

Survey Development for NJCASA

Final Report

Submitted by
Julie Koivunen, Ph.D.
Sarah McMahon, Ph.D
Corinne Warrener, M.S.W.

Center on Violence against Women and Children
Rutgers University, School of Social Work

In partnership with
New Jersey Coalition Against Sexual Assault
New Jersey Department of Community Affairs , Division on Women

Project supported by
Cooperative Agreement Number 5H28CE001536 -02 from the Center's for Disease Control

November 30, 2009
Revised May 11, 2010

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Project Goal	4
Review of the Literature	5
IRB Documentation	7
Refinement of Survey Drafts	8
Piloting the Survey	10
Results from the Pilots	11
Results and Recommendations	21
Summary and Conclusion	25
References	28
Appendices	
Appendix A: Grid/spreadsheet of Work Reviewed	29
Appendix B: Survey for Pilot	51
Appendix C: Final Survey	58

Introduction

This research project involved a joint effort by the Center on Violence Against Women and Children (VAWC) at the Rutgers University School of Social Work and the New Jersey Coalition Against Sexual Assault (NJCASA) to develop a survey on attitudes and beliefs about gender norms which will subsequently be implemented throughout the state of New Jersey. Through the process detailed in this report, VAWC researchers conducted an extensive literature review, evaluated existing scales and instruments, developed a gender norms scale, conducted piloting on the survey, and ultimately finalized the survey for use by NJCASA.

The mission of the Center on Violence Against Women & Children (VAWC) is to strive to eliminate physical, sexual, and other forms of violence against women and children and the power imbalances that permit them. The mission will be accomplished through the use of a collaborative approach that focuses on multidisciplinary research, education, and training that impacts communities in New Jersey, the U.S., and the world.

The New Jersey Coalition against Sexual Assault (NJCASA) is comprised principally of twenty-two (22) Program Members who are the primary providers of sexual violence community education and direct services for survivors of sexual violence in each of New Jersey's 21 counties and Rutgers University. There are also 50 or so Allied Members comprised mainly of committed professionals, community members, and organizations.

The role of NJCASA is to be the state-wide voice advocating for survivors and the Sexual Violence Programs who provide services. Their advocacy is predicated upon the two main mandates of their mission: a just and compassionate survivor-centered paradigm and the elimination of sexual violence. In addition to working on state-level policy and procedures, legislation, prevention, standards, certification, and training, one of NJCASA's main priorities is to develop outcome measures that capture the impact of prevention efforts throughout New Jersey. One such measure will be to establish a baseline understanding of the attitudes and beliefs about gender norms from New Jersey residents, determining county level strengths and challenges to further inform their work. NJCASA plans to repeat such studies to document the impact of sexual violence prevention programs.

Based on the shared interests and goals of the two organizations, this collaboration was created to maximize to the fullest extent the capacities and expertise in developing an instrument to capture attitudes and beliefs about gender norms.

Project Goal

The goal of this Gender Norms project was to conduct a literature review and develop a 12-15 minute telephone survey on attitudes and beliefs about gender norms that can be implemented by another contracted entity through random-digit dialing throughout the State of New Jersey. As part of the survey development, VAWC researchers were asked to pilot the survey with approximately 15 individuals. Through piloting, VAWC was able to gain additional insight and feedback regarding questions and topics as well as the specific wording and language

used in the pilot survey. Through this process, VAWC was able to finalize the survey, which will be implemented by NJCASA in the upcoming year.

Review of the Literature

To begin the project, VAWC researchers conducted a comprehensive literature review in order to gather reliable and validated scales and other questions for consideration in the survey development. In an effort to accurately compare and contrast existing scales and instruments, the research team began with the identification of protective and risk factors for sexual violence, which helped pinpoint several key search terms to be used in finding existing scales and literature. After the scales were identified, they were presented in a spreadsheet format (see Appendix A) providing an overview of relevant strengths and limitations, and then evaluated for appropriateness within this specific project.

The protective and risk factors were based on information provided by the Governor's Advisory Council Against Sexual Assault and the Prevention and Public Education Committee (PPEC), taken from the final report of the Risk and Protective Factors Working Group 2007. Based on the original factors, the researchers identified five on which to focus: (1) Attachment/parenting/empathy, (2) Social support, (3) Media literacy, (4) Prosocial moral reasoning, (5) Hypermasculinity. These factors were chosen because of their ability to be realistically impacted by an intervention within a time span of a few years, which is one of the goals of the PPEC. For example, the risk factor of witnessing family violence was ruled out because it is an issue that would have happened in the past for the adults being surveyed in this project.

After the identification of risk and protective factors, searches were conducted in each subject area for measurement tools. The topics of attachment, parenting and empathy were searched separately. The primary focus of the searches was to identify scales that had been developed and tested for reliability and validity. In addition, articles that tested the scales in other populations or settings were also included. In a few cases, including the area of rape attitudes, articles were identified that provided a meta-analysis or literature review comparing several scales. In later reading and evaluating each article, there were occasional references to instruments that were not identified by the original search. In these instances, these instruments were identified at this point in the process and entered into the spreadsheet. A total of 72 articles were reviewed, however not all articles were included in the spreadsheet if not completely relevant. Twenty-seven different scales were reviewed among the various categories, some of which (notably, Burt's Scales) included several subscales.

Once scales and literature in each area were collected, a spreadsheet was developed to record information in a way that would allow for a straightforward comparison of articles. The areas of information included in the columns of the spreadsheet were a collaborative decision made by the research team. The areas included are: Instrument, Authors/Date/Journal, Purpose, Reliability, Sample, Strengths, Weaknesses, and Notes/Recommendations (see Appendix A).

The evaluation of instruments was based on the various categories included in the spreadsheet. Newer instruments were preferable, however some instruments had been updated over the years or were considered because of their strengths in other areas, such as reliability. Reliability, or the Cronbach's alpha score, was considered as higher reliability indicates an instrument with greater potential for success when replicated. Cronbach's alpha measures the internal reliability of an instrument, giving a score that reflects how well the items within a scale

fit together. A decent score would be .70 or higher. The sample populations would ideally be varied in age, location, ethnicity, gender, etc, but this was frequently not the case. Some scales were not recommended because the format was not conducive to a phone survey, for example, those that required in-depth interviews. Other scales were not recommended because the focus of the questions was not in line with the purpose of the NJCASA project. Certain categories were not recommended as a whole because the relevance and strength of scales in that area was weak (e.g. prosocial moral reasoning scales were all geared toward children; the empathy scales had multiple problems including disagreement on definition and measuring constructs, and it is likely that empathy would be difficult to change during the time span projected by NJCASA). The recommended scales typically had the potential for updating language and had content that was deemed particularly relevant to the study, such as the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (IRMA) and Burt's Scales. These scales also typically had good reliability, had been tested among various populations, and showed potential for being shortened or combined with other instruments.

IRB Documentation

In June and July, the VAWC research team prepared the various documentation for submission to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Rutgers University. This process included completing the protocol form, writing an informed oral consent, and completing a Survey/Instrument for review by the Board. The research team decided that the survey submitted to the IRB would include various scales selected by the team, after an extensive review of the literature, and scales and instruments that had been identified in the grid/spreadsheet. The Scales included in the instrument submitted to the IRB included the following:

1. **Burt Scales** (Burt, 1980)
(Includes the following scales: Sex Role Stereotyping, Adversarial Sexual Beliefs, Sexual Conservatism, & Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence)
2. **Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (IRMA)**(Payne, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999)
3. **Bystander Scale** (modified from the Bystander Attitude Scale, Banyard, Moynihan & Plante, 2007)
4. **Classical and Modern Sexism Scales** (Ekehammar, Akrami, & Araya, 2000).
5. **Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI)** (Glick. & Fiske, 1996)

While it was clear that all of these scales could not be used in the final survey due to time constraints, all of the above scales were included in the IRB documentation in order to gain approval for their use. The researchers then further analyzed and reviewed the materials to determine which were best suited to be piloted for the final survey. Upon further revision of these scales, and in consultation with NJCASA, a shorter survey was finalized that would be appropriate for a 12-15 minute phone survey. The documentation for this project was submitted to the Rutgers' IRB in August and final approval was received in September.

Refinement of Survey Drafts

The research team worked throughout late August and early September to identify the exact phrases, questions and issues that were most appropriate for inclusion in the final survey. The team reviewed the entire document that was submitted to the IRB, and methodically critiqued and analyzed each question, to determine the appropriateness of the fit for the drafts being created. It was decided that the VAWC research team would prepare three different versions of the survey for review by NJCASA. Through providing three entirely different versions of the survey, NJCASA would be able to look more objectively at each question and sentiment captured in the various drafts.

The researchers prepared one survey that contained questions that focused more generally on questions related to gender roles and gender issues. The second survey was one that focused more specifically on rape myths. The third survey contained some questions on both of these subjects, but also included the entire Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale, Short Form (IRMA), and the strength of this particular survey was that outcomes and results from the data collection in this project could then be compared to other findings in the literature that utilized this same scale.

Various issues were addressed during this time of survey refinement, and included the initial choice of the question itself, careful scrutiny of the wording of each question, checking for the appropriateness of the wording, it's "present day" use and understanding (compared to wording that had been written in previous decades), and finally, insuring that the wording in each question was appropriate for a wide audience, including problems related to sophisticated wording and phrases that may not easily be understood by a lay audience or one whose highest level of educational attainment is high school.

The three versions of the survey were then sent to NJCASA for their review and feedback on the structure of the surveys, the content, the wording of questions, and the arrangement and order of the questions. Staff from NJCASA reviewed the three options and decided that the first version was closest to meeting their needs. Specific suggestions and feedback were provided to the research team, who made the changes. Again, consideration was given to the various cohorts and age groups of people that would be potential participants in the survey. Specific attention was also given to questions that may be worded in such a way that they may alienate or confuse those with lower educational levels.

The revised survey was sent to NJCASA for their review and then discussed over a conference call. Staff from NJCASA requested some additional bystander questions as well as selecting language that was more universal. The research team made another round of changes based on this conversation. During this revision process, wording and language improvements were made to reflect that of a wider audience. For example, age-specific language such as “bitch”, “slut” and “ho” were removed, and other descriptive terms were inserted. Also considered was the ordering of the questions, with those questions which may be perceived as more personal (such as the respondent’s own behavior), or questions addressing the topics of rape and rape myths being placed at the end of the survey, and the more general questions, such as those about gender roles in society, were placed at the beginning of the survey (following the demographic section). Also, it was decided that a brief statement would be placed in the section preceding questions about rape, reminding the respondent that he or she may choose to not answer a question. Also discussed was the importance of providing language in the survey that was easily understood by those whose first language may be something other than English. In an effort to write phrases and statements that were understood by a great majority of potential respondents, additional consideration was given to words that may be misconstrued or have dual meaning.

Piloting the Survey

Upon securing final IRB approval on October 16th, the researchers sought to schedule the pilots with the instrument presented and approved by the IRB, and selected by NJCASA, in an effort to obtain feedback and reactions from a variety of people, which would ultimately inform the final draft of the instrument.

The researchers contacted a significant number of people from various age cohorts, educational backgrounds, those with various relationship status (single, married, partnered), as well as those from various ethnic and racial groups. The pilot sessions were held from the first through the third week of November. VAWC researchers completed 12 pilot interviews with the survey for piloting (see Appendix B). The following section of the report details specific information gathered from respondents through this process.

An MSW student was hired to help conduct the pilot interviews. She received training on conducting interviews including the background of the project, ethical considerations, and how to efficiently gather feedback on the instrument. Also discussed was the importance of timing each interview, to specify the exact time it would take to complete each pilot. The team started to schedule phone interviews in late October to pilot the survey.

Results from the Pilots

The following section of this report provides specific details on the data collected through the piloting process. Each participant's demographic information is provided, as well as a report of the amount of time it took to conduct each pilot (from the first through the thirty-fifth question). Please note that the time reported does not include the discussion that was held after the conclusion of the survey; the survey administrator timed only the questions themselves. Additionally, the informed consent form was sent to the participant via email, prior to the actual pilot date, giving ample time for the participant to review the form. Upon the beginning of each phone call, the interviewer confirmed receipt of the informed consent, and asked if the respondent had any questions. The following section provides specific feedback and suggestions from each respondent in the piloting process.

1. A 67-year-old Caucasian female whose highest level of education included a bachelor's degree participated in a pilot interview that lasted 8 minutes.

Overall, the participant expressed positive sentiments regarding the survey. When asked what the participant liked best, the participant stated that she liked the questions. She stated that the questions were targeted, specific, and clear. She reported that she did not find any of the questions confusing or vague. When asked about the length of the survey, the participant stated that it was "perfect," not too long, not too short. All in all, the participant stated that she appreciates the surveys' attempt to address perceptions of gender roles and gender norms.

2. A 37-year-old Caucasian male whose highest level of education included a graduate degree participated in a pilot interview on November 6, 2009. The entire pilot session lasted 10 minutes from the first to the last (35th question).

Overall, the participant expressed positive sentiments regarding the survey, stating that the survey had good flow. In addition, the participant stated that he appreciated the order of the questions, the way that it went from the general to the more personal. When asked what he liked best, the participant stated that he liked the questions regarding the role of the media and its portrayal of women.

When the administrator asked the participant if there were any questions that were confusing or unclear, he stated that number 9 and number 37 were confusing. With regard to number 9, which reads, "Other people over-react to violence against women shown on TV and in movies," the participant was unsure of what "other people" means. Also pertaining to the question, the participant wasn't sure what the question meant by "overreact."

The participant also expressed confusion regarding number 37 which reads: "Ask my partner if he or she wants to get intimate, even if we are in a long term relationship." The participant expressed that he had no idea what the question was asking, and what its relevance is in the survey. He stated that he believes that questions nine and thirty-seven need to be reworded to explicitly and clearly state what it seeks to ask.

Another piece of feedback that the participant offered is that it would be helpful to remind survey participants (at least once more) of the scaling (completely somewhat disagree, disagree, neutral, somewhat agree, strongly agree). The participant stated that because the scaling shifted from asking about the participant's agreement to statements to asking participant about the likelihood of their individual action, he was confused about how to respond.

All in all, the participant said the length of the survey was perfect. The participant stated that because the survey is short, it may increase the likelihood of getting people to participate.

3. A 50-year-old Caucasian female whose highest level of education included a graduate degree participated in a pilot interview on November 12, 2009. The entire pilot session lasted 7 minutes from the first to the last (35th question).

Overall, the participant thought that the survey was well-constructed, with a great range of questions. In addition, the participant said that the informed consent was clearly written.

However, the participant did express a few concerns. The participant stated that she found numbers 9, 15, 22, and 34 confusing. In regard to number 9 which reads, “Other people over-react to violence against women shown on TV and in movies,” the participant found this question confusing. She was unsure about “who” other referred to. She was wondering whether it meant people outside of the domestic violence/women’s studies fields.

The participant was also curious about number 15, which reads, “More still needs to be done to gain equality for men and women at work.” The participant wanted to know why men were included in this question (what was the purpose of including men in the question).

In regard to number 22, which reads, “It is more acceptable for men to be sexually aggressive than for women,” the participant was not sure whether the question meant personally (her own opinion- how she feels) or on a societal level.

In regard to number 34, which reads, “Ask my partner if he or she wants to get intimate, even if we are in a long-term relationship,” the participant expressed concern. As a person who is in the domestic violence field, she easily understood this question and what it was asking. However, she is concerned that this question operates on the assumption that people have knowledge about DV related issues.

In addition, the participant also expressed concern about the instructions for questions 34 and 35 which read: “The final two questions are about your own behavior with your partner.” The participant wanted to point out that it assumes that one has a partner. The participant suggested that this question might be rephrased to include people who don’t have a partner.

Lastly, the participant said that it would be helpful to be reminded of the Likert choices. The participant stated that she wrote down the choices, however, she was wondering if there was a better way to remind participants of the answer choices.

4. A 33-year-old Caucasian female whose highest level of education included a master’s degree participated in a pilot interview on November 13, 2009. The entire pilot session lasted 6 minutes from the first to the last (35th question).

Overall, the participant thought the survey was well-constructed and easy to understand. The participant also appreciated the range of areas that the questions covered. In addition, the participant liked the length of the survey and thought that it was perfect- not too long, not too short.

The participant expressed concerns with questions 15 and 30. In regard to question number 15, which reads, “More still needs to be done to gain equality for men and women at work”, the participant was unsure of what was being asked. She didn’t know if the question meant that more needs to be done for women and *some* men to gain equality at work (implying that men don’t fit

into a homogenous group where they are all advantaged to women), or if the question meant more needs to be done for women and men to be equal to one another in the workforce.

In regard to question 30, which reads, “How likely are you to refuse to listen to music that uses sexist language to describe women or girls,” the participant was confused about how to answer. She wanted to know if this meant not listening to an artist because they produce music that is sexist or not listening to a particular song because it has sexist/degrading lyrics. Furthermore, she said that this question is very situational and depends on if she (as an individual) thinks that there is a problem with the music (if she feels that the sexist/degrading content is bad).

5. A 56-year-old Caucasian female whose highest level of education included half of a master’s degree participated in a pilot interview on November 13, 2009. The entire pilot session lasted 6 minutes from the first to the last (35th question).

Overall, the participant expressed extremely positive sentiments in regards to the survey. In particular, the participant liked the range of questions in the survey. The participant liked the emphasis on the media (advertisements, music, etc). The participant feels that this is an extremely pervasive issue facing younger generations.

6. A 29-year-old Caucasian female whose highest level of education is an undergraduate degree participated in a pilot interview on November 14, 2009. The entire pilot session lasted 7.5 minutes from the first to the last (35th question).

Overall, the participant expressed positive sentiments regarding the survey. When the administrator asked the participant if there were any questions that were confusing or unclear, she stated that numbers 15, 22, and 25 were slightly confusing. The administrator asked her to elaborate on her thoughts regarding these questions.

The respondent indicated that she believed that question number 15, which reads: “More still needs to be done to gain equality for man and women at work” could be changed or re-worked in some way. She felt that this question could be improved upon by eliminating the word “still”. In considering the administration of this survey through a phone format, she reasoned that the wordiness was a bit cumbersome, and that it may flow better, or be easier for the respondent to hear and process if there were fewer words at the beginning of this sentence.

The participant also expressed confusion regarding question number 22 which reads: “It is more acceptable for men to be sexually aggressive than for women.” The participant indicated that the wording is unclear for this particular question. She stated that “it is more acceptable *according to society’s standards*, and therefore, should I be responding to this question, based upon the perspective that exists in our society, or am I supposed to respond to this question based upon my own personal beliefs?”. The participant provided a suggestion for improving this question, and clarifying the sentiment. She suggested adding the words “I think” to the beginning of the question, so that the question would read, “I think it is more acceptable for men to be sexually aggressive than for women”. In adding these words, it would be clearer to the respondent that he

or she is expected to provide an answer based upon their own personal belief system, rather than reporting on that of society.

The respondent indicated a similar sentiment in question 25 which reads, “False accusations of rape are often used as a way of getting back at men”. She indicated that she wondered if she is expected to respond in such a way that reflects society’s view (what she thinks our society believes about this issue), or whether she is supposed to respond regarding her own personal beliefs. She suggested that the words “I believe that”, be added to the beginning of the question. In this way, the question would read, “I believe that false accusations of rape are often used as a way of getting back at men”.

The participant also reflected on the directive statement which occurs prior to question number 25. This statement reads, “**We would like to remind you that your participation in this survey is voluntary and you can answer or not answer a specific question or withdraw at any time. The next few questions focus on the topic of rape and rape myths**”. This participant (who does not have a background in social work, domestic violence or sexual assault), provided feedback on using the words “rape myths” at the end of this statement. This respondent is not familiar with this term, or the background, or this area of study, and was therefore in a unique position to comment on this language. (Perhaps she is similar to potential respondents in the state-wide survey who do not know this discipline or field). She indicated that using the words “rape myths” may not be helpful because it plants the seed to the respondent or may contaminate in some way their thoughts and responses on the next few questions. In removing the word “myths” from the statement, she suggested that the respondent may be more authentic in their response, rather than feeling that they needed to respond in a politically correct manner, or respond in such a way that the person thinks the survey administrator would want to hear.

In response to the questions posed by the administrator, the participant reported that the length of the survey was perfect, that it was not too long. She also indicated that what she liked about the survey was that it made her think in a different way about these topics, and for people who do not work in this particular field, participation in this survey would be wonderful in that it would be an opportunity for them to reflect on the important topics of gender and current gender roles in our society, and their own particular beliefs.

7. A 35-year-old Caucasian male whose highest level of education is a doctoral degree participated in a pilot interview on November 15, 2009.. After obtaining informed consent, the survey began. The entire pilot session lasted 8 minutes from the first to the last (35th question).

The respondent observed that in the demographic section, on the question requesting the participant’s zip code, some people (albeit few in number), in an effort to be thorough or accurate, may report their zip code with the additional 4-digit number that often follows a hyphen in present-day zip codes.

Overall, the participant felt that the survey was very good. When the administrator asked the participant if there were any questions that were confusing or unclear, he stated that questions 11 and 16 were slightly confusing.

The participant expressed slight confusion regarding question number 11 which reads, “It is more important for the man in the family to have a job than it is for a woman”. The participant felt that the wording was unclear for this particular question. He stated that he was uncertain as to whether this question was asking him to respond in such a way that reflected the current views of society, or whether he was supposed to answer the question based upon his own personal beliefs. He suggested that the question could be improved if it were re-phrased in such a way to clarify whether we are seeking information about the respondent’s beliefs, or rather, that of society.

The participant also expressed confusion regarding question number 16 which reads, “A man should fight when the woman he is with is insulted by another man.” He paused, and responded in a confused manner, asking, ‘who is fighting who’? Upon further inquiry, he explained that the wording was a bit confusing, and it was hard to “follow” the sentiment of what was trying to be conveyed in the question. At the end of the survey, when asked for feedback, the respondent again brought up this question and said that it sounded a bit “wordy”, and attempted to brainstorm another way to phrase the question. He felt that if the ‘incident’ in the question is described first, then the respondent might be able to follow the question more easily. He suggested something along the lines of starting with, “When a woman is insulted...”, or “If a woman is insulted...”.

The respondent thought it was very helpful that prior to question number 28, there was a directive which stated, “For each statement below, answer how likely you are to engage in this behavior”. The respondent thought it may be beneficial to include a similar word-stem for the first few questions after that, such as for questions 28, 29, 30, which would then help the respondent recall the directive. The respondent referenced surveys that he has conducted, and thought that repeating the word-stem a few times might be helpful. For example, 28 might say, “How likely are you to express concern if a family member makes a sexist, degrading, or disrespectful joke”. Then, question 29 might say, “How likely are you to challenge a friend.....”. The respondent felt that this might help with the flow and that it might be clearer to the respondent to include this, even if only for the next three questions.

Overall, the participant said the length of the survey was neither too long, nor too short. He stated that he thought the strengths of the survey was that it was brief and straightforward. He also said that he liked that the survey could be a ‘jumping off point’ in helping people reflect on their own views, thoughts and behaviors, which they may not otherwise be cognizant of. He hoped that in hearing the questions, and taking some time to think about them, perhaps even after the survey had ended, one’s participation might elicit change in their behavior, or at the very least, invoke more thoughtful decision-making.

8. A 60-year-old Caucasian female whose highest level of education is a master’s degree participated in a pilot interview on November 16, 2009. The entire pilot session lasted 8.5 minutes from the first to the last (35th question).

The respondent felt that the survey was excellent, generally easy to understand. She also felt that for the most part, the responses were worded well.

She felt that the instructions for questions 34 and 35 were a bit unclear, or could be improved upon. They read: “The final two questions are about your own behavior with your partner.” The participant felt that this section could be re-worded to account for the fact that not all respondents may have a partner. She thought that some may be single, may be divorced, or may be widowed, and therefore may not currently have a partner. She raised the issue that a potential participant may not know how to respond. For example, should they respond based upon their previous experience of having a partner in the past, or about what they believe their behavior would be if/when they have a partner in the future.

Further, she also felt that another question could be improved upon, which was question number 7. This question reads, “Music often portrays women as sex objects”. She reported being slightly confused as to how to answer. She felt that the situation may be different for each respondent, and that their answer to this could vary tremendously, based upon the type of music they prefer to listen to. She thought that among younger people, they may be more likely to listen to current, present day music such as rap and other contemporary forms of music. However, among an older population, and for this respondent in particular, she often listens to opera music, classical music, or church-related music. Therefore, her reference points were quite different, and therefore she pointed out that she would respond differently to the question, based her own frame of reference, and the type of music that she listens to. The participant mentioned that she is, of course, certainly aware of the ways in which current top-40 type music does often portray women and girls in a sexist manner.

9. A 26-year-old Caucasian male whose highest level of education is a undergraduate degree participated in a pilot interview on November 18, 2009. The entire pilot session lasted 7 minutes from the first to the last (35th question).

Overall, the respondent felt that the survey was excellent.

The respondent expressed some confusion regarding question number 16 which reads, “A man should fight when the woman he is with is insulted by another man.” He thought that it was unclear whether this meant verbally or physically fighting with someone, and also mentioned that it was unclear about who should fight whom. He thought that this question could be re-worded in some way, to clarify the meaning and intent of the question for the future participants.

He also expressed some concern on another question, number 22 which reads: “It is more acceptable for men to be sexually aggressive than for women.” This respondent expressed confusion, and asked for clarification, regarding whether or not he should respond in such a way that reflected his own, personal beliefs, or rather, that of society. This feedback and critique of this particular question is consistent with a number of other pilot respondents who also expressed confusion.

10. A 75-year-old Caucasian female whose highest level of education included a high school diploma participated in a pilot interview on November 19, 2009. The entire pilot session lasted 12 minutes from the first to the last (35th question).

Overall, the participant expressed extremely positive sentiments regarding the survey. The participant expressed appreciation for the wide array of questions. The only question that the participant struggled with answering was number nine which read: “Other people over-react to violence against women shown on TV and in movies.” The participant was confused as what the question was asking—who are “other people.”

On side note (the survey administrator’s own observation)—the participant seemed to have to negotiate between her “old fashioned” (her term) values and more modern societal views regarding gender norms. As a result, the participant needed to talk herself through some of the questions (and in a way justify some of her answers). Thus contributing to the longer time of 12 minutes.

11. A 30-year-old Caucasian male whose highest level of education is an undergraduate degree participated in a pilot interview on November 18, 2009. The entire pilot session lasted 7 minutes from the first to the last (35th question).

The respondent indicated that he liked the survey overall. He felt that the survey was easy to complete and participate in, that the questions were straightforward. When asked about additional feedback and comments that he had, he felt that, “in general it is difficult to answer questions that use broad terms like ‘violence’ without a definition provided by the interviewer”. When asked to elaborate on this, he indicated that some of the words used, such as “society”, is a term that is large, and far-reaching, that it is a little vague when the respondent does not have more information to respond to, other than when the word “society” is used. An example of this is in question 14, which reads, “Society treats men and women in the same way”. He understood that it is difficult to provide specific examples, or have a more nuanced question, but he just felt that using broad terms like that were a bit vague.

12. A 40-year-old Hispanic male whose highest level of education included a doctorate degree participated in a pilot interview on November 23, 2009. After obtaining informed consent, the survey began. The entire pilot session lasted 7 minutes from the first to the last (35th question).

At the conclusion of the survey, the administrator asked the participant for their overall thoughts, observations, and feedback regarding the survey. Overall, the participant thought that the survey was good; however, he expressed a few concerns.

One of the concerns that the participant had was in regards to the questions pertaining to media. The participant thought the use of the word “often” (i.e. “music often portrays women as sex objects”) complicated the question. The participant stated that he thinks that some music does portray women as sex objects, and some does not. However, he thinks that the use of the word “often” implies more often than not—and therefore, may confuse people. He suggested that the survey use “sometimes” instead of “often.”

Another question the participant was confused about was number 15 which reads: “More still needs to be done to gain equality for men and women at work.” When I first read the question,

the participant said “more **what**.” He seemed to think that there was more to the question: “More _____ still needs to be done to gain equality for men and women at work.” In retrospect, some of the other participants also seemed to think there was more to the question because they asked me to repeat the question or they asked me “more what?”

Also, in regards to number 15: prefacing his feedback by saying that men are the dominant group (in terms of access to education and resources), the participant thought that this question was double-barreled. The participant thought that this question, could be broken down into two separate questions: 1. “More still needs to be done to gain equality for women at work,” 2. “More needs to be done to educate men about equality for women at work.”

The last piece of feedback that the participant offered was in regards to question number 22 which reads: “It is more acceptable for men to be sexually aggressive than for women.” The participant was confused about whether this was asking his own person beliefs, or societal views.

13. A 20-year-old Non-Hispanic African-American male who is currently a junior in college (highest educational level is high school completion) participated in a pilot interview on April 15, 2010. Prior to beginning the interview, the survey administrator explained the purpose of the study and assured confidentiality. The participant gave the interviewer verbal informed consent that he was voluntarily participating. After obtaining informed consent, the survey began. The entire pilot session lasted 7 minutes from the first to the last (35th question).

At the conclusion of the survey, the administrator asked the participant for his overall thoughts, observations, and feedback regarding the survey. Overall, the participant expressed positive sentiments regarding the survey. The participant stated that he found the questions asked in the survey to be thought provoking. He further stated that he found this survey and the questions included to be particularly interesting because he never thought about his own personal views and biases regarding gender norms before. He did not have suggestions for changes regarding the content or wording of any questions.

When asked about the length of the survey, the participant stated that it was shorter than anticipated. He stated that he would be interested in adding questions that asked about gender stereotypes among particular races.

14. A 22-year-old Asian-American female who is currently a senior in college (highest educational level is high school completion) participated in a pilot interview on May 3, 2010. Prior to beginning the interview, the survey administrator explained the purpose of the study and assured confidentiality. The participant gave the interviewer verbal informed consent that she was voluntarily participating. After obtaining informed consent, the survey began. The entire pilot session lasted 6 minutes from the first to the last (35th question).

At the conclusion of the survey, the administrator asked the participant for her overall thoughts, observations, and feedback regarding the survey. Overall, the participant expressed positive sentiments regarding the survey. The participant stated that she especially appreciated the

questions that asked about her own personal behavior. She stated that these questions prompted her to honestly reflect on herself and her own behavior.

When asked if she found the wording of any of the questions confusing, the participant stated that she found question #29 (“Challenge a friend who uses sexist language to talk about or describe girls or women”) confusing. When asked for clarification, the participant reported being confused as to what “sexist” language entailed. During the administration of the survey, the participant stated that she didn’t understand the question so the administrator read the original wording of the question for the participant (“Challenge a friend who uses “ho,” “bitch,” “slut” to describe girls or women.”). After the interviewer then re-phrased the question, using the original wording of the statement (“challenge a friend who uses “ho,” “bitch,” “slut” to describe girls or women”), the participant stated that she had a clearer understanding of what the question was asking, and was subsequently able to answer the question.

The participant also stated that she found the Likert scale choices of “not likely, somewhat unlikely neutral, somewhat likely, extremely likely” to be confusing. The participant was unable to elaborate on why she didn’t like the Likert scale choices of “not likely, somewhat unlikely, neutral, somewhat likely, extremely likely”, and was unable to provide an alternative wording for the response. However, upon reflection, the interviewer hypothesizes that the participant found it difficult to remember the choices, as evidenced by the fact that the participant asked the interviewer to repeat the choices multiple times. When asked about the length of the survey, the participant stated that it was “fine.”

15. A 21-year-old African-American female who is currently a junior in college (highest educational level is high school completion) participated in a pilot interview on May 6, 2010. Prior to beginning the interview, the survey administrator explained the purpose of the study and assured confidentiality. The participant gave the interviewer verbal informed consent that she was voluntarily participating. After obtaining informed consent, the survey began. The entire pilot session lasted 7 minutes from the first to the last (35th question).

At the conclusion of the survey, the interviewer asked the participant for her overall thoughts, observations, and feedback regarding the survey. The participant noted that there were a few questions that were situational and that she “sometimes” would agree/disagree with a statement. The participant noted that there were a few questions that were situational, and that sometimes she would agree/disagree with the statement. The specific questions that the participant indicated, as being dependent upon the situation include the following:

- “A man should fight when the woman he is with is insulted by another man.”
- “A woman who dresses in skimpy clothes should not be surprised if a man tries to force her to have sex.”
- “Rape happens when a man’s sex drive gets out of control.”

When asked if she found the wording of any of the questions confusing, the participant stated that she found question #22 (“It is more acceptable for men to be sexually aggressive than for women”) confusing. The participant noted that she was confused as to whether the question was asking about her own person beliefs, or her perception of beliefs held by society.

The participant also stated that she found question #34 (“Ask my partner if he or she wants to get intimate, even if we are in a long term relationship”) confusing. She stated that she was unsure what the question was asking. During the discussion and feedback process, the interviewer clarified and stated that the question was asking about consent—only then did the participant understand the question. When asked about the length of the survey, the participant stated that it was “perfect .”

Results and Recommendations

Overall, most respondents reported that the length and structure of the survey worked well. The time it took to complete the survey ranged from 6 - 12 minutes. However, there were certain items that warranted revision based on the comments.

There were several pilot participants who expressed slight confusion regarding the question centering on the topic of music. Regarding question number 7, which reads, “Music often portrays women as sex objects”, participants noted that situational variables could significantly alter the way that one perceives this question. For example, within a younger population, there may be a greater likelihood of referencing current, present day music such as rap and other contemporary forms of music. However, among an older population, and for one respondent in particular, she often listens to opera music, classical music, or church-related music. Therefore, her reference points were quite different, and therefore she pointed out that she would respond differently to the question, based upon the *type* of music that the question was referring to. Based on this feedback, the research team changed the question to read, “Popular music often portrays women as sex objects”.

Participants also critiqued question number 9 which reads, “Other people over-react to violence against women shown on TV and in movies”. Respondents felt that the use of the word “other” was unclear or ambiguous. They felt that the question could be improved upon by

inserting the word, “some” instead. Therefore, the question has been changed to read, “Some people over-react to violence against women shown on TV and in movies”.

During the pilot testing, question number 11 read, “It is more important for the man in the family to have a job than it is for a woman”. In this, and other questions later in the pilot, respondents expressed confusion regarding whether or not they should respond in such a way that indicates their own, personal beliefs about this subject, or whether they should respond in such a way that reflects the views of society. For example, respondents felt that this sentiment does exist among some people in society, specifically those that have a more traditional way of thinking about family and gender roles, however, several respondents said that they, themselves, did not hold this opinion. However, they were aware that some people in the current society still believe this statement to be true, and therefore were uncertain as to how to respond. Based upon this feedback, the question has been re-worded to say, “I think that it is more important for the man in the family to have a job than it is for a woman”.

Another question the participants felt could be improved upon was number 15 which read: “More still needs to be done to gain equality for men and women at work.” When first read the question, some participants said “more **what.**” They seemed to think that there was more to the question: “More _____ still needs to be done to gain equality for men and women at work.” Based upon these comments and feedback, it was determined that additional information should be provided. Thus, the question was changed to, “More progress needs to be made in order for men and women to gain equality at work”.

Further, several participants expressed confusion regarding question number 16 which reads, “A man should fight when the woman he is with is insulted by another man.” They felt it was unclear about who might be fighting who, and that the wording was slightly confusing. They

felt that it was hard to “follow” the sentiment of what was trying to be conveyed in the question. It was suggested that something along the lines of starting with, “When a woman is insulted...”, or “If a woman is insulted...”. Based on these comments, we changed the question to read, “If a woman is insulted by another man, her boyfriend or partner should fight on her behalf”.

One of the central themes, and among the most common responses to the survey, was that some questions were confusing regarding whether the participant was expected to respond to questions based upon their own, personal belief system, or respond based upon current societal beliefs. For example, in question number 22, which reads, “It is more acceptable for men to be sexually aggressive than for women,” participants was unsure whether the question meant that they should reply based upon their own opinion, or rather, on that of society. Based on this feedback, we changed the question to read, “I think it is more acceptable for men to be sexually aggressive than for women”. Additionally, in the most recent group of pilot interviews conducted in May, another participant indicated that they found the wording to be unclear, in terms of the question asking about her opinion, or that of society. Given this feedback, one recommendation is to consider inserting guidelines of some kind at the beginning of the survey, in which the respondent is directed to answer the question based upon their own opinion, and not that of society.

Additional confusion was expressed regarding question number 25 which reads, “False accusations of rape are often used as a way of getting back at men”. Participants indicated that they wondered if they were expected to respond in such a way that reflects society’s view (what they think our society believes about this issue), or whether they are supposed to respond regarding their own personal beliefs. Based upon the feedback that we received regarding this

question, the wording has been changed to, “I think that false accusations of rape are often used as a way of getting back at men”.

Additional feedback was provided on the statement prior to question number 25 which read, “*We would like to remind you that your participation in this survey is voluntary and you can answer or not answer a specific question or withdraw at any time. The next few questions focus on the topic of rape and rape myths*”. Feedback from the pilot indicated that it might be advisable to consider removing the words “rape myths” at the end of this section. Comments from the participants (specifically several who do not have a background in social work, domestic violence or sexual assault), provided feedback on the use of these terms. They indicated that in removing the word “myths” from the statement, the potential participant may be more authentic in their response, rather than feeling that they needed to respond in a politically correct manner, or respond in such a way that the person thinks the survey administrator would want to hear. Based upon this feedback, the research team removed the final three words (“and rape myths”) from this section. Therefore, the last sentence reads, “The next few questions focus on the topic of rape”.

Several participants expressed concern regarding the instructions for questions 34 and 35 which read: “The final two questions are about your own behavior with your partner.” The participants felt that this section could be improved upon, by re-wording the question, given that some people may not currently have a partner, and therefore, may not know how to respond (ie, based upon their previous experience of having a partner in the past, or about their hypothetical behavior if/when they have a partner in the future). Additionally, these questions seemed to make individuals uncomfortable. The VAWC research team discussed this at length raised the point that for older generations or within certain cultures or religions, asking about an

individual's own sexual behavior may not be well received. Since the rest of the survey is focused on measuring attitudes and not actual behaviors, these questions were removed. It is recommended that if NJCASA wants to include measures of individual's own sexual behavior that these be carefully considered.

More general feedback was provided as well. Another piece of feedback gathered through the piloting process was that participants thought it would be helpful to remind survey participants (at least once more) of the scaling (completely somewhat disagree, disagree, neutral, somewhat agree, strongly agree). Participants stated that because the scaling shifted from asking about the participant's agreement to statements to asking participant about the likelihood of their individual action, it may be confusing to some people, regarding how to respond. Based on this feedback, the research team has added a reminder of the Likert choices to one other area of the survey. In the most recent pilot interviews, conducted in May, one participant stated that she found the Likert scale choices of "not likely, somewhat unlikely neutral, somewhat likely, extremely likely" to be confusing. Given this additional feedback, it is advised that the Likert scale choices be given further consideration, and possibly be revised.

Based upon the above suggestions and feedback gleaned through the piloting process, the research team recommends that these changes be made to the final survey implemented throughout the State. We have revised the survey to reflect these final changes and amendments, and the final survey is found in Appendix C of this report.

Summary and Conclusion

Throughout the course of this project, the VAWC research team has completed an extensive literature review, created numerous drafts of the survey for review by NJCASA,

completed significant revisions and edits in an effort to prepare the survey for piloting, conducted pilot testing with fifteen individuals, and lastly, prepared a final survey for use during the implementation of the survey throughout the State.

In the upcoming months, NJCASA may wish to share this report with the agency with whom they have contracted regarding the implementation of the survey. The research team has carefully considered all of the wording and language used throughout the document, however, further consideration by NJCASA staff may be beneficial. With participants completing the survey in 6- 12 minutes along with the elimination of two questions, there is also room to consider additional questions.

The piloting process resulted in a number of suggestions, all of which were carefully considered, and many of which were subsequently revised and modified in the final version. However, it is important to note several limitations of the subject pool. First, the pilot pool provided a start to the revision process, but included only 15 individuals. Depending on the ultimate sample size of the project, we recommend further pilot testing with a larger sample.

Second, while every effort was made to enlist participants with a range of diversity in terms of educational levels, age ranges, and racial and ethnic backgrounds, the sample included a disproportionate number of Caucasian respondents. The age range of participants was from 20 to 76 years of age, and educational levels varied from those who held a high school diploma to those to held a doctoral degree. Further, while researchers kept the language in the survey general enough to reflect a wide audience (young and elderly people, various levels of education, and those who are not native English speakers), it is important to note that language, especially around sexual slang, may be different for various groups. The VAWC research team strongly recommends further pilot testing to gather additional feedback about the survey. In particular,

the inclusion of Spanish-speaking individuals and immigrant participants is warranted to determine the relevance of the questionnaire items for those groups. Pilot testing of any translated instruments is also encouraged to assure the reliability of the questions.

With the goal of having one final survey, which will be administered to a wide range of participants throughout the state of New Jersey, it is virtually impossible to tailor the survey to specific groups. Without creating several different surveys to administer to several different groups, there are limitations to consider in having only one instrument. The VAWC research team encourages further discussion about the pros and cons of using one survey for a large range of participants versus adapting the survey for various subgroups based on age, language, and ethnicity.

Finally, the VAWC research team appreciates the opportunity to have assisted in this project. We are excited about the implementation of the survey throughout the State in the upcoming months and years, and look forward to hearing about the results of the survey.

References

- Bishop, P.D., Chertok, F. & Jason, L.A. (1997). Measuring sense of community: Beyond local boundaries. *The Journal of Primary Prevention, 18* (2), 193-212.
- Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*, 217–230.
- Glick, P. & Fiske, S.T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 491-512.
- Ekehammar, B., Akrami, N. & Araya, T. (2000). Development and validation of Swedish classical and modern sexism scales. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 41*, 307-314.
- Glick, P. & Fiske, S.T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 491-512.
- Hill, J.L. (1996). Psychological sense of community: Suggestions for future research. *Journal of Community Psychology, 24* (4), 431-438.
- McMahon, S. & Farmer, G.L. (Under review). An updated measure for assessing subtle rape myths.
- Obst, P.L. & White, K.M. (2004). Revisiting the Sense of Community Index: A confirmatory factor analysis. *Journal of Community Psychology, 32* (6), 691-705.
- Payne, D. L., Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1999). Rape myth acceptance: Exploration of its structure and its measurement using the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale. *Journal of Research in Personality, 33*, 27-68.

Appendix A: Grid/Spreadsheet of Materials Reviewed

Instrument	Authors, Date, Journal	Purpose	Reliability	Sample	Strengths	Limitations	Notes/Recommendations
Category: Adult Attachment							
Adult Attachment Scale	Collins & Read, 1990, J of Personality and Soc Psych	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Influenced by the work of Havan & Shaver, 1987 15 item scale, 5 items for each attachment style Defines 3 styles: dependent, anxiety, close Tested against working models of self & others Tested against 3 aspects of dating relationships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Depend $\alpha=.75$ Anxiety $\alpha=.72$ Close $\alpha=.69$ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undergrads from USC Men and women 17-37 years old (mean 18.8) Also tested on dating couples, ages ranging 18-44 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good test/retest stability Use of attachment theory in design Applies generally to relationships, not specifically to romantic or marital relationships Widely used 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reliability/validity only applies to college undergrads 	This scale's strength is that it is general in its measurement of attachment, rather than specific to married or romantic relationships. If this is a priority area for the instrument, this could potentially be a good measure of attachment for the purposes of this study.
	Holtworth-Munroe, Stuart & Hutchinson, 1997, J of Family Psych	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tested against marital violence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not reported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 90 men, violent and nonviolent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent with literature that violent men tend to avoid dependency and more anxious about abandonment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tested with violent/nonviolent men, so reliability and validity with women may be lacking 	Given the scale's use in looking at violence, this scale could be a good choice, if this area is a primary focus.

Instrument	Authors, Date, Journal	Purpose	Reliability	Sample	Strengths	Limitations	Notes/Recommendations
Adult Attachment Interview (AAI)	Holtworth-Munroe, Stuart & Hutchinson, 1997, J of Family Psych	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tested against marital violence • Interview focuses on childhood memories of relationships with parents • Semi-structured interview 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not reported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ~100 men, violent & nonviolent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tested among violent and non violent men • Context of the study is similar to goals of NJCASA project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only cross-sectional studies • AAI does not show convergence with other related questionnaires (RSQ, RTS) • 	<p>(Holworth-Munroe article compared AAI, RSQ, and Rempel Trust Scale.)</p> <p>The AAI does not seem appropriate for the purposes of the NJCASA project because of its focus on childhood memories, a variable not able to be impacted by the state intervention. Also, the structure of the interview is not appropriate for the telephone survey.</p>
	VanIjzendoorn, 1995, Psych Bulletin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AAI originally intended to consider parental contribution to attachment relationship with child 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not reported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meta-analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long-term stability is established • Reliable and valid 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not originally intended for adults 	(See above comments)
Relationship Styles Questionnaire (RSQ)	Holtworth-Munroe, Stuart & Hutchinson, 1997, J of Family Psych	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tested against marital violence • Focuses on romantic relationships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not reported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ~100 men, violent & nonviolent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with AAS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only tested in cross-sectional studies • Specific to romantic relationships 	RSQ not ideal because of its focus on romantic relationships.

Instrument	Authors, Date, Journal	Purpose	Reliability	Sample	Strengths	Limitations	Notes/Recommendations
Rempel Trust Scale	Holtworth-Munroe, Stuart & Hutchinson, 1997, J of Family Psych	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tested against marital violence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not reported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ~100 men, violent & nonviolent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct measures belief that one's partner is dependable and predictable (as opposed to measuring jealousy) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only tested in cross-sectional studies • Specific to current relationships 	The RTS specifically looks at the current relationship, and therefore would not be appropriate for the NJCASA project.
Spouse-Specific Dependency Scale (SSDS)	Rathus & O'Leary 1997, J of Family Violence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primarily focuses on dependency issues with partner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • α scores ranged from .84 to .93 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 196 undergrads, men and women • Ages 18-26 (mean 19.9) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separate scales for men and women 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only tested with undergrads • Specific to married relationships 	The SSDS is not appropriate for the project because looks at current romantic relationships in terms of attachment and dependency. It is similar to the AAS, but the AAS would be a better option because of its general focus on attachment and connectedness.
Category: Empathy							

Instrument	Authors, Date, Journal	Purpose	Reliability	Sample	Strengths	Limitations	Notes/Recommendations
Hogan Empathy Scale	<p>Chlopan, McCain, Carbonell & Hagan, 1985, J of Personality and Social Psychology</p> <p>Hogan, 1969, J of Consulting and Clinical Psychology</p> <p>Marshall, Hudson, Jones & Fernandez, 1995, Clinical Psychology Review</p> <p>Watson, Grisham, Potter & Biderman, 1984, J of Personality Assessment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defines empathy as: the intellectual or imaginative apprehension of another's condition without actually experiencing that person's feelings • 64-item scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test-retest reliability .84 in one sample, but varies in other (some as low as .6) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Military • Undergrads • Adolescents • Mothers • Adult males 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus is more on behavior and role taking than emotions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reliability and validity is established according to some reports, but in Chlopan et al, the article calls attention to some discrepancies • Marshall et al state that the scale has low internal consistency 	<p>In a study classifying abusive/non-abusive mothers, the Hogan scale did the best job (80% accuracy) of correctly identifying the groups.</p> <p>The Hogan Scale measures role-taking ability and focuses more on social functioning.</p> <p>The Hogan Scale and QMEE have low correlation, indicating they are measuring different things. The Hogan Scale would be a better option for the project, if desired, because it measure role-taking ability. However, the Hogan Scale is quite lengthy.</p>
	Levenson & Reuf, 1992, J of Personality and Social Psychology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authors took the Empathy subscale from the CPI (California Personality Inventory, adapted from Hogan's) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not reported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 31 married subjects • Over 21 years old 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measured higher rates accuracy rates for women, which is consistent with the literature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above, issues in validity, consistency 	(See above comments)

Instrument	Authors, Date, Journal	Purpose	Reliability	Sample	Strengths	Limitations	Notes/Recommendations
Questionnaire Measure of Emotional Empathy (QMEE)	Chlopan, McCain, Carbonell & Hagan, 1985, J of Personality and Social Psychology Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 33 item test, scaling from -4 to +4 • Score is summed (higher means more empathy) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not reported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Male and female undergrads 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Valid among male and female undergrads 	The QMEE is measuring vicarious emotional arousal, or how much another person's emotions influence the respondent's emotions	The QMEE is measuring emotional arousal rather than ability to perceive others' emotions, and therefore would not be particularly relevant to the NJCASA project.
Category: Attitudes about Rape							
Rape Empathy Scale (RES)	Dietz & Byrnes, 1981, J of Psychology Dietz, Blackwell, Daley, and Bentley, 1982, J of Personality and Social Psychology Dietz, Littman & Bentley, 1984, Sex Roles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 item scale • Designed to measure the presentation of the crime in court • Looks at both victim and rapist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • .80 and above 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undergrads, male and female 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures factors that influence empathy toward victims and rapists • Measurable difference between men's and women's responses/empathy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrow focus on presentation of crime victims and perpetrators (e.g. physical attractiveness) 	This particular version does not appear to be appropriate for the measuring societal values, however that is the goal of the ATR (see section on Attitudes Toward Rape Scale).
Attitudes Toward Rape Victims Scale (ARVS)	Jimenez & Abreu, 2003, J of Counseling Psychology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25 items • Scored 1-7, higher score indicates unfavorable attitude • Focus is on rape victim 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • .83 in Jimenez study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Latino and Caucasian undergrads 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures attitudes and beliefs about rape 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus is very specific to victims 	This scale is not ideal for the project because of the focus on victims, as opposed to women in general (sexism) or the act of rape.

Instrument	Authors, Date, Journal	Purpose	Reliability	Sample	Strengths	Limitations	Notes/Recommendations
Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (RMAS)	Burt, 1980, J of Personality and Social Psych	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measures acceptance of rape myths 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .87 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 598 Minnesota Adults (18+) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes items regarding behavior about what causes rape and who is responsible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wider scope may be more than is needed for the project 	The RMAS would need to be adapted for the NJCASA project but the items concerning behaviors that cause rape might be useful for the study.
	Carr & VanDeusen, 2004, J of Family Violence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measured risk factors for sexual aggression on college campuses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .88 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Men and women Undergraduates 18-23 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See above 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See above 	See other comments.
	Jimenez & Abreu, 2003, J of Counseling Psychology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 19 item scale Scored 1-7 Higher score means more accurate perception of rape Focus is on acceptance of rape and rape myths 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .88 in Jimenez study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Latino and Caucasian undergrads 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See above 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See above 	Jimenez study was altered to be more specific to the population, changing names and other culturally relevant words.

Instrument	Authors, Date, Journal	Purpose	Reliability	Sample	Strengths	Limitations	Notes/Recommendations
	Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994, Psychology of Women Quarterly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meta analysis of rape myth literature and RMAS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See above 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See above 	<p>One study found 3 types of myths through 'rational analysis'. (1. Denial of rape existence, 2. Excusal, 3. Denial of rape seriousness)</p> <p>Another study conducted a factor analysis and found four factors. (1.) Disbelief of rape claims-6 items, 2) Victim responsible for rape-9 items, 3) Rape reports as manipulation-2 items, 4) Rape only happens to certain kinds of women-1 item)</p>

Instrument	Authors, Date, Journal	Purpose	Reliability	Sample	Strengths	Limitations	Notes/Recommendations
	Hall, Howard, & Boezio, 1986, Psychology of Women Quarterly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study used RMAS to compare prison sample with community • Also tested on adolescents and college students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not reported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Men age 18-39 • Prison (n=46) and community population (30) • Prison population committed rape (27) or other violent crimes (19) • Male and female adolescents • Male and female college students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tested on multiple populations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modified scales not included in the article 	See above comments.
Attitudes Toward Rape Scale (ATR)	Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994, Psychology of Women Quarterly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 32 items • 6 point likert scale • 8 factors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • .62 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General citizens • Police officers • Rape crisis counselors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accounts for 50% of variance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower reliability, however its attributed to high number of factors, high heterogeneity, high number of items loading .30 or above 	The ATR is similar to the RMAS, but has lower reliability.
	Earle, 1996, NASPA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used 25 item version • 6 point likert scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not reported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 347 college men 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures societal attitudes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See above 	(See above comments)

Instrument	Authors, Date, Journal	Purpose	Reliability	Sample	Strengths	Limitations	Notes/Recommendations
Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale	Payne, Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1999, J of Research in Personality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long (45) & short (20) item versions • Measures rape myths-general construct & 7 subscales: <i>She asked for it; It wasn't really rape; He didn't mean to; She wanted it; She lied; Rape is a trivial event; and Rape is a deviant event.</i> • 5 point likert 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.93 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 604 undergraduate students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive testing • Arguably best psychometric properties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language can be outdate or specific to student culture (noted by authors) 	Moderate to strong recommendation to include for this study- can be adapted to include updated language. Either specific subscales or the short version might fit with the length of the survey.
IRMA-Revised	McMahon & Farmer, 2008, under review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 23 item scale using 5 of the IRMA subscales • Includes updated language & subtle rape myths 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.90 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 951 undergraduate students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated language • IRMA as foundation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Still under review and further testing 	Moderate consideration for this study- similar to IRMA strengths/limitations
Category: Hyper masculinity							

Instrument	Authors, Date, Journal	Purpose	Reliability	Sample	Strengths	Limitations	Notes/Recommendations
Burt's Scales: (1) Sex role Satisfaction (2) Sex role stereotyping (3) Adversarial sexual beliefs (4) Sexual Conservatism (5) Acceptance of IPV	Burt, 1980, J of Personality and Social Psych	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 subscales measuring aspects of attitudes • Responses rated on a 7 point scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sex role satisfaction $\alpha = .781$ • Sex role stereotyping $\alpha = .800$ • Adversarial sexual beliefs $\alpha = .802$ • Sexual Conservatism $\alpha = .811$ • Acceptance of interpersonal violence $\alpha = .586$ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 598 Minnesota adults (18+) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good reliability • Distinct subscales 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Older scale 	This scale could be used all together or be broken apart into its subscales. The most appropriate subscales would be Sexual Conservatism or Sex Role Stereotyping, but Adversarial Sexual beliefs and Acceptance of IPV could also be useful.
	Carr & VanDeusen, 2004, J of Family Violence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used all 5 scales to measure risk factors for sexual aggression on college campuses • Also used RMAS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sex role: .78 • Conservatism: .81 • Stereotyping: .80 • Acceptance: .59 • Adversarial: .80 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Men and women • Ages 18-23 or older 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current use of the scales • Good reliability for 4 of 5 scales 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use with college students only 	Current use of the scales lends itself to the reliability and validity of the scales.

Instrument	Authors, Date, Journal	Purpose	Reliability	Sample	Strengths	Limitations	Notes/Recommendations
Hostility Toward Women Scale	Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995, J of Personality and Social Psych Check, Malamuth, Elias, & Barton, 1985, Psychology Today	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authors tested Burt's scale to see if hostility toward women accounted for rape myth acceptance • Found that hostility has more predictive power • 30 items • Separate scales for men and women • True/false answers that are summed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not reported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 429 men and women, undergrads 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple and direct style of questioning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Credibility of source is questionable (is it a peer reviewed journal?) 	Lonsway & Fitzgerald tested the HTWS against Burt's Scales and conclude that Burt's findings are really based on hostility toward women. However, just looking at the items on the various scales at face value, it appears that Burt's scales are measuring more specific aspects of hostility, as opposed to a completely different construct, as Lonsway & Fitzgerald would have the reader believe.
	Abbey, McCauslen, Zawacki, Clinton & Buck, 2001, J of Interpersonal Violence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authors used Burt's Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale and Lonsway & Fitzgerald's Hostility Toward Women Scale • The two scales were found to be highly correlated ($r=.72$) and were combined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $\alpha=.97$ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 343 male undergrads • 18-53 years old 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High reliability • Used on population with wider age range 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be measuring the same construct as Burt, just more generally 	See above.

Instrument	Authors, Date, Journal	Purpose	Reliability	Sample	Strengths	Limitations	Notes/Recommendations
Sexist Attitudes Toward Women Scale (SATWS)	Benson & Vincent, 1980, Psychology of Women Quarterly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40 item scale: 24 sexist, 16 non-sexist (to be recoded) • Attempts to measure “attitudes which function to place females in a place of relative inferiority to males by limiting women’s social, political, economic, and psychological development • 7 point likert scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $\alpha=.90$ to $.93$ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1976-7 tested on high school students, college students, and non-student adults 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good construct validity • Tested on different age groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scale created and tested in the 1970’s 	Some items or all of this scale could be useful, however the language would need to be updated. Items focus on the fundamental value of women and men and only a few items looks at stereotypes or gender roles. However, this may make the scale a lower priority for the NJCASA project.
Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS)	Earle, 1996, NASPA Nelson, 1988, Sex Roles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Originally created by Barnett & Field (1977) • Earle Study used Nelson’s 1988 version, with 22 items, language updates, and validation • Scale is 1-5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $\alpha= .78$ to $.85$ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 347 college men (Earle) • Men and women throughout U.S. (Nelson) • Tested on various age groups (Nelson) • Tested on British women (Nelson) • All education, income, and occupational status represented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus is on roles and stereotypes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certain items or language might be outdated • Unsure of validity and reliability among poor or lower income 	This scale may have some good items within it, but would probably need updating of language and style in order to be relevant.

Instrument	Authors, Date, Journal	Purpose	Reliability	Sample	Strengths	Limitations	Notes/Recommendations
Classical and Modern Sexism Scales	Ekehammar, Akrami, & Araya, 2000, Scandinavian J of Psychology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed and tested construct validity of classical and modern sexism scales Classical=overt, direct sexism Modern=covert, indirect sexism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .73 for classical .80 for modern 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18-59 years old Men and women From Uppsala Univ in Sweden 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highly correlated items, confirming construct validity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited research in this area, relatively new scale Needs alteration with regard to language in order to make culturally appropriate 	This study found that there is a distinguishable difference between classical and modern sexism. The concepts of overt and covert sexism could be an interesting aspect to include in the final instrument. Swim & Cohen (1997) note the importance of including both covert and overt sexism in analysis.
Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Hostile Sexism, Benevolent Sexism)	Glick & Fiske, 1996, J of Personality and Social Psychology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designed to account for the simultaneous holding of both hostile and benevolent sexist beliefs Hypothesized 3 subcomponents: paternalism, gender differentiation, and heterosexuality 22 items Scale 0-5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cronbach's α ranges from .73 to .92 (over 5 studies) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undergraduate men and women from various universities in Massachusetts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study shows the importance of accounting for both types of sexism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very general attitudes, not specific to rape or violence against women 	This scale has potential, but other scales may be closer to the purpose of the NJCASA project because of their use in looking at rape or violence against women. This scale asks very general questions.

Instrument	Authors, Date, Journal	Purpose	Reliability	Sample	Strengths	Limitations	Notes/Recommendations
Attitudes Toward Male/Female Dating Violence (AMDV, AFDV)	Price, Byers, & the Dating Violence Research team, 1999, J of Family Violence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measures attitudes and acceptance of abusive dating behaviors 6 scales total AMDV-Psyc (15 items) AMDV-Phys (15) AMDV-Sex (12) AFDV-Psyc (13) AFDV-Phys (12) AFDV-Sex (12) 5 point Likert scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AMDV-Psyc $\alpha=.83$ AMDV-Phys $\alpha=.83$ AMDV-Sex $\alpha=.87$ AFDV-Psyc $\alpha=.75$ AFDV-Phys $\alpha=.85$ AFDV-Sex α=not reported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 823 students 7th, 9th and 11th grade Tested in Canada Instrument used in both French and English 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good internal consistency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific to adolescents 	This scale would need a lot of work to make it appropriate for the project as it was used for adolescents and in Canada.
Sex Role Egalitarianism Scale (SRES)	Simonson & Subich, 1999, Sex Roles Beere, King, Beere, & King & 1984, Sex Roles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intended to measure attitudes that cause one to respond to another individual independently of the other individual's sex 5 point likert scale 5 subscales Total scores range from 95-475 This study tested against perceptions of rape 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marital $\alpha=.88$ Parental $\alpha=.88$ Employment $\alpha=.89$ Social-interpersonal-heterosexual $\alpha=.84$ Educational $\alpha=.89$ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Males and females Mostly Caucasian Undergraduates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subscales that look at roles within various areas of life (work, education) Used to examine attitudes about rape and how it relates to gender roles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instrument not included in article Only tested on undergrads in this study 	Interesting scale because of the different areas it covers but difficult to assess without seeing the items used. Understanding these attitudes may not be a priority for the final instrument, however.
Category: Pro Social Moral Reasoning							

Instrument	Authors, Date, Journal	Purpose	Reliability	Sample	Strengths	Limitations	Notes/Recommendations
Bystander Attitudes & Behaviors Scale	McMahon, Postmus & Koenick, 2008, under review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on work of Banyard To explore individuals' intentions to intervene in a range of behaviors related to sexual violence as well as their actual behavior 16 items on each scale Attitudes is 1-5 Behaviors is Yes, No, Wasn't in Situation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .86 for attitudes .69 for behaviors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 951 undergraduates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measures range of bystander actions on continuum of violence One of only scales available to measure bystander 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Still being developed Further work needed 	A few items may be useful from this scale but not the whole scale, given the limited length of the survey
Prosocial Reasoning Objective Measure (PROM)	Carlo, Eisenberg, & Knight, 1992, J of Research on Adolescence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To assess adolescents' moral reasoning Paper and pencil test Seeks to assess preference rather than spontaneous production of moral justifications Based on Eisenberg's prosocial moral reasoning interview Contains 5 stories designed to invoke a conflict between actor's needs, wants, desires, and those of another 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> $\alpha=.56-.78$ evidence that the PROM is a reliable measure of prosocial moral reasoning for use with adolescents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 64 adolescents 15 m & 13 f 7th graders 11 m & 25 f 10th graders White, middle class 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not require much verbal abilities Positive relations between prosocial moral reasoning and sympathy can be considered further evidence of the validity of the PROM Some evidence of the concurrent validity of the PROM Evidence of discriminant validity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further assessment of the PROM's psychometric properties is needed, particularly if it is to be used with other populations Response bias on 5-point rating scales Present study's design limits inferences about developmental change in moral reasoning preferences 	<p>As noted by the authors, moral reasoning should theoretically change with age and development, making it crucial that any measure used among different age groups be sensitive to these differences.</p> <p>This measure appears effective, but may be difficult to implement given the design of vignettes and reliability/validity only tested on adolescents.</p>

Instrument	Authors, Date, Journal	Purpose	Reliability	Sample	Strengths	Limitations	Notes/Recommendations
	Carlo, Eisenberg, Koller, Da Silva & Frohlich, 1996, Developmental Psychology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See above 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not reported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5th through 10th graders Male and female White, middle class community in Southern Brazil (Compared with study of U.S. adolescents) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See reliability Translated into Portuguese and back into English Effective among non U.S. group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not tested on a adults Reliability not reported, only noted in discussion as 'appearing' to be reliable and valid among Brazilian 5th to 10th graders 	This measure still lacks proven reliability and validity among multiple populations.
	Eisenberg et al, 2002, J of Personality and Social Psychology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Longitudinal study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not reported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 16 male and 16 female from preschool until age 20 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Longitudinal design Moral reasoning measure is consistent over time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Small sample size, all white and only 2 Hispanics Reliability of PROM not specifically reported 	This study suggests that the PROM holds up over longitudinal studies, however the sample size and population are major limitations for the validity and reliability of these statements.
Prosocial Tendency Measure (PTM)	Carlo & Randall, 2002, J of Youth and Adolescence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designed to measure the various dimensions of prosocial behaviors in late adolescence 4 types of prosocial behaviors were identified: altruistic, compliant, emotional and public 23 items, 6 subscales 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public (4 items) .78 Anonymous (5 items) .85 Dire (3 items) .63 Emotional (4 items) .75 Compliant (2 items) .80 Altruism (5 items) .74 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> College students, male and female 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Test-retest reliability ranges from .61 to .80 (p<.001) Good validity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong reliability and validity only applies to late adolescents 	The various dimensions found in this measure could be useful in understanding the different circumstances that influence people's intervention. The scale could potentially be shortened to include only one or a few of the subscales if desired.

Instrument	Authors, Date, Journal	Purpose	Reliability	Sample	Strengths	Limitations	Notes/Recommendations
	Carlo, Hausmann, Christansen, & Randall, 2003, J of Early Adolescence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current study was modified to include 25 items that assess six types of prosocial behaviors • Modified from original form by using focus groups with adolescents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Middle adolescents: .75 to .86 • Early adolescents: .59 to .86 • Test retest for middle: .56 to .82 • Test retest for early: .54 to .76 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adolescents (mean age 15.8) • White/non Hispanic, African American, and other groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tested on different racial groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not tested on adults • Validity and reliability only briefly mentioned as being 'partially supported' 	See above comments.
Category: Media Literacy							
Media Influence	Brosius & Engel, 1996, International J of Public Opinion Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures self reported influence of media • Varying questions based on closeness/remoteness (i.e., does it affect the individual, his/her friends, other people) • Scale 1-7 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not reported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quota sampling to include all social strata 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can be adapted for different purposes based on its construction and testing in this study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many variations of the survey because it looks at influence on the individual as well as others 	Could be adapted for questions about the individual's perception of media as well as the media's influence on others. Language would need to be adapted to look specifically at sexual exploitation, pornography, or related topics.

Instrument	Authors, Date, Journal	Purpose	Reliability	Sample	Strengths	Limitations	Notes/Recommendations
Mass Media Influence Subscale	Green & Pritchard, 2003, Social Behavior and Personality Vartanian et al, 2001, Social Behavior and Personality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subscale of Socialization Factors Questionnaire by Vartanian et al, 2001 10 items 5 point scale Measures influence of various media outlets on the individual's perception of themselves Intended for body image 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .85 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Males and females Ages 19-68 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tested on adults 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intended for use in looking at body image 	Instrument is not included in the article and therefore makes it difficult to assess for appropriateness.
Media Influence Scale	Polce-Lynch et al, 2001, J of Youth and Adolescence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designed to examine how adolescents' thoughts and feelings about their physical appearance may be influenced by advertisements, movies, and television 4 point scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .87 in pilot .88 in study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grades 5, 8, 12 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good reliability Strengths are really specific to this topic area and population 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Originally intended for adolescents with a focus on body image 	Scale is definitely not appropriate as is, but could be used as a reference for how to create questions pertaining to media and the topic (e.g. sexual assault, pornography).

***Not included in table:

Prosocial Moral Reasoning : Carlo, Eisenberg, Troyer, Switzer & Speer, 1991 - Study used researcher observation to evaluate constructs and therefore is not useful for the project.

Adult Attachment: Interpersonal Jealousy Scale - Mathes, Adams & Davies, 1985 J of Personality and Social Psych. Not reviewed because of its focus on individual jealousy traits and inappropriateness for the NJCASA project.

Hypermasculinity: Sexual Harassment Attitude Scale - Mazer & Percival, 1989. Not reviewed because of its specificity to sexual harassment only.

Macho Scale – Villemez & Touhey, 1977, referenced in Mazer & Percival, 1989. Unable to obtain copy of original scale, therefore not reviewed.

Appendix B

NJCASA Survey for Pilot

Script said by interviewer:

I am a researcher who would like to learn more about your perspectives and opinions on gender roles and gender norms. If you agree that I can ask you about your perspectives related to these issues, I would ask you to participate in a phone survey, which will take less than 30 minutes of your time. The study procedures include answering questions over the phone, which include some demographic questions and some of your views and perspectives on gender norms. If there are any questions that you don't want to answer, then you can just ask me to go on to the next question.

The benefit of participation in this study is that the information gained will be used by the State, in order to gain a better understanding of gender norms and beliefs among citizens of New Jersey, and will also ultimately improve the services offered by the New Jersey Coalition against Sexual Assault (NJCASA). Participation in the study may bring up uncomfortable emotions if you or someone close to you has experienced any form of sexual violence. If participation in this survey brings up any issues for you, please contact the State Sexual Assault Hotline, which is 1-800-601-7200.

Participation in this study is voluntary. You may choose not to participate, and you may withdraw at any time during the study procedures without any penalty to you. Further, you may choose not to answer any particular questions with which you are not comfortable.

This research is confidential. Confidential means that the research records will include some information about you, such as your gender, age, and race. You will not be asked for your name, address, or other contact information. I will keep your information confidential by limiting individual's access to the research data and keeping it in a secure location. The research team, NJCASA, and the Institutional Review Board at Rutgers University are the only parties that will be allowed to see the data, except as may be required by law. If a report of this study is published, or the results are presented at a professional conference, only group results will be stated, unless you have agreed otherwise.

If you have any questions about the study procedures, you may contact Julie Koivunen, PhD at the Center on Violence against Women and Children at 732-932-7520, extension 171. If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may contact the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs of Rutgers University at 3 Rutgers Plaza, New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559, call 732.932.0150 ext. 2104, or email humansubjects@orsp.rutgers.edu.

This informed consent form was approved by the Rutgers University Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects on August 31, 2009; approval of this form expires on August 30, 2010.

NJCASA Survey for Pilot

Demographic Questions

1. Gender : _____M _____F

2. What is your age? _____

Prompt: Please do not read all of the categories, rather just ask for person's age and then indicate and mark below based on the category they fall in.

- ___ 18-24
- ___ 25-34
- ___ 35-44
- ___ 45-54
- ___ 55-64
- ___ 65-84
- ___ 85 and older

3. What racial or ethnic group do you consider yourself to be a member of?

- ___ Non-Hispanic White
- ___ Non-Hispanic African-American or Black
- ___ Latina or Hispanic
- ___ Pacific Islander ___ Asian
- ___ Other: _____

Prompt: ___ South Asian ___ East Asian

4. What is the highest grade or year of school that you have completed?

<u>Grade School</u>	<u>High School</u>	<u>College/Technical School</u>	<u>Graduate School</u>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	9 10 11 12	13 14 15 16	17 18 19 20+

5. Please provide your current zip code:

___ ___ ___ ___ ___

Please answer the following questions, and indicate whether you strongly disagree, disagree, are neutral, agree or strongly agree. Please provide an answer for each question or statement.

6. Advertising influences how people treat women.

--	--	--	--

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

7. Music often portrays women as sex objects.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

8. I am bothered by violence against women shown on TV and in movies.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

9. Other people over-react to violence against women shown on TV and in movies.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

10. I prefer a male boss to a female. (Classical Sexism Scale)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

11. It is more important for the man in the family to have a job than it is for a woman.

Original wording: A man's work is more important than a woman's. (Classical Sexism Scale)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

12. In the United States, women no longer have to worry about equality.

Original wording: Discrimination of women is no longer a problem in the United States. (Modern Sexism Scale)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

13. Advertisements on TV and in magazines often make women look like sexual objects.

Original wording: Humiliating treatment of women in advertisements is unusual. (Modern Sexism Scale)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

14. Society treats men and women in the same way. (Modern Sexism Scale)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

15. More still needs to be done to gain equality for men and women at work.

Original wording: Better measures should be taken to achieve equality (between the sexes) in workplaces. (Modern Sexism Scale)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

16. A man should fight when the woman he's with is insulted by another man.(original wording) (Sex Role Stereotyping Scale by Burt)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

17. It is okay for the woman to pay for a date. (Sex Role Stereotyping Scale by Burt)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

18. There is something wrong with a woman who doesn't want to marry and raise a family.

(Sex Role Stereotyping Scale by Burt)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

19. A woman should never disagree with her husband in public when other people can hear.

Original Wording: A wife should never contradict her husband in public. (Sex Role Stereotyping Scale by Burt)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

20. It is acceptable for a woman to have a career, but marriage and family should come first.

(Sex Role Stereotyping Scale by Burt)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

21. I have no respect for women who have casual sex.

Original wording: I would have no respect for a woman who engages in sexual relationships without any emotional involvement (Sexual Conservatism Scale by Burt)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

22. It is more acceptable for men to be sexually aggressive than for women.

Original wording: Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess. (Ambivalent Sexism Inventory)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

23. Women should be protected by men.

Original wording: Women should be cherished and protected by men. (Ambivalent Sexism Inventory)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

24. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own happiness in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.

Original wording: Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives. (Ambivalent Sexism Inventory)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

We would like to remind you that your participation in this survey is voluntary and you can answer or not answer a specific question or withdraw at any time. The next few questions focus on the topic of rape and rape myths.

25. False accusations of rape are often used as a way of getting back at men.

Original wording: Rape accusations are often used as a way of getting back at men. (IRMA)

--	--	--	--	--

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

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

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

27. Rape happens when a man's sex drive gets out of control. (IRMA)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

For each statement below, answer how likely you are to engage in this behavior.

28. Express concern if a family member makes a sexist, degrading or disrespectful joke.

Original wording: Express concern if a family member makes a sexist joke. (Bystander Scale)

Not Likely	Somewhat Unlikely	Neutral	Somewhat Likely	Extremely Likely
------------	-------------------	---------	-----------------	------------------

29. Challenge a friend who uses sexist language to talk about or describe girls or women.

Original wording: Challenge a friend who uses "ho", "bitch" or "slut" to describe girls. (Bystander Scale).

Not Likely	Somewhat Unlikely	Neutral	Somewhat Likely	Extremely Likely
------------	-------------------	---------	-----------------	------------------

30. Refuse to listen to music that uses sexist language to describe women or girls (Bystander Scale).

Not Likely	Somewhat Unlikely	Neutral	Somewhat Likely	Extremely Likely
------------	-------------------	---------	-----------------	------------------

31. Talk to boys or men in my family about treating girls and women with respect (Bystander Scale).

Not Likely	Somewhat Unlikely	Neutral	Somewhat Likely	Extremely Likely
------------	-------------------	---------	-----------------	------------------

32. Confront a friend who looks like he is trying to take advantage of a girl or woman. (Bystander Scale).

Not Likely	Somewhat Unlikely	Neutral	Somewhat Likely	Extremely Likely
------------	-------------------	---------	-----------------	------------------

33. Confront a friend if I heard that he took advantage of a woman.

Original wording: Confront a friend if I hear rumors that s/he forced sex on someone. (Bystander Scale).

Not Likely	Somewhat Unlikely	Neutral	Somewhat Likely	Extremely Likely
------------	-------------------	---------	-----------------	------------------

Note: The final two questions are about your own behaviors with your partner

34. Ask my partner if he or she wants to get intimate, even if we are in a long term relationship.

Original wording: Ask for verbal consent when I am intimate with my partner, even if we are in a long term relationship. (Bystander Scale).

Not Likely	Somewhat Unlikely	Neutral	Somewhat Likely	Extremely Likely
------------	-------------------	---------	-----------------	------------------

35. If my partner asks me to stop, even if we've already started having sex, I will stop.

Original wording: Stop having sex with a partner if s/he says to stop, even if it started consensually. (Bystander Scale)

Not Likely	Somewhat Unlikely	Neutral	Somewhat Likely	Extremely Likely
------------	-------------------	---------	-----------------	------------------

Feedback from Respondent:

Upon completing the phone pilot, the Interviewer will state the following:

Thank you for your participation in the piloting of the Survey. We appreciate your help and your time. We are interested in your thoughts and observations about the survey, its overall design, the specific questions, etc.

Please feel free to provide feedback in both a general sense, as well as comments on specifics.

1. What are your overall thoughts about the Survey?

2. Please share any comments or feedback you have.
3. What, in particular, did you like about the Survey?
4. What, in particular, did you not like about the Survey?
5. Were there any questions that were confusing to you? If yes, which ones/why?
6. Were there any words we used that you were unsure of the meaning, or think other people might be unsure? If yes, which ones?
7. How was the length of the Survey, was it too long/too short?
8. Is there anything we can do to improve the Survey?

Appendix C: Final Survey

Demographic Questions

1. Gender : _____M _____F

2. What is your age? _____

Prompt: Please do not read all of the categories, rather just ask for person's age and then indicate and mark below based on the category they fall in.

- ___ 18-24
- ___ 25-34
- ___ 35-44
- ___ 45-54
- ___ 55-64
- ___ 65-84
- ___ 85 and older

3. What racial or ethnic group do you consider yourself to be a member of?

- ___ Non-Hispanic White
- ___ Non-Hispanic African-American or Black
- ___ Latina or Hispanic
- ___ Pacific Islander
- ___ Asian *Prompt:* ___ South Asian ___ East Asian
- ___ Other: _____

4. What is the highest grade or year of school that you have completed?

<u>Grade School</u>								<u>High School</u>				<u>College/Technical School</u>				<u>Graduate School</u>			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20+

5. Please provide your current zip code:

___ - ___ - ___

Please answer the following questions, and indicate whether you strongly disagree, disagree, are neutral, agree or strongly agree. Please provide an answer for each question or statement.

6. Advertising influences how people treat women.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

7. Popular music often portrays women as sex objects.

Wording for the pilot: Music often portrays women as sex objects.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

8. I am bothered by violence against women shown on TV and in movies.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

9. Some people over-react to violence against women shown on TV and in movies.

Wording for the pilot: Other people over-react to violence against women shown on TV and in movies. (respondents wondered who "other" meant.....)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

10. I prefer a male boss to a female. (Classical Sexism Scale)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

11. I think it is more important for the man in the family to have a job than it is for a woman.

Original wording: A man's work is more important than a woman's. (Classical Sexism Scale)

Wording for the pilot: It is more important for the man in the family to have a job than it is for a woman.

--	--	--	--	--

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

12. In the United States, women no longer have to worry about equality.

Original wording: Discrimination of women is no longer a problem in the United States. (Modern Sexism Scale)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

13. Advertisements on TV and in magazines often make women look like sexual objects.

Original wording: Humiliating treatment of women in advertisements is unusual. (Modern Sexism Scale)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

A reminder to please answer the following questions, and indicate whether you strongly disagree, disagree, are neutral, agree or strongly agree. Please provide an answer for each question or statement.

14. Society treats men and women in the same way. (Modern Sexism Scale)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

15. More progress needs to be made in order for men and women to gain equality at work.

Original wording: Better measures should be taken to achieve equality (between the sexes) in workplaces. (Modern Sexism Scale)

Wording for the pilot: More still needs to be done to gain equality for men and women at work. (respondents thought “more what _____ needs to be done”)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

16. If a woman is insulted by another man, her boyfriend or partner should fight on her behalf.

Original wording: A man should fight when the woman he's with is insulted by another man. (Sex Role Stereotyping Scale by Burt)

Wording for the pilot: A man should fight when the woman he's with is insulted by another man.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

17. It is okay for the woman to pay for a date. (Sex Role Stereotyping Scale by Burt)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

18. There is something wrong with a woman who doesn't want to marry and raise a family.

(Sex Role Stereotyping Scale by Burt)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

19. A woman should never disagree with her husband in public when other people can hear.

Original Wording: A wife should never contradict her husband in public. (Sex Role Stereotyping Scale by Burt)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

20. It is acceptable for a woman to have a career, but marriage and family should come first.

(Sex Role Stereotyping Scale by Burt)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

21. I have no respect for women who have casual sex.

Original wording: I would have no respect for a woman who engages in sexual relationships without any emotional involvement (Sexual Conservatism Scale by Burt)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

22. I think that it is more acceptable for men to be sexually aggressive than for women.

Original wording: Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess. (Ambivalent Sexism Inventory)

Wording for pilot: It is more acceptable for men to be sexually aggressive than for women.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

23. Women should be protected by men.

Original wording: Women should be cherished and protected by men. (Ambivalent Sexism Inventory)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

24. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own happiness in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.

Original wording: Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives. (Ambivalent Sexism Inventory)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

We would like to remind you that your participation in this survey is voluntary and you can answer or not answer a specific question or withdraw at any time. The next few questions focus on the topic of rape.

25. I believe that false accusations of rape are often used as a way of getting back at men.

Original wording: Rape accusations are often used as a way of getting back at men. (IRMA)

Wording for pilot: False accusations of rape are often used as a way of getting back at men.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

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

--	--	--	--	--

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

27. Rape happens when a man's sex drive gets out of control. (IRMA)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

For each statement below, answer how likely you are to engage in this behavior.

28. How likely are you to express concern if a family member makes a sexist, degrading or disrespectful joke.

Original wording: Express concern if a family member makes a sexist joke. (Bystander Scale)

Not Likely	Somewhat Unlikely	Neutral	Somewhat Likely	Extremely Likely
------------	-------------------	---------	-----------------	------------------

29. How likely are you to challenge a friend who uses sexist language to talk about or describe girls or women.

Original wording: Challenge a friend who uses "ho", "bitch" or "slut" to describe girls. (Bystander Scale).

Not Likely	Somewhat Unlikely	Neutral	Somewhat Likely	Extremely Likely
------------	-------------------	---------	-----------------	------------------

30. How likely are you to refuse to listen to music that uses sexist language to describe women or girls (Bystander Scale).

Not Likely	Somewhat Unlikely	Neutral	Somewhat Likely	Extremely Likely
------------	-------------------	---------	-----------------	------------------

31. Talk to boys or men in my family about treating girls and women with respect (Bystander Scale).

Not Likely	Somewhat Unlikely	Neutral	Somewhat Likely	Extremely Likely
------------	-------------------	---------	-----------------	------------------

32. Confront a friend who looks like he is trying to take advantage of a girl or woman. (Bystander Scale).

Not Likely	Somewhat Unlikely	Neutral	Somewhat Likely	Extremely Likely
------------	-------------------	---------	-----------------	------------------

33. Confront a friend if I heard that he took advantage of a woman.

Original wording: Confront a friend if I hear rumors that s/he forced sex on someone. (Bystander Scale).

Not Likely	Somewhat Unlikely	Neutral	Somewhat Likely	Extremely Likely
------------	-------------------	---------	-----------------	------------------