also a marginally significant difference between intentions scores for people in the group orientation category and the both orientation category,  $p = .065$ .

Previous research on the BAS-R has shown that the scale has four subcomponents (see McMahon et al., 2013). To see if this replicated with my sample, I ran a factor analysis using the principal component method with varimax rotation and eigenvalues of greater than one. This analysis revealed four factors, accounting for slightly more than 57% of the variance. However, the factors that emerged were different from the ones found by McMahon et al. (2013). This may be due to gender and demographic differences. McMahon et al. (2013) had a sample that was 53% female and 48% white, while the participants in this study were overwhelmingly male (83%) and predominately white (71%).

The first factor I found included six items related to the discontinuation of sexually inappropriate behaviors (see Appendix D.1). The second factor included four items related to the discontinuation of sexist language of family and friends (see Appendix D.1). The third factor included four items related to the prevention of sexual assault (see Appendix D.1). The fourth factor included two items related to the personal avoidance of sexist language (See Appendix D.1).

I ran a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to analyze the effects of message condition X moral orientation X gender on each of the factors. Because the fourth factor only had two relevant items, it was excluded.

The analysis showed main effects of message condition  $F(2, 398) = 3.80, p = .023$ , and gender,  $F(1,398) = 15.47, p < .001$ , on the prevention of sexual assault factor. Follow up pairwise comparisons revealed some further support for my hypothesis. Participants who received a message congruent with their moral orientation ( $M = 3.93, SD = .78$ ) reported slightly greater intentions to prevent sexual assault than participants who received the control message ( $M = 3.67, SD = .84$ ). However, this effect was marginally significant,  $p = .082$ . Also, females

( $M = 4.16$ ,  $SD = .72$ ) reported stronger intentions to prevent sexual assault than did males ( $M = 3.73$ ,  $SD = .80$ ). No other significant effects were found.

For the discontinuation of sexually inappropriate behaviors factor, although there was no main effect of message condition, there was a main effect of moral orientation,  $F(3, 398) = 5.23$ ,  $p = .002$ , and gender,  $F(1, 398) = 3.93$ ,  $p = .048$ . Participants in the individual moral orientation category ( $M = 4.40$ ,  $SD = .60$ ) reported slightly greater intentions to discontinue sexually inappropriate behaviors than those in the group orientation category ( $M = 4.32$ ,  $SD = .55$ ),  $p = .014$ , and greater intentions than those who were motivated by components of both orientations ( $M = 3.95$ ,  $SD = .77$ )  $p = .001$ . Females ( $M = 4.56$ ,  $SD = .62$ ) reported stronger intentions to discontinue sexually inappropriate behavior than did males ( $M = 4.30$ ,  $SD = .62$ ).

There was a main effect of moral orientation,  $F(1, 398) = 25.74$ ,  $p < .001$ , and gender,  $F(1, 398) = 15.47$ , on the discontinuation of sexist language of family and friends factor. Participants in the individual orientation category reported significantly greater intentions ( $M = 2.95$ ,  $SD = .91$ ) than those who were not motivated by components of either orientation ( $M = 2.30$ ,  $SD = .85$ ),  $p = .001$ , and those who were motivated by components of both orientations ( $M = 2.26$ ,  $SD = .75$ )  $p < .001$ . Participants in the group orientation ( $M = 2.77$ ,  $SD = .92$ ) reported marginally greater intentions than those who were not motivated by components of either orientation and those who were motivated by components of both orientations, but the results were marginally significant,  $p < .10$ . No other significant effects were found for this factor.

Pairwise comparisons showed that participants in the individual orientation category ( $M = 3.77$ ,  $SD = .47$ ) reported a significant difference in intentions scores than participants who were not motivated by components of either orientation, ( $M = 3.36$ ,  $SD = .53$ ),  $p < .001$ , and those who were motivated by components of both orientations, ( $M = 3.36$ ,  $SD = .53$ ),  $p = .008$ .

Analyses also showed that participants in the group orientation ( $M = 3.68$ ,  $SD = .59$ ) reported a significant difference in intentions scores than those who were not motivated by components of either orientation,  $p < .001$  and those who were motivated by components of both orientations,  $p = .065$ .

### **General Discussion**

Sexual misconduct is an important issue in college communities that must be addressed, and MFT provides a possible source for designing a quick and affordable intervention tool. Previous research has shown benefits of matching personal characteristics to persuasive messages (Burnkrant and Unnava, 1998; Herek et al., 1998). Success has been found influencing prosocial recycling intentions by matching messages to participants' characteristics using Moral Foundations Theory (Kidwell et al., 2013). Consistent with previous research (Herek et al., 1998; Kidwell et al., 2013) participants in my study who received a message congruent with either their individual or group-level orientation reported the message as more influential and also reported more prosocial intentions than those who received a control message. Participants who received a congruent message also reported the message as more influential than participants who received an incongruent message and also reported more prosocial intentions than those who received an incongruent message, although this finding was marginally significant. Factor analyses showed that differences in prosocial intentions between the participants who received congruent and incongruent messages were driven by differences in prosocial intentions to prevent sexual assault. Message congruency did not affect other factor ratings significantly. This pattern shows that the effects of message congruency were specific to the content of the persuasive messages. This pattern also provides support for a message congruency approach to intervention.

I also hypothesized that participants who received an incongruent message would show evidence of the backfire effect, and report less persuasion for their message and fewer prosocial intentions. That hypothesis was not supported. This may be due to several factors. Researchers who have studied the backfire effect (Nyhan and Reifler, 2014) presented participants with messages that opposed their beliefs. The lack of a backfire effect in my study may be because the message of preventing sexual misconduct was one that participants agreed with, regardless of moral orientation. Both anti-sexual misconduct messages began with a paragraph containing the same information, which could have reduced the effects of message congruency.

Overall, I am very encouraged by the results. Although many of the significant differences found were small, the intervention was extremely brief. Typically, participants completed reading their message within one minute. The lack of a backfire effect is also promising. If the congruency of the message to moral orientation is not as imperative, then both messages can be delivered to incoming students without causing detrimental effects and without the need to prescreen students and match messages to moral orientations.

There are a number of additional research questions that would be worthwhile to investigate. Other research (Kumkale and Albarracín, 2004) has shown evidence of *the sleeper effect*, the idea that the effects of persuasive messages grow with time. It would also be worthwhile to investigate the impact of the brief intervention after a longer delay. Past research has shown that longer intervention programs have produced more positive results (Vladutiu et al., 2011). Although my results are very impressive given the brevity of the message, greater benefits might be obtained from a longer, more detailed message. Finally, it is worth noting that my sample was predominately white male engineering students. Future studies might replicate

this design with a more diverse sample of participants to investigate whether or not these demographic factors played a role.

## Appendix A

**When you decide whether something is right or wrong, to what extent are the following considerations relevant to your thinking? Please rate each statement using this scale:**

[0] = not at all relevant (This consideration has nothing to do with my judgments of right and wrong)

[1] = not very relevant

[2] = slightly relevant

[3] = somewhat relevant

[4] = very relevant

[5] = extremely relevant (This is one of the most important factors when I judge right and wrong)

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Whether or not someone suffered emotionally
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Whether or not some people were treated differently than others
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Whether or not someone's action showed love for his or her country
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Whether or not someone showed a lack of respect for authority
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Whether or not someone violated standards of purity and decency
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Whether or not someone was good at math
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. Whether or not someone cared for someone weak or vulnerable
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. Whether or not someone acted unfairly
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. Whether or not someone did something to betray his or her group
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10. Whether or not someone conformed to the traditions of society
- \_\_\_\_\_ 11. Whether or not someone did something disgusting
- \_\_\_\_\_ 12. Whether or not someone was cruel
- \_\_\_\_\_ 13. Whether or not someone was denied his or her rights
- \_\_\_\_\_ 14. Whether or not someone showed a lack of loyalty
- \_\_\_\_\_ 15. Whether or not an action caused chaos or disorder
- \_\_\_\_\_ 16. Whether or not someone acted in a way that God would approve of
- \_\_\_\_\_ 17. Compassion for those who are suffering is the most crucial virtue.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 18. When the government makes laws, the number one principle should be ensuring that everyone is treated fairly.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 19. I am proud of my country's history.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 20. Respect for authority is something all children need to learn.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 21. People should not do things that are disgusting, even if no one is harmed.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 22. It is better to do good than to do bad.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 23. One of the worst things a person could do is hurt a defenseless animal.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 24. Justice is the most important requirement for a society.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 25. People should be loyal to their family members, even when they have done something wrong.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 26. Men and women each have different roles to play in society.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 27. I would call some acts wrong on the grounds that they are unnatural.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 28. It can never be right to kill a human being.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 29. I think it's morally wrong that rich children inherit a lot of money while poor children inherit nothing.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 30. It is more important to be a team player than to express oneself.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 31. If I were a soldier and disagreed with my commanding officer's orders, I would obey anyway because that's my duty.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 32. Chastity is an important and valuable virtue.

## Appendix B.1

**Please read the following message.**

### UHS Pharmacy

The University Health Services (UHS) Pharmacy provides prescription services, and over-the-counter medications and health care products to Penn State students, employees and retirees.

The Pharmacy is open Monday through Saturday during the school year. It is closed on all major holidays observed by the University and over the holiday break. In the summer, it is closed on Saturdays.

The Pharmacy is located on the second floor (entry level) of the Student Health Center (adjacent to the Eisenhower Parking Deck and the Bank of America Career Services Building off of Bigler Road).

A written, original prescription from your healthcare provider is required for all new prescriptions. To fill your prescription, you may:

- Have your healthcare provider fax your prescription to the pharmacy at 814.863.5371.
- Mail your prescription to the UHS Pharmacy at 202 Student Health Center, University Park, PA 16802.
- Bring your original prescription to the UHS Pharmacy service window or use our convenient drop off box.

For your convenience, if you have a prescription already on file at the UHS Pharmacy, you may order refills either by phone or electronically.

Please Note: Once medication has left the pharmacy, state regulations prohibit its return.

## Appendix B.2

Please read the following message.

### Penn State CAREs

Did you know that reducing sexual misconduct protects the moral foundation of your community? This message is part of a Penn State initiative to improve our campus. Sexual misconduct can take many forms. It can include forced, pressured, or coerced sexual contact. It can include sexual contact with people who can't give consent because they are intoxicated or unconscious. Fighting for the protection and security of our students increases the health and happiness of our campus community. We need your help today!

Sexual misconduct harms people and violates their rights. You can make a difference by taking action to reduce sexual misconduct. Even the smallest actions can make the greatest difference in the welfare of others. Your actions will help care for others and make campus a more supportive environment for everyone. Because of students like you, we can reduce the harm to others and the community. Stand up against sexual misconduct!

Penn State **CAREs**. Here is how you can help others by doing your part to reduce sexual misconduct:

**C** is for Consent: Make sure that your partner is comfortable with your actions.

**A** is for Assist: Help reduce harm. If somebody needs help, don't hesitate to step in.

**R** is for Respect: Respect people's rights. Take responsibility to promote social justice.

**E** is for Educate: Keep people safe. Educate yourself about ways to reduce sexual misconduct, and encourage others to educate themselves, too.

## Appendix B.3

Please read the following message.

### Join the RACE

Did you know that reducing sexual misconduct protects the moral foundation of your community? This message is part of a Penn State initiative to improve our campus. Sexual misconduct can take many forms. It can include forced, pressured, or coerced sexual contact. It can include sexual contact with people who can't give consent because they are intoxicated or unconscious. Fighting for the protection and security of our students increases the health and happiness of our campus community. We need your help today!

Sexual misconduct erodes the social structure of the Penn State community. It adds impurities to the campus community, and causes people to question the sanctity of Penn State. You can join the fight with others to prevent sexual misconduct. Take action and do your civic duty to protect your friends, family, and fellow Penn Staters. Because of students like you, we can follow the advice of national and community leaders who are calling on us to stand up against sexual misconduct. Join the fight today!

Here's what you can do to help preserve the virtue of the Penn State community. Join the **RACE** to reduce sexual misconduct at Penn State:

**R** is for Respect: Respect laws and authority. Take responsibility to do your duty.

**A** is for Assist: Be a loyal Penn Stater. If somebody needs help, don't hesitate to step in.

**C** is for Consent: Make sure that your partner is comfortable with your actions.

**E** is for Educate: Don't let sexual misconduct taint our campus community. Educate yourself about ways to reduce sexual misconduct, and encourage others to educate themselves, too.





	<b>Extremely Unlikely</b>				<b>Extremely Likely</b>
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Stop having sex with a partner if s/he says to stop, even if it started consensually	—	—	—	—	—
Decide not to have sex with a partner if s/he is drunk.	—	—	—	—	—

**Appendix D.1**  
**Factor**

Ask for verbal consent when I am intimate with my partner, even if we are in a long term relationship	3
Stop sexual activity when asked to, even if I am already sexually aroused	1
Check in with my friend who looks drunk when s/he goes to a room with someone else at a party	3
Say something to my friend who is taking a drunk person back to his/her room at a party	3
Challenge a friend who made a sexist joke	2
Express my concern if a family member makes a sexist joke	2
Use the word "ho," "bitch" or "slut" to describe girls when I was with my friends	4
Challenge a friend who uses "ho," "bitch" or "slut" to describe girls	2
Confront a friend who plans to give someone alcohol to get sex	1
Refuse to participate in activities where girls' appearances are ranked/rated	2
Listen to music that includes "ho," "bitch" or "slut"	4
Confront a friend who is hooking up with someone who was passed out	1
Confront a friend if I hear rumors that s/he forced sex on someone	1
Report a friend that committed a rape or sexual assault	1
Stop having sex with a partner if s/he says to stop, even if it started consensually	1
Decide not to have sex with a partner if s/he is drunk.	3

## References

- 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.
- Bachar, K., & Koss, M.P. (2001). From prevalence to prevention: Closing the gap between what we know about rape and what we do. In C. M. Renzetti, J. L. Edleson, & R. K. Bergen (Eds.), *Sourcebook on violence against women* (pp. 117-142). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Banyard VL, Plante EG, Moynihan MM. Rape Prevention Through Bystander Education: Final Report. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice; 2005. Document no. 208701. Available at: <http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/grants/208701.pdf>
- Basile, K. C., Black, M. C., Simon, T. R., Arias, I., Brener, N. D., & Saltzman, L. E. (2006). The association between self-reported lifetime history of forced sexual intercourse and recent health-risk behaviors: findings from the 2003 National Youth Risk Behavior Survey. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 39*(5), 752-e1.
- Beres, M. A. (2007). 'Spontaneous' sexual consent: An analysis of sexual consent literature. *Feminism & Psychology, 17*(1), 93-108.
- Breitenbecher, K. H. (2001). Sexual revictimization among women: A review of the literature focusing on empirical investigations. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 6*(4), 415-432.
- Briñol, P., & Petty, R. (2006, August 4). Fundamental Processes Leading to Attitude Change: Implications for Cancer Prevention Communications. *Journal of Communication*.
- Burnkrant, R., & Unnava, R. (1989). Self-referencing: A strategy for increasing processing message content. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 15*, 628-638.
- Campus Sexual Violence. (2014). In *West Virginia Foundation for Rape Information & Services*.
- Champion, H. L., Foley, K. L., Durant, R. H., Hensberry, R., Altman, D., & Wolfson, M. (2004). Adolescent sexual victimization, use of alcohol and other substances, and other health risk behaviors. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 35*(4), 321-328.
- Deitz, S. R., Blackwell, K. T., Daley, P. C., & Bentley, B. J. (1982). Measurement of empathy toward rape victims and rapists. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43*(2), 372-384. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.43.2.372>
- Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity. (2014). In *Penn State University Budget Office*.
- Felitti, V. J., Anda, R. F., Nordenberg, D., Williamson, D. F., Spitz, A. M., Edwards, V., & Marks, J. S. (1998). Relationship of childhood abuse and household dysfunction to many of the leading causes of death in adults: The Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) Study. *American journal of preventive medicine, 14*(4), 245-258.

- Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). The sexual victimization of college women series: Research report. *NCJ*.
- Franiuk, R. (2005). Sexual assault attitudes, beliefs, and experiences of students at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point. *Manuscript in preparation*.
- Goodchilds, J. D., Zellman, G. L., Johnson, P. B., & Giarrusso, R. (1988). Adolescents and their perceptions of sexual interactions. *Rape and sexual assault*, 2, 245-270.
- Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. A. (2009, May). Liberals and Conservatives Rely on Different Sets of Moral Foundations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96(5). Retrieved April 5, 2014
- Heppner, M. J., Humphrey, C. F., Hillenbrand-Gunn, T. L., & DeBord, K. A. (1995). The differential effects of rape prevention programming on attitudes, behavior, and knowledge. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 42, 508-518.
- Herek, G. M., Gillis, J. R., Glunt, E. K., Lewis, J., Welton, D., & Capitanio, J. P. (1998). Culturally sensitive AIDS educational videos for African American audiences: Effects of source, message, receiver, and context. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 26(5), 705-743.
- Jewkes, R., Sen, P., & Garcia-Moreno, C. (2002). Sexual violence.
- Kidwell, B., Farmer, A., & Hardesty, D. M. (2013). Getting Liberals and Conservatives to Go Green: Political Ideology and Congruent Appeals. *Chicago Journals*. Retrieved March 15, 2014.
- Kilpatrick, D., Resnick, H., Ruggiero, K., Conoscenti, L., & McCauley, J. (2007). *Drug Facilitated, incapacitated and forcible rape: A national study*. Charleston, SC: National Crime Victims Research and Treatment Center.
- Knowledge Networks (2011). College Dating Violence and Abuse Poll. Accessed from <https://breakthecycle.org/college-dating-violence-and-abuse-poll>
- Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C. H., Warner, T. D., Fisher, B. S., & Martin, S. L. (2007). *The campus sexual assault (csa) study* (221153). Retrieved from website: <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/221153.pdf>
- Kumkale, G. T., & Albarracín, D. (2004). The sleeper effect in persuasion: a meta-analytic review. *Psychological bulletin*, 130(1), 143.
- Kunda, Z. (1990). The case for motivated reasoning. *Psychological bulletin*, 108(3), 480.

- Lonsway, K. A. (1996). Preventing acquaintance rape through education: What do we know? *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 20, 229-265.
- Lonsway, K.A. & Kothari, C. (2000). First year campus acquaintance rape education. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24, 220-232.
- Marks, M. J., & Fraley, R. C. (2006). Confirmation bias and the sexual double standard. *Sex Roles*, 54(1-2), 19-26.
- McMahon, S., Allen, C. T., Postmus, J. L., McMahon, S. M., Peterson, N. A., & Lowe Hoffman, M. (2014). Measuring bystander attitudes and behavior to prevent sexual violence. *Journal of American College Health*, 62(1), 58-66.
- Middlewood, B. L., & Gasper, K. (2014). Making information matter: Symmetrically appealing layouts promote issue relevance, which facilitates action and attention to argument quality. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 53, 100-106.  
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2014.03.003>
- Mohler-Kuo, M., Dowdall, G. W., Koss, M. P., & Wechsler, H. (2004). Correlates of rape while intoxicated in a national sample of college women. *Journal of studies on alcohol and drugs*, 65(1), 37.
- Morrison, S., Hardison, J., Mathew, A., & O'Neil, J. (2004). An Evidence-Based Review of Sexual Assault Preventive Intervention Programs. Retrieved September 21, 2014, from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/207262.pdf>
- Nickerson, R. S. (1998). Confirmation bias: A ubiquitous phenomenon in many guises. *Review of general psychology*, 2(2), 175.
- Nyhan, B., Reifler, J., Richey, S., & Freed, G. L. (2014). Effective messages in vaccine promotion: a randomized trial. *Pediatrics*, 133(4), e835-e842.
- O'Donohue, W., Yeater, E. A., & Fanetti, M. (2003). Rape Prevention With College Males The Roles of Rape Myth Acceptance, Victim Empathy, and Outcome Expectancies. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18(5), 513-531.
- Raj, A., Silverman, J. G., & Amaro, H. (2000). The relationship between sexual abuse and sexual risk among high school students: Findings from the 1997 Massachusetts Youth Risk Behavior Survey. *Maternal and child health journal*, 4(2), 125-134.
- Rape and Sexual Assault: A Renewed Call to Action, The White House Council on Women and Girls, 2014
- Schewe, P. A. & O'Donohue, W. (1993). Rape prevention: Methodological problems and new directions. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 13, 667-682

- Sexual Harassment Support. (2011). *Effect of sexual harassment/what is sexual harassment and why is it so difficult to confront*. Retrieved from: <http://www.sexualharassmentsupport.org/>
- Sexual Violence: Consequences (2014, January 2). In *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention* . Retrieved September 14, 2014, from <http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/sexualviolence/consequences.html>
- Silver, E., & Abell, L. (in press). Beyond Harm and Fairness: A Study of Deviance and Morality.
- Tabachnick, J. (2009). Engaging Bystanders in Sexual Violence Prevention. In *National Sexual Violence Resource Center*. Retrieved from [http://www.nsvrc.org/sites/default/files/Publications\\_NSVRC\\_Booklets\\_Engaging-Bystanders-in-Sexual-Violence-Prevention.pdf](http://www.nsvrc.org/sites/default/files/Publications_NSVRC_Booklets_Engaging-Bystanders-in-Sexual-Violence-Prevention.pdf)
- Vladutiu, C. J., Martin, S. L., & Macy, R. J. (2010). College-or university-based sexual assault prevention programs: A review of program outcomes, characteristics, and recommendations. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 1524838010390708
- Yeater, E. A., & O'Donohue, W. (1999). Sexual assault prevention programs: Current issues, future directions, and the potential efficacy of interventions with women. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 19, 739-771.
- Yuan, N. P., Koss, M. P., & Stone, M. (2006). The psychological consequences of sexual trauma. Retrieved September, 27, 2014.

# KARI HARTBAUER

**CURRENT ADDRESS:**

119 S. Barnard St.  
University Park, PA

724.469.1615 | kvh5154@psu.edu

**PERMANENT ADDRESS:**

106 Sherwood Drive  
McMurray, PA 15317

**EDUCATION**


---

**The Pennsylvania State University | The Schreyer Honors College**

The College of Liberal Arts | Bachelor of Arts in Psychology

The College of Liberal Arts | Minors in English, Sociology and Human Development and Family Studies

**University Park, PA**

Class of May 2015

**RESEARCH**


---

**Penn Staters Researching Interventions in Social Misconduct (PRISM) Lab**

*Honors Research Assistant*

**University Park, PA**

*Dec 2012 – Present*

- Conducted honors thesis research on developing effective interventions for areas of social misconduct
- Compiled and reviewed scholarly articles pertaining to sexual assault, consent, bystander intervention, and moral foundational theory
- Devised experimental designs for thesis
- Collected and analyzed research data
- Instructed research assistants on proper laboratory and data management

**Rock Ethics Institute**

*Consultant/Contributor*

**University Park, PA**

*Feb 2013 – Present*

- Aided in the creation of a bystander intervention toolkit which provided university faculty with the appropriate tools for addressing the subjects of sexual misconduct
- Consulted on content of presentation tools

**PSU Sports Concussion Neuropsychology Lab**

*Panelist*

**University Park, PA**

*Oct 2014 – Present*

- Participated in round table discussions of neuropsychological research ranging from chronic traumatic encephalopathy to multiple sclerosis

**RESEARCH CONFERENCES**


---

**Psi Chi Research Conference**

*First Place Contestant*

**University Park, PA**

*Apr 2014*

- Winner of conceptual research poster “Developing New Interventions Based on Moral Foundations”

**Eastern Psychological Association Poster Exhibition**

*Presenter*

**University Park, PA**

*Mar 2015*

- Contributed to topics such as bystander intervention, date rape drugs, the effects of sexual assault, consent and coercion, and talking with survivors as recommendations for educators on discussing sexual misconduct with students

**Psi Chi Research Conference**

*Presenter*

**University Park, PA**

*Apr 2015*

- Presented empirical thesis research data on the effectiveness of matching an intervention message to participants’ moral foundations

**Recording of Academic Research (ROAR)**

*Competitor*

**University Park, PA**

*Apr 2015*

- Communicated the main message of my thesis work in a two minute recording so that those who are not in the field of psychology can understand the goals and results

**Sports Neuropsychology Society Sports Concussion Symposium**

**Atlanta, GA**

*May 2015*

---

## LEADERSHIP AND EXPERIENCE

---

### Springfield, Benefiting the Pennsylvania State Dance Marathon

University Park, PA

*Family Relations Executive, Class Representative, Committee Facilitator*

*Sep 2011 – Present*

- Planned and executed events throughout the year for other volunteers within the Dance Marathon (THON) community to develop relationships with families affected by pediatric cancer
- Provided families with a constructive outlet for coping with the everyday struggles of cancer
- Networked within an organization of 15,000 student volunteers in order to best provide a voice and outlet for Four Diamonds Families
- Advised on an executive board of one of the largest contributing organizations to THON—the world's largest student run philanthropy
- Presented weekly in front of 100+ volunteers

### Camp Kesem

Schwenksville, PA

*Counselor*

*Sep 2013 – Present*

- Supported children ages six to sixteen whose parents have been affected by cancer
- Initiated daily constructive talks to aid campers understanding and emotional comprehension of the disease
- Allowed campers the opportunity during an Empowerment Ceremony to voice how cancer has affected their lives

### Camp Cranium

Millville, PA

*Counselor*

*August 2014 – Present*

- Guided children who have had brain trauma, stroke, brain tumors, or other brain-related illnesses through a summer adventure camp which provided them with the opportunity to achieve goals they did not previously think were possible, and build self-confidence and independence

### LeaderShape Institute

University Park, PA

*Participant*

*May 2013*

- Elected into a program for leaders within the Penn State community
- Dedicated to leading with integrity
- Learned to effectively communicate, develop strong visions and goals, and work in group settings

### Liberal Arts Mentorship

University Park, PA

*Mentee*

*Sep 2013 – Present*

- Developed a mentor relationship with neuropsychologist, Dr. Vincent Culotta, to reflect on experiences and goals in the professional field of neuropsychology

### Job Shadowing

University Park, PA

*Shadowed Dr. James Petrick*

*Sep 2013 – Present*

- Shadowed neuropsychologist, Dr. James Petrick, to assess interest in the field and learn about the daily activities of a neuropsychologist

## TEACHING EXPERIENCE

---

### Lead Teaching Assistant

#### University Park, PA

*Sociology Facilitator*

*Fall 2014*

- Mentored teaching assistants on how to properly manage grading and tutoring assignments
- Organized meeting times

#### Sociology Preceptorship

University Park, PA

*Teaching Assistant*

*Jan 2014 – May 2014*

- Assisted students with learning and writing in the sociological field
  - Graded student papers and activities
  - Individually tutored students who had difficulties which needed to be addressed
-

## **HONORS AND MEMBERSHIPS**

---

**Schreyer Academic Excellence Scholarship**  
**The Paterno Fellows Program**  
**Sports Neuropsychology Society**  
**Eastern Psychological Association**  
**The Emily Trump Award**  
**Penn State Dance Marathon Dancer**

## **SKILLS/INTERESTS**

---

Reading, Writing  
Traveling, Hiking  
Working with philanthropies and children