NEBRASKA
DEPT. OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

NEBRASKA COALITION
TO END SEXUAL AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT OMAHA
SUPPORT AND TRAINING FOR
THE EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS

Sexual Violence Prevention Education Measurement Tools for Nebraska RPE

Report by:
December Lange Treacy, M.S., PA Ph.D. Student
Claire Rynearson, MPA, PCMSW, PLMHP, Program Evaluator

with Jeanette Harder, PhD, Professor, STEPs Project Director

December 18, 2018

Table of Contents

To navigate through this document, *click on any of the boxes below to learn more about a specific topic.*

You can return to this menu at any time by clicking the ⊛ in the upper right corner of each page.

Introduction

The purpose of this report is to provide sexual violence prevention advocates and practitioners in Nebraska with measurement tools for evaluating their sexual violence prevention education programs.

The beginning sections of this report will provide you with an overview of how to use the report. It includes the definitions we used to provide additional information about each of the measurement tools. There are also examples of the types of outcomes the tools may measure. These outcomes, and therefore the tools, were selected based on the logic models completed by 16 RPE fund recipients during STEPs trainings in the summer and fall of 2018. The beginning section ends with important tips on how to use the measurement tools. The majority of the report is dedicated to the measurement tools.

Our hope is that this report provides you with the measurement tools you need to evaluate your sexual violence prevention education programs in your schools, youth agencies, and communities.

Using this Report

Content Area

Use your organization's logic model to determine which content area you would like to evaluate. Navigate to your chosen content area by clicking one of the links under Measurement Tool Directories.

Outcomes

Determine the outcome(s) you would like to evaluate. Outcome levels may include knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, confidence, skills, and behaviors. Click here for examples.

Focus

Use the "Focus" column of the table to identify tools available for your chosen outcome level (i.e. knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, confidence, etc.).

Suggested Audience

Use the "Suggested Audience" column of the table to determine tools appropriate for your target population.

Measurement Tool Selection

Once you have determined which measurement tools may be most useful, click on the link to learn information such as how the tool must be scored, any requirements for reverse coding, the reliability, and the tool citation.

Use the Tool

Copy the tool for distribution, making sure to use a credit line to cite the source.

Outcomes by Measurement Tools

Content Tool	Examples of Short-Term Program Outcomes
Bystander Intervention Measurement Tools	• Participants have increased knowledge of bystander intervention strategies. • Participants have increased confidence in bystander intervention. • Participants are willing to intervene as an active bystander. • Participants have increased skills to intervene to prevent sexual violence.
Consent Measurement Tools	• Participants know about consent. • Participants have increased knowledge of consent within sexual relationships. • Participants have increased confidence in their ability to provide or refuse consent. • Participants will use consent in their sexual relationships.
Dating Violence Measurement Tools	• Participants are able to identify dating violence. • Participants have increased knowledge of dating violence.
Sexual Violence Measurement Tools	• Participants gain knowledge of sexual violence. • Participants are able to identify sexual violence. • Participants gain knowledge of the effects of sexual violence. • Participants gain knowledge about the prevalence of sexual violence. • Participants have changed beliefs on victim blaming.

Additional resources can be found in the Pennsylvania Coalition Against Rape's Technical Assistance Guide and Resource Kit for Primary Prevention and Evaluation (Townsend, 2009). Topics from this resource include:

• Attitudes about Gender Roles
• Perpetration and Victimization
• Changes in Community Norms
• Focus Groups and Interviews
• Program Satisfaction

Tips for Using the Measurement Tools

Copyright Information

Measurement tool content may be reproduced and used for non-commercial research and educational purposes without seeking written permission. Distribution must be controlled, meaning only to the participants engaged in the research or enrolled in the educational activity. Any other type of reproduction or distribution of measurement tool content is not authorized without written permission from the author and publisher. Always include a credit line that contains the source citation and copyright owner when writing about or using any test (American Psychiatric Association and PsychTEST, 2018).

Appropriate Adaptations

Some audience levels included under "Suggested Audience" are marked with an asterisk. This indicates adaptations may be made to the measurement tool to accommodate the designated audience. For example, a tool using words such as "professor" or "resident assistant" indicates intended use for college students. An adaptation may be made for high school students by changing "professor" to "teacher," and "resident assistant" to "trusted adult."

Adaptations are appropriate when they ensure suitability for age and culture without changing the meaning of the item.

Reverse Coding

Reverse coding is used for coding items that are negatively worded. For example, let's say a measurement tool has 20 items rated on a scale of 1-5. For most items, a 5 indicates a positive attitude towards the issue, but for a few items, a 1 indicates a positive attitude. When it comes analyzing your collected data, you will want to reverse code the items where a 1 indicates a positive attitude. This way, a 5 will indicate a positive attitude for all items in your dataset. For negatively worded items that require reverse coding, the conversion will look like this: $1 \rightarrow 5$, $2 \rightarrow 4$, $3 \rightarrow 3$, $4 \rightarrow 2$, and $5 \rightarrow 1$.

Need for Additional Measurement Tools

The measurement tools included in this document are based on short-term outcomes contained in logic models created by Nebraska's RPE-funded programs during May 2018-August 2018. The most frequently occurring outcomes were selected for inclusion in this menu. As such, some outcomes were not able to be included. In addition, not all frequently occurring outcomes have reliable and verified tools, which excluded them from this document.

Additional measurement tools may be found using resources such as Google Scholar, local library databases, and RPE technical assistance.

Tips for Using the Measurement Tools (continued)

Reliability and Validity

Many tools include information about reliability, which refers to the tool's consistency. Most of the tools in this menu report an internal consistency measure, which refers to "the consistency of people's responses across the items on a multiple-item measure" (Price, Jhangiani, & Chiang, 2015). Internal reliability examines how closely all items on a given scale are related to one another. This report uses Cronbach's alpha (α) to express internal consistency. Generally, when α is greater than .8, there is a high level of internal consistency for the tool (Price, Jhangiani, & Chiang, 2015).

Validity refers to the degree which a tool measures what it is intended to measure. Overall, this report was prepared with face validity in mind. Meaning, we determined the tools included in this menu measure what we would expect them to measure based on face value. We found the items to be consistent with what we would expect to be asked based on the subject of the measurement tool.

Measurement Tool Directories

To view available measurement tools based on the content area, *click the appropriate box below.*

Bystander Intervention Measurement Tools

Consent Measurement Tools

Dating Violence Measurement Tools

Sexual Violence Measurement Tools

Additional Resources from the Technical Assistance Guide and Resource Kit for Primary Prevention and Evaluation

Bystander Intervention Measurement Tools

Focus	Tool Name	Type	Questions	Audience Suggestion
Confidence	Confidence in Capability to Intervene in a Sexual Assault Situation Scale	Rating scale	4	• High school • College
Willingness	Intentions to Intervene in a Sexual Assault Situation	Rating scale	3	• High school • College
	Intent to Help Friends Scale: Brief Version	Rating scale	10	• Middle school* • High school • College • Community
Behavior	Modified Bystander Behaviors Scale	Rating scale	12	• Middle school* • High school • College • Community*

*Indicates the measure may be used with this population with appropriate adaptations.

Confidence in Capability to Intervene in a Sexual Assault Situation Scale

Scoring	This tool is scored using a 7-point Likert scale where 1=Strongly disagree and 7=Strongly agree. Higher average scores indicate a higher confidence in capability to intervene in a sexual assault situation.
Reliability	α=0.70
Citation	Hust, S. J. T., Marett, E. G., Lei, M., Chang, H., Ren, C., McNab, A. L., & Adams, P. M. (2013). Health promotion messages in entertainment media: Crime drama viewership and intentions to intervene in a sexual assault situation. *Journal of Health Communication, 18*(1), 105-123.

Intent to Help Friends Scale: Brief Version

Scoring	This tool is scored using a 5-point Likert scale where 1=Not at all likely and 5=Extremely likely. Higher average scores indicate a higher intent to help and lower average scores indicate a lower intent to help.
Reliability	α=0.93
Citation	Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., Cares, A. C., & Warner, R. (2014). How do we know if it works? Measuring outcomes in bystander-focused abuse prevention on campuses. *Psychology of Violence, 4*(1), 101-115.

Intentions to Intervene in a Sexual Assault Situation

Scoring	This tool is scored using a 7-point Likert scale where 1=Strongly disagree and 7=Strongly agree. Higher average scores indicate a higher intent to intervene in a sexual assault situation and lower average scores indicate a lower intent to intervene.
Reliability	α=0.75
Citation	Hust, S. J. T., Marett, E. G., Lei, M., Chang, H., Ren, C., McNab, A. L., & Adams, P. M. (2013). Health promotion messages in entertainment media: Crime drama viewership and intentions to intervene in a sexual assault situation. *Journal of Health Communication, 18*(1), 105-123.

Modified Bystander Behaviors Scale

Scoring	This tool asks individuals to indicate how frequently they engaged in active bystander behaviors in the last school year. It is scored using a 4-point Likert scale where 0=Not at all, 1=1-2 times, 2=3-5 times, and 3=6 or more times. Scores are added together with higher composite scores indicating higher levels of active bystander behavior and lower scores indicating lower levels of active bystander behavior. Scores can range between 0-36.
Reliability	α=0.90
Citation	Coker, A. L., Cook-Craig, P. G., Williams, C. M., Fisher, B. S., Clear, E. R., Garcia, L. S., & Hegge, L. M. (2011). Evaluation of Green Dot: An active bystander intervention to reduce sexual violence on college campuses. *Violence Against Women, 17*(6), 777-796.

Consent Measurement Tools

The Sexual Consent Scale-Revised consists of six subscales. These tools can be used as individual measures or combined for the complete Sexual Consent Scale-Revised.

Focus	Tool Name	Type	Questions	Audience Suggestion
Awareness	Sexual Consent Scale-Revised Awareness and Discussion Subscale	Rating scale	4	• High school* • College • Community
Attitudes	Alcohol and Sexual Consent Scale	Rating scale	12	• High school* • College • Community
	Sexual Consent Scale-Revised (Lack of Perceived Behavioral Control) Subscale	Rating scale	11	• High school • College • Community
	Sexual Consent Scale-Revised Positive Attitude Toward Establishing Consent Subscale	Rating scale	11	• High school • College • Community
	Sexual Consent Scale-Revised Sexual Consent Norms Subscale	Rating scale	7	• High school • College • Community
Confidence	Self-Efficacy to Refuse Sexual Behavior Scale	Rating scale	8	• High school • College • Community
Behaviors	Sexual Consent Scale-Revised Indirect Behavioral Approach to Consent	Rating scale	6	• High school • College • Community

*Indicates the measure may be used with this population with appropriate adaptations.

Sexual Consent Scale-Revised Awareness and Discussion Subscale

Scoring	This tool is scored using a 7-point Likert scale where 1=Strongly disagree and 7=Strongly agree. Higher average scores indicate a higher awareness and discussion of consent and lower average scores indicate lower awareness and discussion of consent.
Reverse Coding	Item 4 requires reverse coding.
Reliability	α=0.71
Citation	Humphreys, T. P. & Brousseau, M. M. (2010). The Sexual Consent Scale-Revised: Development, reliability, and preliminary validity. *Journal of Sex Research, 47*(5), 420-428.

Alcohol and Sexual Consent Scale

Scoring	This tool is scored using a 7-point Likert scale where 1=Strongly disagree and 7=Strongly agree. Higher average scores indicate a higher approval of alcohol-involved sexual consent experiences, and lower average scores indicate a lower approval of alcohol-involved sexual consent experiences.
Reverse Coding	Items 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 12 require reverse coding.
Reliability	α=0.76
Citation	Ward, R. M., Matthews, M. R., Weiner, J., Hogan, K. M., & Popson, H. C. (2012). Alcohol and sexual consent scale: Development and validation. *American Journal of Health Behavior, 36*(6), 746-756.

Sexual Consent Scale-Revised (Lack of Perceived Behavioral Control) Subscale

Scoring	This tool is scored using a 7-point Likert scale where 1=Strongly disagree and 7=Strongly agree. Higher average scores indicate individuals who perceive they lack behavioral control while lower average scores indicate individuals feel they have more behavioral control.
Reverse Coding	Items 9 and 11 require reverse coding.
Reliability	α=0.86
Citation	Humphreys, T. P. & Brousseau, M. M. (2010). The Sexual Consent Scale-Revised: Development, reliability, and preliminary validity. *Journal of Sex Research, 47*(5), 420-428.

Sexual Consent Scale-Revised Positive Attitude Toward Establishing Consent Subscale

Scoring	This tool is scored using a 7-point Likert scale where 1=Strongly disagree and 7=Strongly agree. Higher average scores indicate a higher positive attitude toward establishing consent. Lower average scores indicate a lower positive attitude toward establishing consent.
Reverse Coding	Item 11 requires reverse coding.
Reliability	α=0.84
Citation	Humphreys, T. P., & Brousseau, M. M. (2010). The Sexual Consent Scale-Revised: Development, reliability, and preliminary validity. *Journal of Sex Research, 47*(5), 420-428.

Sexual Consent Scale-Revised Sexual Consent Norms Subscale

Scoring	This tool is scored using a 7-point Likert scale where 1=Strongly disagree and 7=Strongly agree. Higher average scores indicate negative sexual consent norms, and lower average scores indicate positive sexual consent norms.
Reliability	α=0.67
Citation	Humphreys, T. P. & Brousseau, M. M. (2010). The Sexual Consent Scale-Revised: Development, reliability, and preliminary validity. *Journal of Sex Research, 47*(5), 420-428.

Self-Efficacy to Refuse Sexual Behavior Scale

Scoring	This tool is scored using a 5-point Likert scale where 1=Not at all sure and 5=Very sure. Higher total scores indicate higher levels of self-efficacy to refuse sexual behavior, and lower total scores indicate lower levels of self-efficacy to refuse sexual behavior.
Reliability	α=0.85
Citation	Cecil, H. & Pinkerton, S. D. (1998). Reliability and validity of a self-efficacy instrument for protective sexual behaviors. *Journal of American College Health, 47*(3), 113-121.

Sexual Consent Scale-Revised Indirect Behavioral Approach to Consent

Scoring	This tool is scored using a 7-point Likert scale where 1=Strongly disagree and 7=Strongly agree. Higher average scores indicate lower levels of consent behavior and lower average scores indicate higher levels of consent behavior.
Reverse Coding	Item 6 requires reverse coding.
Reliability	α=0.71
Citation	Humphreys, T. P. & Brousseau, M. M. (2010). The Sexual Consent Scale-Revised: Development, reliability, and preliminary validity. *Journal of Sex Research, 47*(5), 420-428.

Dating Violence Measurement Tools

Focus	Tool Name	Type	Questions	Audience Suggestion
Attitudes & Beliefs	Dating Violence Questionnaire	Vignette	8	• Middle school • High school*
	Dating Attitudes Inventory	Rating	20	• Middle school • High school • College • Community

*Indicates the measure may be used with this population with appropriate adaptations.

Dating Violence Questionnaire

Scoring	This tool is scored by using two categories: Aggressive Response and Not Aggressive Response. Aggressive Responses are scored at 1 point each, and Not Aggressive Responses are scored at 0 points each. Higher total scores indicate higher levels of aggressive expectations in dating situations, and lower total scores indicate lower levels of aggressive expectations in dating situations.
Reliability	α=0.73
Citation	Próspero, M. (2006). The role of perceptions in dating violence among young adolescents. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 21*(4), 470-484.

Dating Attitudes Inventory

Scoring	This tool is scored using a 5-point Likert scale where 1=Strongly disagree and 5=Strongly agree. Higher average scores indicate higher beliefs in masculine gender role ideology related to dating violence, and lower average scores indicate a lower beliefs in masculine gender role ideology related to dating violence.
Reverse Coding	Items 8, 9, 12, 16 and 19 require reverse coding.
Reliability	α=0.87
Citation	Schwartz, J. P., Kelley, F. A., & Kohli, N. (2012). The development and initial validation of the Dating Attitudes Inventory: A measure of the gender context of dating violence in men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*(10), 1959-1986

Sexual Violence Measurement Tools

Focus	Tool Name	Type	Questions	Audience Suggestion
Attitudes & Beliefs	Abbreviated Rape Myth Acceptance Scale	Rating scale	7	• High school • College • Community
Attitudes & Beliefs	Victim Blaming Measure	Vignette	5	• High school • College
Knowledge	Sexual Violence Attitudes Scale	Test	20	• High school • College • Community
Knowledge	Sexual Assault Questionnaire	Test	18	• High school • College • Community

*Indicates the measure may be used with this population with appropriate adaptations.

Abbreviated Rape Myth Acceptance Scale

Scoring	The first six questions of this tool are scored using a 4-point Likert scale where 1=Strongly agree and 4=Strongly disagree. The final two questions are scored using a 5-point Likert scale where 1=Almost all and 5=Almost none. Higher total scores indicate a lower acceptance of rape myths, and lower total scores indicate a higher acceptance of rape myths.
Reliability	α=0.83
Citation	Monto, M. A., & Hotaling, N. (2001). Predictors of rape myth acceptance among male clients of female street prostitutes. *Violence Against Women, 7*(3), 275-293.

Victim Blaming Measure

Scoring	This tool is scored using a 7-point Likert scale where 1=Strongly disagree and 7=Strongly agree. Higher average scores indicate a higher level of victim blaming, and lower average scores indicate a lower level of victim blaming.
Reliability	α=0.71
Citation	van Prooijen, J., & van den Bos, K. (2009). We blame innocent victims more than I do: Self-construal level moderates responses to just-world threats. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*(11), 1528-1539.

Sexual Violence Attitudes Scale

Scoring	This tool is scored using True, False, and Unsure responses. Higher numbers of correct responses indicate lower belief in rape myths, and lower numbers of correct responses indicate a higher belief in rape myths.
Citation	McGee, H., O'Higgins, M., Garavan, R., & Conroy, R. (2011). Rape and child sexual abuse: What beliefs persist about motives, perpetrators, and survivors? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*(17), 3580-3593.

Sexual Assault Questionnaire

Scoring	This tool is scored using True, False, and Don't Know responses. Higher numbers of correct responses indicates a higher knowledge of rape definition, epidemiology, and psychological impacts, and lower numbers of correct responses indicate a lower knowledge of rape definition, epidemiology, and psychological impact.
Citation	Frazier, P, & B, Eugene. (1988). Juror common understanding and the admissibility of rape trauma syndrome evidence in court. *Law and Human Behavior, 12*(2), 101-122.

References

American Psychologial Association. (2018). PsycTESTS [database]. Retrieved from
    https://libguides.unomaha.edu

Price, P.C., Jhangiani, R., & Chiang, I.A. (2015). *Research methods in psychology: 2nd Canadian edition*. Retrieved from https://opentextbc.ca/researchmethods/

Townsend, S. M. (2009). *Technical assistance guide and resource kit for primary prevention and evaluation*. Retrieved from http://www.nsvrc.org/sites/default/files/Projects_RPE_ PCAR_TA_Guide_for_Evaluation_2009.pdf