

## ABSTRACT

ADAIR, JEANNIE ELIZABETH. Moving from Secondary to Primary Prevention of Sexual Violence: Attitudes, Perceptions, and Experiences of Rape Crisis Prevention Coordinators. (Under the direction of Dr. Sylvia Nassar-McMillan.)

This exploratory qualitative multiple-case study examined attitudes, perceptions and experiences of rape crisis prevention coordinators in the first year of transition to a new way of addressing primary prevention of sexual violence. The main goal of this research study was to discover ways to improve the shift from secondary to primary prevention efforts by exploring and analyzing the lived experiences of prevention coordinators working in rape crisis centers in North Carolina, one of four states fully funded by the CDC to begin moving from secondary to primary prevention. Seven prevention coordinators ranging in age from 23-66 were interviewed with a semi-structured interview.

This research utilized a multiple case study design (Yin, 1984) to explore the factors that support or hinder the shift in focus from secondary to primary prevention of sexual violence. Due to the lack of research on this topic and population, this exploratory phenomenological approach was selected to gain insight into how prevention coordinators perceive their experience. This means that one should keep in mind that whatever information emerged from the data is what was discovered in this study. There were no preconceived notions about what type of data or answers to research questions would come about from the research investigation (Yin, 1984). Instead, what was discovered was that which the participants allowed us to discover.

The themes that emerged from the qualitative data include need for knowledge of impacts of sexual violence, no feminist theory background, shift to primary prevention, discounted old way of doing prevention in rape crisis centers, networking with other prevention coordinators, men as allies, and lack of logical order. Implications of these and other emergent themes, as well as, conclusions and future research directions, were presented.

Moving from Secondary to Primary Prevention of Sexual Violence: Attitudes,  
Perceptions, and Experiences of Rape Crisis Prevention Coordinators

by  
Jeannie Elizabeth Adair

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of  
North Carolina State University  
In partial fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
Counselor Education

Raleigh, North Carolina

September 30, 2008

APPROVED BY:

---

Chair of Advisory Committee  
Dr. Sylvia C. Nassar-McMillan

---

Dr. Stanley B. Baker

---

Dr. Edwin R. Gerler

---

Dr. Pamela P. Martin

## DEDICATION

To the survivors of sexual violence, those who love and support them and the ones who do battle on their behalf, this is for you.

## BIOGRAPHY

Jeannie Adair was born in North Carolina. She and her family are all natives of Coastal North Carolina. Jeannie attended the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill for her Bachelor of Arts in Psychology. While in undergraduate school, she volunteered with the Orange County Rape Crisis Program. After graduation, she moved back to the coast and began work with the Carteret County Rape Crisis Program. While working with the rape crisis program, she was inspired to continue her educational efforts and earned her Master's of Science in Counselor Education from East Carolina University. After receiving her Master's degree, she continued to work with the Carteret County Rape Crisis Program while being supervised for her North Carolina License of Professional Counseling.

After working for another year as the staff counselor at rape crisis, she decided to pursue her doctoral degree in Counselor Education at North Carolina State University, Raleigh, in 2004. While at North Carolina State University, Jeannie worked with the North Carolina Coalition Against Sexual Assault (NCCASA) as the director of training and education. Her work at NCCASA provided her experience at the state level in her work against sexual violence. She traveled across North Carolina, as well as surrounding states, to provide training on various topics related to sexual violence. During Jeannie's last year at North Carolina State University, she moved back to the coast and resumed the role of staff counselor at the Carteret County Rape Crisis Program.

Jeannie's professional development and experiences also consisted of teaching graduate courses, presenting at state and national conferences and publishing in peer reviewed journal. Her passion and research focus on sexual violence issues and prevention have carried with her throughout her program and she has creatively woven them into classroom discussion, conferences and presentations. She is a member of the American Counseling Association, North Carolina Counseling Association and the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I first thank my parents who have consistently given me love and support. My mom Peggy, thank you for being you, the kind, giving and supportive mother who knew when to listen, when to ask questions, when to guide me, when to allow me to make my own mistakes, and who taught me to be independent. Most importantly, thank you for loving me unconditionally. You are a wonderful inspiration and I thank you for helping me become my childhood dream - Wonder Woman! My dad, Julius, thank you for being the first to teach me that being female did not mean treating me different or being easier on me, and that life can be tough but so can I. Thank you for the many hours you spent with me with school work, sports and especially our time out on the water. We have had and continue to have some of our best conversations on the boat. Thank you both for giving me life and for continuing to support me in any way I need and for loving me unconditionally.

I also want to thank my step-father Johnny for your calm spirit, guidance, support and love. I have truly treasured our talks and time together and look forward to life slowing down a bit more so we can enjoy more of those. Remember: It's all good. My sister Janet, thank you for giving me someone to look up to, for supporting me and for being the first -born and smoothing the way for me. My brother-in-law Mark, I will simply say thank you and Happy Birthday. Janet and Mark, thanks for giving me the greatest gifts in the world, my two nieces, Adair and Jameson. Adair, you are a constant source of love. You have filled my heart and given me the mental breaks I have needed

when I get too caught up in the serious world. You have helped me see the world through a child's eyes and allowed me time to slow down and enjoy the simple things in life. You have also been a constant source of comic relief. Jameson, your smile captured my heart the first time I saw you. You have a gentleness about you and your smile and laughter can lighten the greatest load. Both of you are special to me and I cannot wait to continue to watch you grow.

My Aunt Pam, thank you for always being there, for loving me and for being my other mother. We have a special bond that not many understand. My Aunt Eva, thank you for always being there, supporting me and loving me. My Uncle Larry, thank you for always making me smile, for loving me and for challenging me. I also want to thank all of my cousins, aunts and uncles that have been a great support to me over the years. To those who are no longer here but are still watching over me in spirit, I give thanks.

I want to thank all of my professors, mentors, and friends at North Carolina State University. Dr. Nassar-McMillan, thank you for your support and guidance. You have been an inspiration and a wonderful mentor and role model. You have definitely helped shape my counseling, writing and professional experience. Dr Baker, thank you for your guidance and understanding, even when I needed to interrupt class due to being on national TV. Dr. Gerler, thank you for your patience and support. Dr. Martin, thank you for being a part of my committee and for all of your support and assistance with qualitative studies.

A special thank you to my mentor and friend Jane Harvey, you have no idea all the times you have saved me. I truly appreciate your support and your guidance. Thank



you for the countless conversations about work, school, and life. I look forward to life after school and continuing this wonderful friendship.

To the friends I met while at NC State, there is absolutely no way I could have survived without you all. I want to thank you all for your support, listening to my rambles about sexual violence and for, hopefully, sharing some of the passion that I have about ending sexual violence. Dr. Brett Zyromski, you are like a brother to me. We grew a lot during our time in class and more importantly outside of class. I look forward to continuing our friendship and working with you in the future. Dr. Millie Maxwell, thank you for your friendship and guidance. I hope now that we are finished with school that I can actually come over to your house during ‘school nights’ again. Dr. Arline Edwards-Joseph, thank you for your friendship and your determination, something we both share. Cassandra Dixon Acheampong, thank you for your calm spirit and for being so encouraging and positive. Dr. Song Lee and Dr. Heloisa Portela, thank you for your friendship and guidance through the program.

I would like to thank Melissa Garrett, my spirit sister and friend. I am so blessed to have you in my life. Your constant guidance, support, love and friendship have helped me more than you know. You have been a great teacher and coach and I truly appreciate all of the time that we have shared and look forward to having more time to spend on the beach. Kelly Thompson, my cosmic sister, thank you for your friendship, laughter, support and love. Thank you for sitting on top of the world looking down on creation with me. Michelle Gregson, thank you for your caring way, support, and friendship.

Susan Frederick, thank you for your friendship, support, and always finding a way to make me laugh and for allowing me to have play therapy with Daisy.

M.J., thank you for providing me added inspiration to finish my dissertation, as well as, all the smiles and laughs. Dr. Jack and Mary McCall, thank you for your love, support, humor and for adopting me. Dr. J.T. and Phyllis Garrett for your support and encouragement, I thank you. Linda Murrell, thank you for making me laugh and smile, your encouragement, and friendship. Wendy Maddox, thank you for keeping the spirit of what rape crisis is alive and for your support and friendship. Bryan Chadwick, Ms. Betty Skulstad, and Anne Blackwell, thank you for your guidance, support and friendship.

I also want to thank Doris Buffett and the Sunshine Lady Foundation for making an investment in me. I cannot thank you enough for all the support. To the North Carolina Coalition Against Sexual Assault and all rape crisis programs and professional colleagues, thank you for your constant support and encouragement. Keep up the good work.

Thank you to all the other people who have entered my life in some way or another and have allowed me to learn more about myself and others. If I have forgotten anyone, I do apologize; although your name does not appear here, you are appreciated and I thank you.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES .....	xii
<b>CHAPTER 1 – MOVING FROM SEXONDARY TO PRIMARY PREVENTION OF SEXUAL VIOLENCE: ATTITUDES, PERCEPTIONS, AND EXPERIENCES OF RAPE CRISIS PREVENTION COORDINATORS.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Problem Statement .....	3
Need for the Study .....	3
Rationale for Study .....	4
Purpose of the Study.....	7
Research Questions .....	9
Definition of Terms .....	11
Chapter Organization .....	14
<b>CHAPTER 2 – REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND THEORIES .....</b>	<b>15</b>
History of Sexual Violence.....	17
History of Rape Crisis Movement.....	20
Prevalence of Sexual Violence .....	22
Definition of Theory and Model.....	24
Related Theories .....	26
Radical Feminist Theory .....	26
Understanding Human Development.....	28
Theoretical Assumptions.....	29
Theories and Their Applicability to Populations.....	30
Measurability of Theory .....	31
Interpretation .....	32
Current Day Relevance .....	33
Related Empirical Research .....	34
Ecological Systems Theory .....	40
Understanding Human Development .....	42
Theoretical Assumptions.....	43
Measurability of Theory.....	44
Interpretation.....	45
Current Day Relevance to Sexual Violence Prevention Programs.....	46
Related Empirical Research.....	48
Synthesis of Theories and Research.....	60
Conclusion and Future Research.....	60
<b>CHAPTER 3 – METHOD .....</b>	<b>63</b>
Research Design .....	68
Participants .....	69
Researcher as the Interviewer .....	70
Auditor .....	71
Instrumentation .....	72
Archival Data and Analysis .....	72

Annual Report .....	72
Semi-Structured Interview .....	73
Procedure .....	73
Data Analysis .....	75
Theoretical Framework for Analysis .....	76
Coding and Themes .....	78
Validity .....	80
Reliability .....	82
Summary .....	82
CHAPTER 4 – RESULTS .....	84
Individual Profiles .....	86
Addison .....	86
Initial Interview .....	86
Participant Check .....	87
Delaney.....	88
Initial Interview .....	88
Participant Check .....	89
Ella .....	89
Initial Interview .....	89
Participant Check .....	91
Grace .....	91
Initial Interview .....	91
Participant Check .....	93
Jane .....	94
Initial Interview .....	94
Participant Check .....	95
Elizabeth .....	95
Initial Interview .....	95
Participant Check .....	97
Ann .....	97
Initial Interview .....	97
Participant Check .....	98
Common Themes from the Semi-Structured Interview .....	98
Need for Knowledge of Impacts of Sexual Violence .....	98
Shift to Primary Prevention .....	100
Discounted Old Ways of Conducting Prevention Programs .....	101
Networking With Other Prevention Coordinators .....	104
Men as Allies .....	105
Lack of Logical Order .....	106
Triangulation .....	108
Frustration .....	109

Lack of Organization .....	110
Networking with Prevention Coordinators .....	111
Need for Best Practices .....	111
Summary .....	112
CHAPTER 5 – DISCUSSION .....	113
Summary of Results .....	117
Limitations .....	121
Implications and Future Research .....	122
Concluding Remarks .....	125
REFERENCES .....	126
APPENDICES .....	134
Appendix A – Semi-Structured Interview Questionnaire .....	135
Appendix B – Informed Consent Form for Research .....	136
Appendix C – Case Study Protocol .....	138
Appendix D – Coding Book .....	146
Appendix E – Weighted Kappa .....	180
Appendix F – Rape Prevention Education Grid for Funded Programs 2007 .....	181

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Kappa Results .....	85
Table 2. Weighted Kappa .....	180
Table 3. Rape Prevention Education Grid for Funded Programs 2007.....	181

## CHAPTER 1

### MOVING FROM SECONDARY TO PRIMARY PREVENTION OF SEXUAL VIOLENCE: ATTITUDES OF RAPE CRISIS PREVENTION COORDINATORS

The World Health Organization (WHO, 2002) defines sexual violence as: “Any sexual act, attempt to obtain a sexual act, unwanted sexual comments or advances, or acts to traffic, or otherwise directed, against a person’s sexuality using coercion, by any person, regardless of their relationship to the victim, in any setting, including but not limited to home and work” (p. 149). Sexual violence can include rape, attempted rape, sexual harassment, sexual coercion, sexual contact with force, and threat of rape (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000; WHO, 2002). Impacts of sexual violence can include a variety of short and long term effects such as social withdrawal, feelings of shame and/or guilt, poor peer relationships, low self-esteem, negative self body image, and a sudden deterioration in academic performance (American Medical Association, 1985).

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (2004) state that primary prevention means an “approach that takes place before sexual violence has occurred to prevent initial perpetration or victimization” (p. 3) and that secondary prevention is the “immediate responses after sexual violence has occurred to deal with the short-term consequences of violence” ( p. 3). People who have been working on the front lines with victims of sexual violence have never been content to simply offer healing and support; they have been engaged in prevention work. This work has been characterized by

education programs that the CDC refers to as secondary prevention (personal communication, J. Harvey, 2007).

Rape crisis centers have been conducting education programs with the primary focus of the programs directed toward potential victims. The hope was to help potential victims recognize and lower risks and recognize a threat or the potential for harm – in other words, to learn what to avoid, how to respond and how to deter a rapist. These types of programs have not been focused on how to stop perpetration of sexual violence, but on how to protect oneself from sexual violence (personal communication, J. Harvey, 2007). Also, most of these prevention programs have not been formally evaluated for effectiveness (Crowell & Burgess, 1996). Therefore, there was a proposed shift to a new way of addressing sexual violence prevention programs and funding was made available for the purpose of primary prevention programs as defined by the CDC (2004).

This new focus on primary prevention differs from past education programs in that these current approaches will take place before sexual violence has occurred, with the focus on preventing initial perpetration or victimization (CDC, 2004). In 2006, 17 rape crisis programs in North Carolina were funded under this new initiative and are attempting to implement this new approach. This research project examines this shift from secondary to primary prevention efforts.

This research study explored the lived experiences, or the way in which someone experiences and understands the world as real and meaningful, of prevention coordinators employed in seven rape crisis programs in North Carolina. In these programs, funding has recently necessitated a major shift in focus for sexual violence prevention programs



from secondary to primary prevention. This research uncovered the lived experiences using a qualitative multiple-case study design looking at data from the prevention coordinators (PC) who work at rape centers across the state of North Carolina. This study was based on what their lived experiences were for the first year of participating in a pilot study developed by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) to shift focus from secondary to primary prevention.

### Problem Statement

National data shows that one out of every three females and one out of every seven males report having experienced unwanted sexual contact before the age of 18 (Wittmer, 1993). With such high prevalence of sexual coercion and violence, we need to learn ways in which we might begin to understand and develop more effective methods to prevent sexual violence from occurring. We need to hear from the front-line workers and the prevention coordinators in communities as to what is really going on, if anything, in this shift from secondary prevention to primary prevention. Finally, we need to find out how we can facilitate the engagement of more agencies and communities in primary prevention techniques and programs by discovering what has been effective in the current shift. This will help future educators make a smoother adjustment to primary prevention of sexual violence.

### Need for the Study

Most primary prevention programs that are being implemented across the nation have not been formally evaluated for effectiveness and thus are difficult to compare (Crowell & Burgess, 1996). Another issue of concern is that many prevention

coordinators have not been formally trained to make this shift in prevention techniques. The push for primary prevention in North Carolina is an exciting task, but it is a new process and thus needs to be examined for effectiveness of change. This study presents the voices and lived experiences of prevention coordinators in order to aid in future trainings and provide direction for those moving from secondary to primary prevention programs.

While efforts are being made to guide this new shift, it was essential to hear from the prevention coordinators about what is actually enabling them to gain an understanding of primary prevention theories and evidence-based practices. The need for this specific study was to examine perceived successes or barriers of this shift from secondary to primary prevention in the past year since North Carolina has adopted this new way of addressing sexual violence prevention, with the hope of understanding and developing ways of effectively prevent sexual violence.

#### Rationale for Study

The study of sexual violence prevention programs has recently gained momentum and attention in the United States. The CDC is now working with other groups to help develop ways of evaluating sexual violence prevention programs for effectiveness. North Carolina is one of six states participating in Enhancing and Making Programs and Outcomes Work to End Rape (EMPOWER). North Carolina is one of four states fully-funded to pilot this shift to primary prevention; two other states are partially-funded. Therefore, sexual violence prevention is finally being seen as a public health issue and as a topic of great importance in the nation, particularly in areas of school counseling,

human services, private counseling services, health departments, and the juvenile justice system.

In 1994, Congress passed the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), which established the Rape Prevention and Education (RPE) program with the Centers for Disease Control and Preventions (CDC, 2004). The North Carolina Rape Prevention and Education (RPE) Programs were housed in local rape crisis centers and were funded equally in North Carolina until 2006 when grantees competed for funds. Under this new project, the North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services sent out requests for applications for the RPE funds (North Carolina Rape Prevention & Education Program: Request for Applications, 2006).

To qualify to receive funding for this new initiative, programs needed to meet several grant criteria. Once programs were selected to receive RPE funds, there were several grant requirements that the programs had to meet. For the first time, a sufficient amount was available to budget a full time staff position of Prevention Coordinator (PC). Requirements of the RPE funding dictated no part of the PC's work could be dedicated to crisis intervention or victims' services. The PCs and their supervisors would also be required to attend 3 regional trainings during the first fiscal year (North Carolina Rape Prevention & Education Program: Request for Applications, 2006).

The funded programs agreed to utilize the public health and ecological models in creating primary prevention programs, as well as to incorporate principles of effective prevention programming (North Carolina Rape Prevention & Education Program: Request for Applications, 2006). The principles of effective prevention programming

were derived by Nation, Crusto, Wandersman, Kumpfer, Seybolt, Morrissey-Kane and Davino's (2003) nine principles of effective preventions. These principles include: comprehensive (strategies in multiple settings addressing a range of risk and protective factors); varied teaching methods (including interactive programs utilizing different activities); sufficient dosage (the need to expose the participants to the intervention/program enough times to produce desired effects and sustain the effects); theory driven, (programs must have a scientific justification or rationale); positive relationships,(the promotion of strong, positive relationships between adults and children); appropriately timed, (programs which are started early enough in a child's life to maximize impact); sociocultural relevance, (tailoring programs to the needs of the community as well as cultural norms, practices and beliefs); outcome evaluation, (the need for programs to have clear goals and objectives and systematically evaluate how well a program has met the goals and objectives); and well- trained staff, (staff who are sensitive, competent and are sufficiently trained and supported).

Funded programs were also required to address at least two levels of the four-level ecological model recommended by the CDC (CDC, 2004). The four-level ecological model consists of: individual, relationship, community and societal levels. The CDC (2004) believes that the ecological model aids a comprehensive public health approach that addresses "the norms, beliefs, and social and economic systems that create the conditions for the occurrence of sexual violence" (p. 5).

The World Health Organization (2002) supports the application of an ecological model to help best understand the multifaceted nature of violence. Bronfenbrenner's

(1979) theory is cited within that model. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) currently approaches sexual violence prevention using an ecological model derived from Bronfenbrenner's theory as well. According to the CDC, this model is a critical part of an overall framework for working with sexual violence because it includes both protective and risk factors from multiple domains (CDC, 2004). The CDC (2004) also acknowledges there are many theoretical models which attempt to describe root causes of sexual violence, including biological, psychological, and feminist perspectives

The CDC utilizes the ecological model to teach prevention coordinators ways in which to frame their shift to primary prevention. Thus, the researcher felt that Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory (1979) would provide one key theoretical framework to aid research question development and development of the case study protocol. At the same time, radical feminist theory (Saulnier, 1996) is used by the researcher and is the theory from which most rape crisis centers have evolved. Moreover, among its tenants is one that looks at the prevalence of violence against women, particularly in the forms of sexual and physical assaults. This theory holds that violence is political in nature and violence against women is about control and domination (Saulnier, 1996).

#### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research was to examine prevention coordinators' lived experiences as related to the shift from secondary to primary prevention with the ultimate goal of shaping effective prevention approaches for the future. In the past, rape crisis programs have provided advocacy and education programs from a secondary prevention

perspective. The CDC has started a new project in hopes to move toward a new focus on prevention, specifically, a movement toward the primary prevention of sexual violence. For decades, rape crisis centers, evolving out of a grassroots movement, relied on the expertise of front-line workers who gained knowledge from survivors of sexual violence. Most current professionals in the field still gain experience from first-hand work “in the trenches” instead of learning theory or receiving formal training in sexual violence issues or prevention. This research examined the factors that have influenced the prevention coordinators both positively and negatively, whether they have gained knowledge of the theories and models the CDC is utilizing, and what the adjustment experience has been for each individual. This was an exploratory study which focused on the first year of the shift from secondary to primary prevention from the prevention coordinators’ points of view in order to give insight into making the shift easier and more effective in the future.

This qualitative multiple-case study was conducted from a phenomenological perspective which allowed the voices of the providers to emerge and reduce the personal bias of the researcher. The use of phenomenological research means that there were no research hypotheses formulated ahead of time; the goal was to hear the voices and lived experiences of the participants and their perspectives related to the shift to primary prevention. One goal of phenomenological research is to discover themes that emerge from the participants to help understand the phenomena being investigated. The use of qualitative case studies was essential for this research in order to understand the lived experiences of the prevention coordinators within this new shift from secondary to primary prevention of sexual violence. Due to the numbers of people being sexually

victimized and the long term effect sexual violence has on its victims, there was and is a great need for effective prevention programs (Yeater & O'Donohue, 1999). For the first time, the voices of the prevention coordinators, specifically those who are implementing the new process, were heard in regards to their views on the shift, how they view the shift personally both within their agency and community, and how they think society has viewed the topic of sexual violence and this recent shift in focus.

In the past, most programs that were being implemented have not been formally evaluated for effectiveness (Crowell & Burgess, 1996) and many prevention coordinators have not been formally trained to conduct prevention programs. The intent of this researcher was to provide input from those who are implementing this new systems change and to see what types of skills these prevention coordinators possess to weather the transition from secondary to primary prevention of sexual violence.

There are many stakeholders related to this project, including members of the state and federal government who are its funders. This type of data will raise awareness of what is working and what is not working within the current approaches and methods of shifting programs from secondary to primary prevention. This study sought to assist the community in becoming more aware of ways to help make the shift in attitudes and practices for programs and individuals involved in primary prevention efforts.

### Research Questions

This study was a phenomenological qualitative multiple case study; thus, research questions are used as guides to direct the research. The goal of phenomenological research is to uncover the lived experiences and voices of the participants and their

perspectives. The purpose of this study was to uncover the voices of prevention coordinators working at rape crisis programs and reveal their attitudes and perspectives related to the shift in focus from secondary to primary prevention of sexual violence. The research agenda will be framed by the research questions. The following research questions were examined:

- 1) What themes emerged related to the participants' attitudes about the shift from secondary to primary prevention of sexual violence?
- 2) What themes emerged regarding the participants' perceived support or barriers to the process of shifting to primary prevention, from supervisors, agency, grantors, and community?
- 3) What themes were consistent across cases?
- 4) What are the reported best- practices of the shift in focus from secondary to primary prevention of sexual violence of each participant reported to the researcher?
- 5) How do the prevention coordinators perceive the training and technical assistance that they have received to aid in the transition to primary prevention?
- 6) What advice would the prevention coordinators offer to make this shift easier in the future and what skills would they recommend are needed to be successful?

Learning the answers to these questions will lead to further research on sexual violence primary prevention efforts.



## Definition of Terms

Following is a list of terms that are essential to understand in the development of this research project and paper. They are defined here by the investigator or as noted in the citations.

1. Sexual Violence “Any sexual act, attempt to obtain a sexual act, unwanted sexual comments or advances, or acts to traffic, or otherwise directed, against a person’s sexuality using coercion, by any person, regardless of their relationship to the victim, in any setting, including but not limited to home and work” (WHO, 2002, p. 149).
2. Primary Prevention: “Approaches that take place before sexual violence has occurred to prevent initial perpetration or victimization” (CDC, 2004, p. 3).
3. Secondary Prevention: “Immediate responses after sexual violence has occurred to deal with the short-term consequences of violence” (CDC, 2004, p. 3).
4. Phenomenology: “...the study of the shared meaning of experience of a phenomenon for several individuals”, creates ‘a central meaning’ or ‘essence’ of the experiences” (McCaslin & Scott, 2003, p. 449).
5. Lived experiences: “Lived meaning refers to the way that a person experiences and understands his or her world as real and meaningful. Lived meanings describe those aspects of a situation as experienced by the person in it. For example, a teacher wants to understand how a child meaningfully experiences or lives a certain situation even though the child is not explicitly aware of these lived meanings” (Phenomenology Online, n.d.).

6. Interpretive/constructivist framework: Stems from phenomenology and other interpretive philosophies called hermeneutics, in which knowledge is socially constructed by all involved in the research process, and research is a product of the values of the researcher (personal communication, Dr. P. Martin, 2007).
7. Hermeneutics: Beyond a general descriptive look at core concepts and essences in data, to discover meanings within everyday life practices. Focus could be considered to be on what humans actually experience rather than what they are aware of consciously (Lopez & Willis, 2004).
8. Epistemology: Concerned with the nature of knowledge and the relationship between the knower and the would-be knower (Racher & Robinson, 2003).
9. Codes: Tags or labels given to units of meaning to descriptive or inferential information gathered in qualitative research, attached to chunks of words, phrases, whole sentences or paragraphs (Basit, 2003).
10. Emic Codes: Codes that emerge from the data as a result of the reviewing of the data for inherent concepts and patterns (Miles & Huberman, 1994).
11. Descriptive Codes: Ideas that lean toward the concrete, such as actions, definitions, events, and settings within the data that are given tags (Basit, 2003; Miles & Huberman, 1994).
12. Themes: Themes are derived from the many codes found in the raw data, and are more definitive categories of the overall information of the research.

13. Validity: This occurs in qualitative research and refers to the procedures the researcher uses to give the study credibility, not to the actual data itself but instead to the inferences drawn from the data (Creswell & Miller, 2000).

Qualitative research is concerned with the quality of the research, which can be assessed by its impact. Validity is attached to the design of the study (Heppner, Kivlighan, and Wampold, 1999).

14. Reliability: In qualitative research, reliability is determined by specific procedures that are used to help establish how reliable the inferences made from the analysis of the raw data actually are.

15. Triangulation: Triangulation is a strategy to improve validity in research, in order to aid in the elimination of bias and allow truthful propositions to be made about the phenomenon which is being studied (Mathison, 1988). It prescribes the use of multiple measures and/or data sources (Huberman & Miles, 1994).

16. Researcher Reflexivity: Validity procedure in qualitative research which requires that researcher's self- disclose personal biases, beliefs and assumptions (Creswell & Miller, 2000).

17. Thick, Rich Description: Validity procedure in qualitative research; describes the setting, participants, and themes in rich detail and allows researcher to be transported into the particular setting or situation being researched (Creswell & Miller, 2000).

## Organization of Chapters

This dissertation has five chapters. Chapter One is an introduction to the topic, rationale for conducting the study, problem statement, purpose statement, research questions, discussion of the need for the study, and definition of terms that will be used throughout the dissertation. Chapter Two is a literature review and critique of that literature and includes a background section on sexual violence as well as a review and critique of two chosen theories. The theories discussed are ecological systems theory, (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) and radical feminist theory (Saulnier, 1996).

Chapter Three includes qualitative case study procedures utilized in the proposed study. The process of data analysis, which includes code and theme development, as well as validity issues are also addressed in Chapter Three. In Chapter Four the results of the study are presented, including the emergent themes and supporting data. Chapter Five discusses the results of the study and gives a summary of all that was discovered from the data. An evaluation of the study and the investigator's interpretation is also given in relation to the original research questions. Limitations of the study and implications for future research on sexual violence prevention and prevention practices, specifically shifting from secondary to primary prevention, are also discussed.

## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND THEORIES

Due to the numbers of people being sexually victimized and the long term effects of sexual violence on its victims, there is a great need for effective prevention programs (Yeater & O'Donohue, 1999). While there is some research on sexual violence prevention programs, most have not been formally evaluated for effectiveness (Crowell & Burgess, 1996). The World Health Organization (WHO, 2002) defines sexual violence as “any sexual act, attempt to obtain a sexual act, unwanted sexual comments or advances, or acts to traffic, or otherwise directed, against a person’s sexuality using coercion, by any person, regardless of their relationship to the victim, in any setting, including but not limited to home and work” (p. 149). Sexual violence can include rape, attempted rape, sexual harassment, sexual coercion, sexual contact with force, and threat of rape (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000; WHO, 2002).

Sexual violence can have a variety of short and long term effects on victims. The American Medical Association (AMA) (1985) states that some effects are: social withdrawal, feelings of shame and/or guilt, low self-esteem, damaged self-image, poor peer relationships, and a sudden deterioration in academic performance. In studies of children and adolescents who had been sexually abused, about two of every three displayed at least one of a wide variety of problems following the sexual abuse (Kendall, Williams & Finkelhor, 1993). Those who have been sexually abused are more likely to show fear, have nightmares, suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), be

delinquent, engage in sexually inappropriate behavior, run away from home, self-harm, experience depression, be withdrawn, be angry, show signs of aggression, evidence poor peer relationships, experience poor self-esteem, experience deterioration of body image, and exhibit a sudden deterioration in academic performance (Kendal et al., 1993). A 1996 study of older children and teenagers, from age nine to eighteen, found that compared with non-abused youth, those who had been sexually abused were more likely to have emotional distress, physical symptoms, problems with thinking and attention, aggression, and social problems (Silverman, Reinherz & Giaconia, 1996).

In this research project, the purpose of which is to examine sexual violence prevention coordinators' opinions, attitudes, skills, and behaviors as related to primary prevention programs, Radical feminist theory (Saulnier, 1996) and Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory (1979) are examined because they are the most useful theories to help build or construct an approach to primary prevention programs. The literature search included several databases in order to find studies related to sexual violence, sexual violence prevention, and programs that evaluated the effectiveness of prevention programs. The databases used included ERIC, PsyINFO, Info Trac/ NC LIVE, Academic Search Elite, and Expanded Academic ASAP. The search words used included: sexual assault, sexual abuse, sexual violence, incest, sexual assault and prevention, ecological theory, radical feminist theory, and rape crisis movement. The literature from the above databases was examined and included in the present review.

The World Health Organization (2002) applies an ecological model which is intended to help explain the multifaceted nature of violence. Bronfenbrenner's theory

(1979) is cited within that model. Likewise, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) is currently approaching sexual violence prevention using an ecological model derived from Bronfenbrenner's theory. According to the CDC, this model is a critical part of an overall framework for working with sexual violence because it includes both protective and risk factors from multiple domains (CDC, 2004). The CDC (2004) also acknowledges there are many theoretical models which attempt to describe root causes of sexual violence, including biological, psychological and feminist perspectives.

The study of sexual violence prevention programs has only recently become a priority in the United States. The CDC is now working with other groups to help develop ways of evaluating sexual violence prevention programs for effectiveness. North Carolina is one of six states participating in efforts to develop or enhance programs and measure outcomes. (EMPOWER). Therefore, sexual violence prevention is finally being seen as a public health issue and is a topic of great importance in the nation as well as in the fields of school counseling, human services, private counseling services, health departments and the juvenile justice system.

### History of Sexual Violence

Some attempts have been made to gain an understanding of how deeply rooted sexual violence is in cultures worldwide. What follows is a brief overview of some of the major historical events but is by no means a full history of sexual violence or rape.

Sexual violence is a behavior that has existed throughout human history and occurs in all

parts of the world. It is a behavior that is not specific to gender, race, age, or culture (Brownmiller, 1975).

The word rape comes from the Latin verb *rapere* which means to seize or take by force. Originally it had no sexual meaning associated with it. Sexual violence or rape was legally a crime against property when women and children were considered no more than units of property belonging to men (Brownmiller, 1975). In the Code of Hammurabi, women were equally to blame for rape and both perpetrator and victim were sentenced to death by drowning (Brownmiller, 1975). The Hebrews were influenced by the Code of Hammurabi but instead of drowning the two accused, they both were publicly stoned to death.

Brownmiller (1975) also discusses incidents of rape that occur in the Bible. An example is in Genesis, where Dinah, a virgin daughter of Jacob by Leah, was raped by a man when she left the house. Her attacker applied to her family for permission to marry her. Her family agreed with the suggestion, but only if the attacker and the male members of his family would agree to be circumcised, and they did. Nevertheless, the males in Jacob's family slaughtered the rapist, his family, and their livestock. They felt vindicated, but the question Brownmiller asks is what benefit this served for Dinah who remained merely a piece of damaged property (Brownmiller, 1975).

In the Middle Ages, Jewish women began to win some independence and were able to bring legal charges against their perpetrators. The raped virgin was no longer made to marry her rapist. These women were also able to receive financial compensation because rape was now viewed as a theft of virginity (Brownmiller, 1975).



In early English law, approaches to rape were contradictory and left the matter unclear as to whether it was a crime against a man's estate or a woman's body. During his twelfth century reign, King Henry II, the Plantagenet, brought Frankish law to England. Under this law, when a virgin filed a complaint of rape, there was a legal process of indictment and trial by jury. At the end of the thirteenth century, Edward I made advances in legal thinking with the Statutes of Westminster. These statutes covered forcible rape of virgins as well as married women. Edward I made a decree that if the family of the victim failed to bring charges, then the Crown could press charges. Thus, rape was no longer a threat to property but an issue of public safety and concern. In 1275, the First Statute of Westminster set the penalty of rape at two years in prison plus a fine determined at the discretion of the king. A decade later, the Second Statute of Westminster was amended to read that if a man raped a woman, he could be found guilty of a felony and put to death (Brownmiller, 1975).

In the American colonies, it was noted as early as 1768 that patriots received reports of rapes committed by British soldiers. Yet, even with some reports of rape, Brownmiller (1975) states that during the American Revolution, Captain Francis Rawdown wrote in a 1776 letter that he liked the Southern women due to the fact that they did not make public their rapes by British soldiers: "A girl cannot step into the bushes to pluck a rose without running the most imminent risk of being ravished, and they are so little accustomed to these vigorous methods that they don't bear them with the proper resignation, and of consequence we have most entertaining courts martial every day" (p. 117).

Rape was and still is prevalent during war time. Brownmiller (1975) discusses the many ways rape is used as a weapon during war time. . Rape was also used as a weapon during slavery. Brownmiller (1975) discusses two periods in American history when rape was a casual product of the times: the rapes of both Native American women and Black women by white men. Rape during the Indian wars, when white men wanted land, was viewed as retaliatory and simply a peripheral to conquest. During slavery, white men wanted forced labor. Black women were a critical part of the labor force, as both workers and reproducers of future laborers. Their bodies belonged to the master and they had no legal rights. Brownmiller (1975) states: “History is never behind us...The crossroads of racism and sexism had to be a violent meeting place. There is no use pretending it doesn’t exist.” (p. 255).

#### History of Rape Crisis Movement

The women’s movement of the 1970’s gave a voice to rape and sexual abuse victims, and only then was the prevalence of these crimes understood and brought to public awareness. As feminists organized and fought for social change to help improve women’s rights, crimes against them were examined in a new light (Martin, 1990).

In 1971, radical feminists organized their first public speak-out against rape. They viewed rape as much more than a result of a man’s uncontrollable sexual drive. They believed that sex was used as a weapon against women and stressed the political and control aspects of rape (Brownmiller, 1975). Dupre, Hampton, Morrison and Meeks (1993) found that pressure from feminist organizations led most states to revise their rape laws by the 1980’s. Koss and Harvey (1991) found that in response to an increased

awareness of rape, grass-roots feminists developed the first rape crisis centers (RCC's). The rape crisis centers were feminist in nature not only due to their being organized by women who were seeking to change existing power structures, but also because their founders endeavored to establish a female- based power structure in their own organizations. They felt if they were not able to affect power change in the rape crisis centers, then they would not be able to stop rape in society (Fried, 1994).

Gornick, Burt, and Pittman (1985) stated that three markers which characterize true rape crisis centers are “(1) some direct services offered to rape survivors; (2) some specific outreach to and formalized procedure for serving rape survivors; and (3) some internal education and training on rape” (p. 252). In addition to their direct services work, rape crisis centers sought to raise awareness about sexual assault in communities and began to conduct public education programs in a variety of settings (Gornick, Burt, & Pittman, 1985).

In 1972, the Washington, D.C. Rape Crisis Center was incorporated as one of the first two rape crisis centers in the nation started by a small group of women (D.C. Rape Crisis Center, n.d.). North Carolina's first rape crisis center opened in 1975 in Pitt County. In 1976, the National Coalition Against Sexual Assault was formed (NCCASA, n.d.).

In 1982, the first federal allocation of money was given to rape crisis centers through the Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grants (CDC, n.d.). The Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), introduced by President Clinton and passed by Congress, created new criminal penalties and established the Rape Prevention and

Education (RPE) Program now administered by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). The Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) of 1994 brought together and coordinated, for the first time, responses to sexual violence from the criminal justice, social services, and private- nonprofit organizations. It acknowledged and supported rape crisis centers and introduced federal prosecution of certain sexual assault crimes (USDOJ, 1994). This act was re-authorized in 2000 and 2006 (USDOJ, n.d.). The CDC has pushed primary prevention to the forefront of the anti-rape movement in recent years and is in the process of working with four fully- funded and two partially- funded states in creating a shift from secondary to primary prevention of sexual violence.

Thus, there are now many rape crisis centers across the United States and around the world operating with federal, state and local funding to provide services to victims and efforts to prevent sexual assault. The anti-rape movement has made great strides but is still far from ending sexual violence and the need for rape crisis services.

#### Prevalence of Sexual Violence

Sexual violence affects millions of people every year and victims are at an increased risk of being violated again (Elliott, Mok, & Briere, 2004; Jewkes, Sen, & Garcia-Moreno, 2002; Rickert, Wiemann, Vaughan, & White, 2004). Due to how sexual violence is defined and how data is collected, statistics tend to vary about the prevalence of sexual violence. Data about sexual violence usually come from rape crisis programs and other nongovernmental agencies, law enforcement, departments of social services, and survey research. Thus, data available about sexual violence is greatly underestimated since the crimes this category includes (see definition) are the most underreported crimes.

The National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS) found that only 1 in 5 adult women report sexual violence to law enforcement (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2006). The estimates of sexual violence reported to law enforcement from the National Crime Victimization Study (NCVS), which is conducted by the Department of Justice (DOJ), vary from year to year. In 2002, 39% of rape victims reported the crimes to police; but in 2003, 54% reported (DOJ 2002; DOJ 2003). This shows some differences between the NCVS and the NVAWS rates which are probably due to different survey methods, thus the two results should not be directly compared.

The American Medical Association (AMA, 1985) stated that sexual violence continues to be a rapidly growing violent crime in America. Every 45 seconds, sexual violence claims a victim. Most sexually violent attacks are unreported and unrecognized and this leads to what is considered a silent epidemic in America. It is difficult to ascertain the exact number of victims of sexual violence, but it is generally accepted that less than half of all sexually violent crimes are reported to authorities; some estimate that less than 10% are reported (AMA, 1985).

The AMA (1985) stated that the National Victim's Center reports over 700,000 women are sexually violated every year and, of these victims, 61% are under the age of 18. Sexual violence also victimizes males but the frequency of these types of attacks is even less known. Approximately 80% of sexually violent attacks are perpetrated by people the victim knows and trusts (AMA, 1985).

In 2006, the U.S. Department of Justice (USDOJ) collected data on 92,455 forcible rapes reported to law enforcement agencies in the United States. This rate of

forcible rapes is estimated at 60.9 offenses per 100,000 females. They found that sexual violence reports of rapes by force comprised 91.9 percent of reported rape offenses and that attempted rape was around 8.1 percent of reported offenses. These numbers show that 56.0 rapes by force per 100,000 females and 4.9 attempts of rape per 100,000 females occurred in 2006 (USDOJ, 2006). But what really occurred, and what was reported, is not at all the same thing for the most under-reported of crimes.

The North Carolina Council for Women and Domestic Violence Commission (NCCWDVC, 2006) funds 75 local programs in North Carolina to provide assistance to victims of sexual violence. They reported that in North Carolina there were 25,849 crisis calls received and 8,721 clients of sexual violence served in fiscal year 2005-2006. Of those served, 63% were white and 21% were black; 25% were between the ages of 26-40; females comprised 89% of the total served and males accounted for 11%; and 22% were victims of offenses committed against children (NCCWDVC, 2006).

#### Definition of Theory and Model

Before analyzing and critiquing radical feminist theory (Saulnier, 1996) and Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory (1979), the two theories used to guide this research on sexual violence and its prevention, it is important to discuss the differences between a theory and model. Theories have a set of interconnected statements such as definitions, postulates, axioms, hypothetical constructs, laws, intervening variables and hypotheses (Miller, 1989). Miller (1989) also states that these interconnected statements describe unobservable structures, mechanisms or processes and establish a relationship to

each other and to observable events. Also, theories often are difficult to prove and do not reach a complete, formal state, especially those in social sciences.

Miller (1989) describes three tasks that a developmental theory will include. The first task is a theory which describes changes that occur within one or more areas of behavior. Next, a theory describes the changes in relationships among several areas of behavior. The third task is for the theory to describe the course of development (Miller, 1989).

Issues of developmental psychology deal directly with the basic nature of humans and theories largely depend on particular views of human nature, for example: a mechanistic view, an organismic view, a capitalistic view, or a mercantilistic view (Miller, 1989). Also, when examining a theory's view of human nature, one needs to understand whether the developments could be considered qualitative or quantitative in nature (Miller, 1989). Finally, one needs to consider the theorist's views of the nature versus nurture question and how biology and society impact the development of a human being (Miller, 1989).

Miller (1989) states: "a model is a framework, structure, or system that has been developed in one field and is then applied to another, usually less well-developed, field" (Miller, 1989, p. 14). A model is often used to help guide research, even though it is not fully developed or supported empirically, and is often the basis to guide future research and thinking (Miller, 1989).

## Related Theories

The two related theories discussed are the radical feminist theory (Saulnier, 1996) and ecological systems theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Radical feminist theory was examined as many rape crisis centers arose out of the women's movement and were based in feminist thought. Feminist theory influenced the start of rape crisis centers as well as their approach to prevention. The ecological systems theory is relevant to the topic of sexual violence prevention due to the fact that this is the theory that the CDC is encouraging prevention coordinators to utilize in the development of primary prevention programs. Thus, these two theories can both be applied in the effort to better understand sexual violence and its prevention

### *Radical Feminist Theory*

Radical feminist theory is one of the main theories upon which rape crisis centers were founded. There are many people who aided in the development of the feminist theory. Some of the principal ideas of radical feminist theories can be traced to Mary Wollstonecraft, Maria Stewart, Elizabeth Stanton, and Susan Brownmiller, among others (Saulnier, 1996). Radical feminist theory arose out of political activism and analysis of the civil rights and social change movements of the 1950's and 1960's, as well as the women's movement of the 1960's and 1970's (Saulnier, 1996). Twentieth century radical feminist theory is based on the fundamental ideas that the person is political; women are an oppressed class and patriarchy is at the root of their oppression; patriarchy is based in psychological and biological factors and enforced through violence against women; woman and men are fundamentally different; society must be completely altered to



eliminate male supremacy because incremental change is insufficient; and all hierarchies must be eliminated to achieve equality (Saulnier, 1996).

To adequately summarize this theory, the fundamental ideas need to be defined. First, “the person is political” is a fundamental position of radical feminist theory which includes social transformation to change the status quo and improve status and well-being of all women. Radical feminists also argue that most injustices to women are political issues which are grounded in sexist power imbalances (Saulnier, 1996). Radical feminists engage in consciousness- raising, one of the specific activities for which they are best known (Saulnier, 1996).

Radical feminists believe that women are an oppressed class and that patriarchy is at the root of their oppression. Patriarchal systems give privileges to men through the complex political manipulation of individual identity, social interactions and structural systems of power (Eisenstein, 1981).Patriarchy is defined as a cultural universal, with all institutions reinforcing that social order (Nes & Iadicola, 1989).

Next, radical feminist theory states that patriarchy is based on psychological and biological factors and is enforced through violence against women. Radical feminist theory developed a psychological analysis of male supremacy and concluded that women are damaged psychologically by the internalization of oppression and patriarchal messages (Echols, 1989) as well as that a major component of patriarchal systems is the psychological control of women (Donovan, 1985).

One tenet of radical feminist theory is the prevalence of violence against women, particularly in the forms of sexual assaults and physical assaults. Violence is defined as

political in nature and about control and domination (Saulnier, 1996). Brownmiller (1975) argues that rape and fear of rape are used to control women politically and socially and that pornography and prostitution are both forms of violence against women because they promote an ideology that degrades and abuses women and their bodies. As another radical feminist writer puts it: “To degrade someone, even with that person’s expressed consent, is to endorse the degradation of persons. It is to affirm that the abuse of persons is acceptable” (Audre Lorde as cited in Tong, 1989, p. 77).

The next fundamental idea of feminist theory is that woman and men are fundamentally different. Radical feminist theory believes that women and men conceptualize power differently; men seek to dominate and control and woman seek to share power and be more nurturing (Saulnier, 1996). Radical feminist theory next explores the concept that society must be completely altered to eliminate male supremacy and that incremental change is insufficient (Saulnier, 1996). Radical feminist theory analyzes sexism as a social system consisting of “law, tradition, economics, education, organized religion, science, language, the mass media, sexual morality, child rearing, the domestic division of labor and everyday social interaction, the purpose of which is to give men power over women” (Willis, 1989, *x*). Radical feminist theory believes that most social institutions need fundamental change (Donovan, 1985).

Finally, the last fundamental idea of radical feminist theory is that all hierarchies must be eliminated. Radical feminists seek egalitarian functions in their organizations and try to eliminate all forms of hierarchy. They also extend the analysis beyond sexual

hierarchies and state that all hierarchies based on sex, race, sexual orientation, class, or other characteristics are oppressive and should be eliminated (Saulnier, 1996).

*Understanding Human Development.* As previously mentioned, Miller (1989) believes that a true theory needs to describe changes that occur within one or more areas of behavior (Miller, 1989). Radical feminist theory seems to describe desired changes in behavior, but not so much the changes once they have occurred. Radical feminist theory is about development but this theory focuses more on the ways in which the political, societal and patriarchal culture affects a human being's development.

Miller's second task is that theory describes the changes in the relationship among several areas of behavior (Miller, 1989). Radical feminist theory covers this aspect with the explanation of patriarchal societies and how society should shift from male dominance to more of an egalitarian one. Radical feminist theory is based on changes that should occur due to changing one's own learned behavior and how individual change could affect others in society who would hopefully make the same behavioral changes.

The third task according to Miller (1989) is that a theory describes the course of development. Radical feminist theory has six fundamental ideas which are clearly stated and are interrelated. Radical feminist theory does not describe a course of development. Instead, it focuses on ways in which the political and societal affect development or lack thereof; it lays out ideas for thought and believes that if these are taken into action, developmental change can occur. Thus, it appears that radical feminist theory does meet these three tasks.

*Theoretical Assumptions.* Radical feminist theory is organized into six fundamental ideas. It attempts to describe how individuals and societies need to address and make changes in things that oppress women. Radical feminist theory attempts to describe how societal views and patriarchal issues influence how men and women develop and behave and how society allows certain behavior to continue to occur.

The six fundamental ideas are stated clearly and do interrelate, although there is some disagreement, even among radical feminists, as to the ideas and their meanings. This is a weakness of this theory.

According to Miller (1989), well-constructed theories have definitions, axioms, postulates, hypothetical constructs, intervening variables, laws and hypotheses. Radical feminist theory defines the major ideas as well as the concepts of patriarchy, hierarchy, violence, biology. A well-constructed theory also makes sure not to have internal components that contradict other statements involved in the explanation of the theory (Miller, 1989). This is another point of great weakness in this theory. As to the idea that women are an oppressed class and patriarchy is at the root of their oppression, women of color have challenged this assumption of shared oppression based on gender (hooks, 1990). Women of color have criticized the notion of sex as the earliest or most significant division of power, pointing out that this perspective could only have been developed by women who did not experience or understand the equally fundamental oppressive structures of class and race (Collins, 1990).

*Theories and Their Applicability to Populations.* Radical feminist theory's applicability to a variety of populations is another weakness of this theory. Radical

feminist theory seems to be colorblind, class blind and heterosexist. Echols (1989) states that radical feminists share a commitment to a universal sisterhood which is intended to emphasize unity of gender despite differences, but their theory has frequently been used to discount race, class and other differences.

The traditional radical feminist theory broke into many different directions, including those cultural feminists who concentrate on similarities, lesbian feminists who critique heterosexuality and womanists who examine matrices of oppression that simultaneously examine race, class and gender (Saulnirt, 1996).

More recent radical feminist theory has attempted to embrace diversity; but the initial fear of differences appears to have limited its adherents. It seems that the traditional radical feminist theory lost many women, especially working class, poor, and nonwhite women. Thus, radical feminist theory seems applicable to white, middle class to upper middle class women and not applicable to those who did not fall within this category.

*Measurability of Theory.* A weakness with feminist theory is that its meaning has varied over time and the present multiple meanings are rather different from those that were used in the 1890's (Beasley, 1999). Delmar (1986) states that there is no set vision in feminism and attempts to distinguish between the practical politics of the women's movement and a history of ideas.

Radical feminist theory does define all six fundamental ideas. But these ideas have not all been empirically tested or evaluated for validity. In order for a theory to be

empirically sound, it must be testable. Radical feminist theory does not appear to be testable in the traditional sense. Also, its ideas are more abstract than operational. An example would be that radical feminist theory does not operationalize a women's position in society, or explain how biology of sex becomes a social phenomenon of gender. Feminist theorists do define violence against women and give examples of pornography and prostitution which are both considered forms of violence against women because they promote an ideology that degrades and abuses women and their bodies. They did not define pornography and definitions of pornography vary (Steinem, 1980). In the United States, there have been cross-sectional studies which involved over-the-counter sales of men's magazines in various states and which found evidence that these largely-nonviolent soft forms of pornography have rape-promoting effects (Ellis, 1989). Malamuth and Check (1981) also found positive correlations between frequency of reading such magazines and self reported likelihood of forcing a woman to have sex. So, this fundamental idea appears to have some supportive research to back feminist theory's claim.

*Interpretation.* Theories need to discuss the mode of interaction between theory and fact (Miller, 1989). To understand radical feminist theory, one must understand the questions that were sparked before the development of radical feminist theory. Radical feminist theory arose out of political activism and analysis of the civil rights and social change movements of the 1950's and 1960's as well as the women's movement of the 1960's and 1970's (Saulnier, 1996). Radical feminist theory is not based on empirical

studies but rather what many in the movement saw as injustices and oppressions for women.

Radical feminist theory attempts to expand boundaries of feminist thought but does leave some fundamental questions about women's position in society unanswered. It also is not multicultural in nature and has actually in some cases oppressed women who were of other races, classes, and sexualities. Thus, this theory should be used with caution since it is not a theory that has been examined with a variety of socio-economic, racial, or ethnic populations. More research is needed addressing the aforementioned populations as well as other areas of weaknesses in this theory before one could state this is a model theory.

*Current Day Relevance of Radical Feminist Theory.* One needs to keep in mind the sparse population that the original radical feminist theory was examining and addressing. Certainly, there are some ways in which radical feminist theory does have current -day relevance. Women are for the most part still excluded from positions of political and economic power. They still live in a patriarchal society which supports male dominance enforced through violence against women, to some degree.

Sexual violence is still prevalent in our society and radical feminists are still attempting to combat this issue. Thus, since sexual violence is prevalent, there is a great need for sexual violence prevention programs. Using the fundamental ideas of radical feminist theory, one could incorporate the ideas into prevention programs in attempting to educate about the history of sexual violence as well as making political and societal impacts. As Beasley (1999) states, some feminists do not accept a conception of

feminism as simply a set of ideas that exist in the absence of a movement. Therefore, the sexual violence prevention programs would hopefully encourage movement for change.

Again, the focus of new prevention programs is to move the onus from the victim to the perpetrator, which is what radical feminist theory attempts to do by looking at political and societal contributors to violence against women. Also, with the new inclusion of diversity, it is hoped that more groups who are working to end violence against women can have a united front to combat these issues surrounding violence against women and other forms of oppression. Therefore, it is believed that this theory does have current relevance but only in the newer forms, not in the colorblind, class blind and heterosexist version of the theory.

#### *Related Empirical Research*

These studies are examined to gather and inform this study's research methodology, as well as to increase the awareness of sexual violence programs, sexual violence attitudes and the need for more research on how to address sexual violence from a primary prevention standpoint.

A study conducted by Fonow, Richardson, & Wemmerus (1992) was chosen because it utilizes an experimental design to examine the effects of feminist rape education. The researchers first analyzed attitudes about rape myths, adversarial sexual beliefs and gender role conservatism. They next evaluated the impacts of a rape education intervention on American college students' attitudes. They used the Solomon four-group design and randomly assigned 12 classes of sociology students. They had three different treatment groups: a live rape education workshop, a video of the workshop, and a control



group. They did find significant differences in gender on all scales. They also found that rape education intervention tends to work best in changing some attitudes about rape for both genders.

The goals of the study were to: assess the level of college- age students' knowledge about rape; examine how rape attitudes are related to victim blaming, gender role conservatism and adversarial sexual beliefs; and evaluate the impact of a feminist rape education program on students' beliefs and knowledge.

This study assessed beliefs about rape and measured the impact of two different rape education interventions on attitudes toward rape. The first intervention was a 25 minute video of a rape education workshop; the second was a 25 minute live rape education workshop. Both were used in college classrooms and the live workshop and video were implemented by an experienced rape education facilitator.

*Critique.* Participants included 582 students enrolled in 14 sections of a sociology class at Ohio State University. The sections were randomly assigned to one of the three conditions, thus accounting for internal validity. For each condition, there was one pretest group and one nonpretest group. All testing occurred in the classroom in small discussion sections, an unobtrusive way to collect data. Both interventions were conducted by the same experienced rape education facilitator; but there were no descriptions in the study of what "experienced rape facilitator" means. It would have been helpful to know the background and extent of experience, as well as demographical information and biases of the facilitator. This study would have also been strengthened by a discussion of construct validity.

The researchers found no difference in demographic or attitudinal data among students. Of the 582 students, there were 319 or 55 percent women and the sample was primarily young, white, and single. There were 88 percent who were under 23; and 86 percent who were white, 10 percent who were black, and 4 percent were other minorities. The external validity can only be compared with similar undergraduate students with the same racial, gender and area breakdowns. Thus, external validity is not known. It would have also been helpful to see if the demographic data was representative of the university as a whole.

The authors state that all instruments had reliability scores of more than .69. The rape myth scale had coefficient alpha of .71; rape-blame scale had coefficient alpha of .71; adversarial sexual belief scale had a coefficient alpha of .79; and the gender-role conservatism scale had a coefficient alpha of .69.

The pretest students did not blame victims, for the most part, and had an average of 2.0 on the rape-blame scale. They also rejected adversarial sexual beliefs with an average score of 2.2 and moderately held nontraditional gender role beliefs with score on the conservatism of 2.5. There was a significant gender difference ( $p < .01$ ) on each of the scales at pretest which is summarized in Table 2; thus type II errors were accounted for by the statistically significant finding. They also found significant correlations between the scales; the acceptance of rape myths was strongly related to victim blaming, conservative gender role beliefs and to adversarial sexual beliefs, all summarized in Table 3. The authors also stated that they found that the pretest was a type of education, although the effect was not powerful;  $F[1, 470] = 8.61, p < .01$ ) as described in Table 4.

All tables are clear and can stand on their own which allows the reader to see the data in a quick and concise manner.

The study found that there were significant findings in both educational interventions when looking at the knowledge and attitudes about rape. Thus, the workshop and video were both effective;  $F[2, 470] = 7.94, p < .01$ ); as shown in Table 4. They also found that gender was not a salient factor in the effectiveness of the education; both genders learned about equally;  $F[2, 470], = .56, ns$ .

The authors controlled for as many confounding effects as they could by random selection, using the same person on both interventions; and using the same population. The effects they were attempting to address were history, maturation, instrumentation, selection, etc. This article also addresses the limitations as well as future directions for research and it offers good insights into how to make feminist rape education stronger and to address themes of race, sex, and rape as means of social control.

*Overall Review.* Strengths of this study include high reliability of instruments; significant findings are taken into account for as many threats of validity. The findings were also related back to feminist rape education and suggestions for improvement and future research directions were clearly stated.

Some of the weaknesses included that the sample is not generalizable, it is an intervention that is for primarily white females and it is not multicultural, and this intervention needs to be more culturally sensitive. Thus, it would be worthwhile to replicate this study implementing these ideas and making it more culturally sensitive. The study suggests the outcomes are significant and that this could be a promising

intervention to educate students about rape myths, adversarial sexual beliefs and gender role conservation.

Another study by Truman, Tokar, & Fischer (1996) was chosen because it examines existing research on links between masculine gender roles and date rape. The authors examined and adequately defined 3 masculinity related constructs: masculinity ideology, attitudes toward feminism and homophobia. Five multiple regression analyses were conducted to examine at the multivariate level that the scores on the masculinity related constructs would predict supportive attitudes of date rape, self reports of sexual aggression on dates and self reports of the likelihood of committing rape if the person knew he would not be caught.

There were 106 male students, ages ranging from 17-48 years with a mean age of 21.09 years ( $SD = 4.34$ ). The sample was primarily white (85%); the rest of the sample included 11% African-Americans, 3% Asians/Asian Americans, and 1% other. There were 51% first year students and 24% second year college students, 8% in third, 13% fourth and 4% beyond fourth year.

The authors found that the multiple regression analysis did indeed reveal attitudes toward feminism and masculinity ideology that predict unique variance in several date rape attitudes and beliefs. They also found that the Façade/counterdependence of masculinity ideology predicts unique variance in self reported history of some form of sexual coercion.

*Critique.* The sample included a breakdown of demographic information but did not include socioeconomic status. It was reported that the majority of the participants

(85%) were white males; thus the results are not that generalizable. There was no indication as to where this study occurred and again this poses a problem with generalizing it to other areas or populations. The study was of college males, although the age range was from 17-48 but the mean was 21 years.

The participants were given extra credit for participation in their introductory psychology class. The study did not discuss ways in which data collection was unobtrusive or if any attempts were made to avoid evaluation apprehension. It also does not address the student who self-selected out of the study. The steps used within multiple regression analysis were not clear.

The study does define constructs and instruments used but does not address how the instruments were implemented. The researchers used six instruments in this study. Five of the six instruments reported high reliability, with Cronbach's Alpha scores: for Male Role Norms Scale (MRNS) in four sections: rationality/respect/status was .73, antifemininity was .81, façade/counterdependence was .74, and physical violence was .48. The Attitudes Toward Feminism scale (ATF) had an alpha of .86; Index of Homophobia (IHP) alpha was .92; Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale (ASB) was .82; Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence Scale (AIV) was .59; Sexual Experiences Survey alpha was .89. This illustrates that the items in most of the instrument do actually measure the underlying construct that they report to measure. But, where most instruments used had good validity, reliability; the internal consistency estimates for the AIV and physical violence subscales of the MRNS were low; thus, extra caution should be used when using these scales.

The researchers do state in the limitations section that one issue was that all data were collected by an undergraduate woman; but this is the only mention of data collection. They did not address the biases of the person collecting data nor how they avoided or checked for biases. The tables were designed well and were self-explanatory and could stand alone. They included the means, standard deviations and intercorrelations of all variables. But, they only mentioned limitations to the study and suggested keeping these in mind for future research. Also, the implications for counseling were only moderately covered.

*Overall Review.* Findings of this study found a low to moderate positive correlation between masculinity- related variables and date rape supportive variables. The date rape supportive attitudes were significant but weakly correlated with the history of sexual coercion and with likelihood of rape. The MRNS had moderate correlations which suggest that the measures address separate but related masculinity dimensions. But, they found no significant correlations between any of the masculinity- related variables and the likelihood of rape.

Replicating this study with a larger sample size, a more diverse population, age range, diverse settings and environments and more diverse data collectors could reveal different results and implications. It would be beneficial in expanding the generalizability of the study. Another area that would be beneficial would be to include practical applications to implement. It is good to gather this type of information, but taking it a step further and applying the results to the question of how one could decrease rape

supportive attitudes, sexual aggression and sexual violence in general, would be beneficial.

### *Ecological Systems Theory*

Bronfenbrenner's (1979) ecological systems theory is examined next in order to provide a theoretical basis for the new shift to primary prevention. The CDC is currently utilizing this theory to teach prevention coordinators ways of addressing sexual violence prevention with a primary prevention focus.

Bronfenbrenner (1979) states an ecological environment is "conceived topologically as a nested arrangement of concentric structures, each contained within the next" (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, p. 22). The work of Bronfenbrenner (1979) suggests several levels at which the individual and the environmental systems interact. The basic concepts in Bronfenbrenner's theory are helpful in illustrating the complexity of the systems in which the individual exists and how that it is often multiple systems embedded in one another.

Bronfenbrenner (1979) describes several levels of environmental influences that interact with the individual variables. Microsystems are the immediate pattern of activities, roles, relationships of the individual, consisting of interpersonal interactions in specific settings like family members, social acquaintances, and work groups (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). The next layer is the mesosystem, which is the relationships or interactions between two or more settings in which the individual participates, such as school, family and work. The mesosystems exist within exosystems, which are settings outside of the individual's direct contact but whose decisions affect the individual, such

as parents' place of employment or local school board. Lastly, the outermost ring of the model represents macrosystems, the social order and cultural norms underlying the consistencies in the inner circles; this layer could be comprised of cultural values, laws, etc. (Bronfenbrenner, 1979).

In his later years, Bronfenbrenner began to call his theory the bioecological theory, a theory closely tied to the science of genetics and human development in regards to genotypes and phenotypes inherent in a developing human (Bronfenbrenner & Ceci, 1994). Bronfenbrenner and Evans (2000) believed that developmental science should be defined as its own form of study, having its own sets of hypotheses, which can be tested empirically.

*Understanding Human Development.* According to Miller (1989), for a theory to be considered well- developed, it must consider three tasks in regards to the development of humans. The first task of a theory is to describe changes that occur within one or more areas of behavior (Miller, 1989). Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory describes many behavior changes that occur in a particular setting and how the setting can influence behavior changes as well as psychological changes or growth of the person.

The second task of a theory is to describe changes in relationships among several areas of behavior (Miller, 1989) Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory covers this aspect with the thorough explanation of the dyads of developing people. Many of the theoretical hypotheses also cover changes which occur due to individual behavior change which then affects another person in the dyad who will then make the same behavior change.



The third task is that the theory describes the course of development (Miller, 1989). Bronfenbrenner's (1979) theory has 50 hypotheses which are clearly stated and seem to build upon one another in the theory. Bronfenbrenner believed that these hypotheses describe a course of development. He states that if hypotheses 1-6 are taken into account, one "can stipulate the optimal conditions for learning and development in a dyadic relationship" (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, p. 60). Thus, Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory does cover the three fundamental tasks that Miller (1989) states should be included in a good developmental theory.

*Theoretical Assumptions.* Bronfenbrenner's theory is organized into 50 hypotheses, which begin as more general and move toward more developed. Bronfenbrenner attempts to describe how humans develop and how environments are interrelated. Miller (1989) also proposes that constructs, assumptions and postulates are all part of a well developed theory. Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory consists of 50 hypotheses, 14 definitions, and 7 postulates. The hypotheses are stated clearly and tend to build upon one another, as do the postulates.

Bronfenbrenner's theory attempts to explain how environmental influences play a major role in the development of humans, including the way a person perceives and deals with the environment (Bronfenbrenner & Ceci, 1994). Abuse can impede positive human development or reinforce "maladaptive and destructive responses toward both the environment and the self" (Bronfenbrenner & Ceci, 1994, p. 572). Thus, the ecological systems theory, now the bioecological theory, has sparked research in many arenas, including violence against women.

Also, a theory needs to discuss the mode of interaction between theory and fact. The ecological systems theory could be considered both deductive and functional. Bronfenbrenner (1979) states that many of the ideas of the original theory are derived from application of theoretical work in empirical studies, but there are some which are deductive in nature. Deductive theory is logical and an organized set of propositions, which are formally stated (Miller, 1989). Bronfenbrenner's theory consists of formally stated hypotheses, definitions and propositions. Thus, it is clearly a deductive theory. Miller (1989) also states that a deductive theory seeks continual testing of hypotheses, testing which can lead to modifications. Over the years, Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory has undergone a number of changes, and now, the bioecological model is considered the more modern version and application of the original theory.

*Measurability of the Theory.* Bronfenbrenner (1979) argues that the ecological experiment strategy is best suited to empirically investigate the interdependencies of the complex concepts of person-environment interactions in the context of interdependence. The ecological experiment is what Bronfenbrenner (1979) describes as an effort to investigate accommodations between growing and changing humans and the environment by a systematic contrast between two or more environmental systems or their structural components. He also states that one should be careful to control other sources of influence by using either random assignment or matching.

Bronfenbrenner (1979) proposes that experiments be conducted in the first phases of scientific inquiry for heuristic purposes in order to analyze the systematic nature of existing accommodations between the person and the environment. Thus, it appears that

Bronfenbrenner takes measurability of this theory seriously. He defines the constructs and attempts to describe ideal ways in which to measure their effectiveness.

Bronfenbrenner (1979) acknowledges the difficulty in measuring exactly how an interaction with others or environments affects the individual or system as a whole.

Bronfenbrenner (1979) also recommends the use of other methods such as ethnographic description, naturalistic observation, case studies, field surveys, etc. Bronfenbrenner encourages the testing and measuring of his theory. Real world research on human development is rare in most experiments in America; thus, one has to look for alternative ways to measure the theory or study.

*Interpretation.* Miller (1989) states that a sound theory includes interactions between theory and facts, as well as a structured set of stages. Bronfenbrenner's theory is heuristic, gives meaning to the relationship between theory and facts, and serves to guide future research. This theory also has a series of hypotheses, postulates and definitions that build upon one another. Bronfenbrenner's theory also can be applied to many areas of human development.

Bronfenbrenner's (1979) ecological systems theory focuses on how one's environment impacts development. Most human developmental theories focus on the traditional psychological processes of perception, learning, thinking and motivation. But the ecological systems theory focuses on the content of development and how development changes as a function of a person's exposure to and interaction with the environment (Bronfenbrenner, 1979).

This theory contains a lot of good ideas but, like all theories, should be used with caution. It is derived from research with low socio-economic classes. Continued research is needed to make sure this theory is applicable to a variety of classes, races, ethnicities, and cultures.

*Current Day Relevance to Sexual Violence Prevention Programs.* Bronfenbrenner is well known for work with underprivileged children, youth and low-income families, as well as for his role as a co-founder of Head Start (Lang, 2005).

This theory has also been used in different types of research, like research directed at issues in special education. The special education research states that this theory has the potential to generate new knowledge and influence practice in a number of important ways. Paying attention to the developmentally instigative characteristics of children with disabilities could shift traditional investigative focus from generalized descriptions of the individual as a person with disabilities to more detailed characterizations of the children in the study sample (Sontag, 1996). Examining personal attributes such as personality and attitudes may help explain both the personal characteristics and the processes influencing development. The developing person would be considered an active agent influencing the interactions encountered in his or her microsystems (*Bronfenbrenner, 1992*). Since Bronfenbrenner's (1979) theory attempts to show how and why environmental issues impact and influence human development, his theory is certainly relevant to sexual violence prevention programs.

Sexual violence prevention programs are available in almost all school districts (Daro & Salmon-Cox, 1994). These programs teach children the how-to's: how to

recognize sexual abuse (secret and/or against-the-rules touching) and how to say “No!, Stop!” assertively, get away, and tell someone (Finkelhor & Strapko, 1992). The primary goal of these programs is to reduce a child’s vulnerability to abuse perpetrated by relatives, acquaintances, and strangers (Kohl, 1993). The assumption is that the naïve, unprepared child is easy prey for sexual predators.

New prevention programs are moving the onus from the victim to the perpetrator. Bronfenbrenner’s theory gives insight into ways to accomplish this. The World Health Organization (2002) applies an ecological model which is intended to help understand the multifaceted nature of violence. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) also are currently approaching sexual violence prevention using an ecological model derived from Bronfenbrenner’s theory. The CDC views this model as a critical part of an overall framework because it includes both protective and risk factors from multiple domains (CDC, 2004). Bronfenbrenner’s theory is relevant to the population of adolescents who receive sexual violence prevention programs. Building prevention programs based on a theory such as the ecological one offers a framework to aid in understanding the interplay of individual, relationship, society, culture, and environment. This helps provide key points for intervention and prevention of sexual violence (WHO, 2002).

It is important to understand human development in order to understand how we as a society have become accustomed to and accepting of sexual violence throughout history. Theories also help us to better understand what motivates people like perpetrators or potential perpetrators to change. Patriarchy, sexual violence, power, dominance, and

the like, have all been building blocks to a rape culture and living in a society where sexual violence is accepted. It is important to understand human development and its history to help move toward a society that is not accepting of sexual violence and to understand how individuals and societies make changes in behaviors and attitudes that will end sexual violence.

### *Related Empirical Research*

Validity of a theory is either supported or refuted through data from empirical studies. These studies also provide directions for future research and hopefully fill existing gaps in the literature. These studies were examined to gather and inform this study's research methodology, as well as to increase the awareness of sexual violence prevention programs and the need for more research on how to improve outcomes for future primary prevention programs.

Telljohann and Everett (1997) examine the effects of a third grade sexual abuse prevention program. The success of this program was characteristic of other similar prevention programs: knowledge increased, but only modestly. To investigate the effectiveness of the sexual abuse program, they conducted a study with 490 third grade students from northwest Ohio's urban, suburban and rural schools. Nine schools were randomly selected and participated in either an experimental or control group. A total of 431 out of the 490 students (88%) completed both the pretest and post-test child abuse prevention evaluation surveys. A 24-item pretest and post-test questionnaire was administered to an experimental group (n = 236) and a control group (n = 195) of third grade students; 45 pretests (27 experimental and 18 control) and 48 post-test (29

experimental and 19 control) were completed but could not be matched, so they were not used in the analyses.

The numbers of males and females in the study were almost equal and most participants were white and age nine. There was not a significant difference with regard to gender or age but there was a statistically significant difference in the higher number of African American students in the control group. The authors of the study state that at pretest there was not a difference in either knowledge or behavior between the races; therefore, differences in racial distribution were not considered to be an issue.

Those receiving the sexual abuse prevention program significantly increased their sexual abuse knowledge scores from pretest to post-test and differences in knowledge were significantly higher in the experimental as compared to the control group. Students who received the sexual abuse curriculum significantly improved from pretest to post-test on their behavioral intention scores, as well; although only a modest improvement could be obtained through use of this two-hour sexual abuse prevention curriculum.

*Critique.* This article provides sufficient information to support the validity and reliability of the instrument. The instrument was developed based on a content analysis of sexual abuse prevention programs, third grade curriculum and a comprehensive review of the literature. It was evaluated for content validity by designers and a convenience sample that completed the instrument and indicated a ceiling effect on six items, which the authors chose not to include.

Stability reliability was found for the knowledge subscale by using the control group's pretest and post-test scores with a Pearson  $r$  of .56. Internal reliability for the

knowledge subscale was estimated using Cronbach's alpha = .59, which is a modest reliability, but could be expected based on the variety of topics which were included in subscales. Stability reliability was estimated using the control groups pretest and post-test scores which showed a Person  $r = .44$  and internal reliability Cronbach's alpha = .49. This modest correlation may be due to the low number of items on the behavioral subscale.

Table 2 lists responses for pretest and post-test for the experimental group. Tables were self-explanatory and allowed the reader to see examples of the responses, as well as the scenarios. As a result, the reader gains an understanding about the types of questions and scenarios the third graders were asked to answer. In Table 3, the authors show the means and standard deviations of the pretest and post-test scores for the knowledge and behavioral intention of both the experimental/control groups.

Several areas within the experiment could have been improved. The authors did not discuss how they standardized the training or the trainers who presented the program. Also, experimenter expectancies were not discussed. The researchers were not the ones giving the program, but all trainers could have been aware of the hypotheses and the researchers could have discussed how they screened for this. The authors used trained volunteers who attended a 30-hour training session and a staff member from a social service agency to teach the two-hour curriculum over a two-week period, but they did not describe the training that they received. The authors did take measures to strengthen internal validity, such as short duration, and they used random assignment and ran the control and experimental groups concurrently.



The article also did not discuss whether evaluation apprehension was screened for. Thus, this article would be stronger if, for example, they discussed with the children that there were no right or wrong answers and to be honest. Also, the large sample size could have led to statistical significance that was not very substantial.

The authors also describe limitations of the study. One of the main issues surrounding sexual abuse prevention programs is determining if the programs result in children being less likely to be abused. Ethically, it is problematic to attempt to put children in real life situations and observe how they react after a prevention program. They did list this as a major limitation; however, they also noted that results of past behavior skills trainings have shown positive changes in behaviors of participants.

The ceiling effect of the instrument on the pretest was also listed as a limitation. This minimized their ability to show significant improvements on the part of the participants due to the fact that the upper limit of the dependent variable may limit the amount of change that could be demonstrated on that variable. Finally, the pretest could have played a role in the control group's perceived ability to tell someone outside the home about abuse. It would be interesting to replicate this study with post-test only to see the effects. The authors also did not mention future directions or research, which would have been beneficial.

*Overall Review.* The strengths of this study included reliable instruments and evidence of internal validity as well as construct validity. The authors did a good job of presenting the results of the study. They could have strengthened the article by describing how they standardized the trainers, addressed experimenter expectancies and evaluation

apprehension. They also met their research goals and found that participants in sexual abuse prevention programs significantly increased their knowledge.

This article did not directly address Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory but the microsystems level could be applied. This level is the immediate pattern of activities, roles and relationships of the individual. Microsystems consist of interpersonal interactions in specific settings like family members, social acquaintances, school and work group (Bronfenbrenner, 1979).

Randolph and Gold (1994) evaluate a teacher training program developed by Hazzard, Kleemeier, Pohl, and Webb (1988b) on child sexual abuse prevention called Child Sexual Abuse Prevention: Teacher Training Workshop Curriculum. They made minor modifications to the original program. The program is a six hour secondary prevention program designed to improve teachers' skills in the area recognizing and responding to child sexual abuse. The independent variables included several elements, including how to recognize behavioral and physical symptoms of sexual abuse, how to respond appropriately to disclosures and report sexual abuse cases. The dependent measures include Teacher Knowledge Scale, Teacher Opinion Scale, Teacher Vignettes Measure, Teacher Prevention Behavior Measure, and Workshop Evaluation.

The teachers who participated were able to apply their knowledge to hypothetical situations better than untrained teachers and reported spending more time discussing child abuse issues with a friend or colleague. Compared to teachers in the control group, participants provided more classroom activities or discussions about abuse, as well as discussions with individual children about possible abuse. On the 30-item knowledge

scale, teachers in the control group had a pre-test average of 19.62 compared to having a post-test average of 19.57; and trained teachers went from having a pre-test average of 18.29 to having a post-test average of 25.43. On the opinion scale, the control group scored 50.24 on the pre-test and 50.10 on the post-test, versus the trained teachers who scored 50.52 on the pre-test and 57.00 on the post-test. The post-test vignette average score for the control group was 25.14 versus 44.24 for the trained teachers.

*Critique.* This study utilizes an experimental design. The groups were randomly assigned by sex and grade level of instruction in order to have an equal number of males and females and an equal number of elementary and middle school teachers per group. Four males and 17 females in the experimental group had a mean age of 42.7 years and mean of 12.8 years of teaching experience; 16 were elementary school teachers and 5 were middle school teachers. The control group included 4 males and 17 females with mean age of 41.7 years and mean of 12.05 years of teaching experience; there were 16 elementary teachers and 5 middle school teachers. There was no attrition since everyone who signed up finished the study.

An ANOVA was conducted and the participants were randomly assigned, accounting for internal validity. The program used was the “Child Sexual Abuse Prevention: Teacher Training Workshop Curriculum (CSAP: TTWC)” by Hazzard et. al. (1988b) developed and validated the measures of knowledge, attitudes, victim identification and communication skills, as well as the teacher’s prevention behaviors. The same instruments and scoring used in the Hazzard et. al. (1988b) study was employed in this one.

The teacher knowledge scale is a 30 true/false scale and all but three item-total correlations were above .25 and the overall internal consistency of the scale as assessed scores was .90. The teacher opinion scale is a 23 item Likert scale and all but 4 item total correlations were above .25, and coefficient alpha for the scale was .78 and the test-retest reliability for control was .79. Coefficient alpha is a statistic which represents reliability or internal consistency. This statistic is also used to evaluate whether the items measure the same characteristic at different points in time and in different samples and is sometimes called Cronbach's alpha.

The teacher vignettes measure was an 8- item written vignettes scored by two raters, using Hazzard et al.'s (1988b) recommended system; total scores on the measure could range from -4 to 64. Coefficient alpha for this scale was .78 and interrater reliability was .99. The authors used a second rater who was not involved in the program. There was no reliability data reported for the teacher prevention behavior measure other than the teachers' own self-reports. Also, the director of a local sexual abuse center, working in conjunction with DSS, reported that the numbers of teacher reports from the schools had increased as a result of the intervention.

There were minimal threats to internal validity. The teachers were randomly assigned and the program was administered in 2-hours over three consecutive days. At one of the schools the intervention was given after school hours. Both the control and experimental groups completed a demographics questionnaire, the Teacher Knowledge Scale and the Teacher Opinion Scale and were asked not to discuss the information presented in the training session with teachers in the other group as it could affect the

outcome of the study. There was a post test knowledge, opinion and vignette and at three months post-training participants in both groups were asked to complete the prevention behavior measure. Due to the pretest/post-test format there could have been residual effects of the pretest. It would be interesting to conduct a post-test -only experiment and compare results.

One area that could be improved is the diffusion or imitation of treatments. The teachers could have discussed the program with the other teachers even though they were asked not to. This was not thought to have a known effect on the outcome but could have been improved by keeping the teachers apart during the duration of the study. Researchers could have controlled the compensatory equalization of treatments more if trainers did not know the hypothesis.

The authors properly assessed threats to construct validity. They discussed and described the constructs and the independent variables. However, there could have been some hypothesis guessing due to the type of program and the authors might have presented and discussed ways in which they accounted for this. Another issue is that they used experts in the field to be trainers; thus their background and knowledge varied and they did not describe how they standardized the program. There were also multiple tests and the pretest/post-test experiment model was used, in which the pretest could have influenced performance on posttest.

The authors also reduced threats for external validity. Participants were 42 teachers from one school district, randomly assigned by sex and grade level to achieve equal numbers of males/females and elementary versus middle school teachers. A

MANACOVA was conducted and no significant differences between experimental and control group in sex, age, years teaching, marital status, race, degree held or previous experience in the area of child sexual abuse were found. The MANACOVA was significant, Wilk = .2204,  $p < .001$ , indicating that there was a significant difference between the performance of the experimental and control group. This overall significance allowed the researchers to examine the individual scales to see where the performance differences were.

The setting was rural and involved a small portion of the school system's teachers. The exact location was not disclosed. The Hazzard et. al. (1988a) study was conducted in an Atlanta area suburban school district; thus, it would be useful to know where this study was conducted. There were two tables which were clear and could be easily understood on their own. Table 1 gave the means and standard deviations of the individual scale differences and Table 2 presented the means and standard deviations of the teacher prevention and behavior follow-up.

*Overall Review.* Strengths of this study include random assignment and strong external validity and construct validity. This article found that trained teachers showed significant increases in knowledge about child sexual abuse, attitudes regarding prevention, identifying behavioral indicators of abuse and intervention in potential abuse cases. Thus, the teacher training program had significant outcomes.

This article also did not directly address Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory but the microsystems level could be applied. This level is the immediate pattern of activities, roles and relationships of the individual. Microsystems consist of interpersonal

interactions in specific settings like family members, social acquaintances, school and work group (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). This article could also be connected to the mesosystem, which is the relationships or interactions between two or more settings in which the individual participates, such as school, family and work. The mesosystem can include the connection between the child's teacher and parents. This article measured teachers' ability to communicate and report to the appropriate authorities.

Finally a study by Dalla, (2000) was chosen due to its focus on sexual violence and prostitution and because it is a developed qualitative study. The author defined a prostitute as "one who exchanges sex or sexual favors for money, [drugs], or other desirable commodities" (Dalla, 2000, ¶2). The article addressed assumptions and stereotypes that tend to be associated with prostitutes in our society.

Dalla (2002) incorporated the personal and developmental experiences of the participants who became streetwalking prostitutes. The author wanted to gain an understanding from these lived experiences and look for similar themes emerging in interviews with the participants. The researcher wanted to capture these women as human beings with real lives and experiences, beyond what society tends to assume about this population.

*Critique.* Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory (1979) and family systems theory were the theories that the author utilized to help guide the study. In qualitative research, selection and description of participants is important, and the author did a good job in clearly describing the participants. The participants for this article were in an

intervention program designed to help keep women from being prostitutes. They volunteered for the study, consent was obtained, and ethical issues were addressed.

Semi-structured interviews with 43 participants were conducted. Five out of the 43 were then selected. In this study, the questions for the interviews were predetermined. The article did not state the exact questions but they were addressed throughout the article.

The Phenomenological Descriptive Methodology created by Colaizzi in 1978 was used for data analysis. The author did present the methodology and participant checks which help address bias as there was more than one person who checked the themes. The author also allowed the participants to review the final analysis and they were asked to discuss their thoughts on the data and give input for inclusion in the final study.

The findings are logical and clearly stated. The five brief biographies from the subgroup were clearly written and helped grab the reader's attention. The 43 interviews the author conducted help develop the following: what historical events led the woman into prostitution, what was life as a prostitute like, and what was the future life for these women. The thematic presentation of this study appears logical and is broken down into three category areas. The historical events which the women discussed included themes of sexual abuse, abandonment, and runaways. The second category included themes about the age of the women and the time of becoming a prostitute, their drug abuse, condom use, and information about their pimps. The third category included themes about the women living on the streets; time spent in prisons, whether they were forced off



the streets or voluntarily left the streets. The women's dreams were also included as they tended to share similarities among participants.

Gaps in the literature were discussed in the implications section. The author stated that there is a need for more research which needs to focus on the internal, rather than the external, factors which lead women into prostitution. Also, the author suggested future studies need to focus on activism for these women who are prostitutes to help develop policy change for women's employment, among other things. Some of the limitations which were presented included a nonrandom sample, the fact that participants were not current prostitutes, and only one interview conducted with each participant.

*Overall Review.* This article contained many taboo issues like sexual abuse, prostitution, drug abuse, human trafficking. The author could have had biases which may have affected the interviews and data. One limitation was that there was no discussion of personal reflection on the part of the researcher or methods used to address the biases, like journaling or having an auditor.

Sexual violence victims have a variety of issues with which they must cope as individuals. How they cope affects their futures and future choices. The effects of being a prostitute are devastating and it is significant that this study addressed a history of sexual victimization as a factor in the women's choices to become prostitutes. With the possibility of such consequences as this, it is apparent that there is a great need for prevention of sexual violence and all its many after-effects.

## Synthesis of Theories and Research

Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory is useful in determining the environmental factors that influence changes in individuals, communities, relationships and society. The ecological systems theory allows the inclusion of risk and protective factors from multiple domains. Radical feminist theory also provides insight into societal risk factors which can be incorporated into the ecological theory. Thus, these two theories can both be applied in the effort to better understand sexual violence and its prevention.

Both theories show some signs of white privilege that may cause minorities to view these theories as not being applicable to them. Thus, it is important that empirical studies utilizing these theories be conducted in multicultural environments. There are limitless future research possibilities pertaining to sexual violence prevention programs. Gender, race, ethnicity, class, etc. all need to be addressed and taken into account in all theoretical frameworks.

## Conclusion and Future Research Needs

The current literature related to sexual violence prevention programs appears to acknowledge that current theoretical frameworks and empirical studies are lacking in this field. The two theoretical frameworks examined in this manuscript are no different. The theories examined all have their strengths and weaknesses and it is hoped that in future research that the weaknesses of the theories will be taken into account and measured for reliability and validity on a variety of populations.

There are many gaps in the research on sexual violence and its prevention. First, research must begin to focus more on empirically testing available programs in

prevention. Once this is done, we can begin to successfully replicate programs in other areas and test for their generalizability. These programs also need to be based in theory to have an empirical basis for research.

The ecological systems approach includes aspects of environmental factors that help or hinder development. Communities are vital in development of strategies for the prevention of sexual violence. It is crucial that prevention strategies address norms in communities/society because of the powerful influence they have on behavior. We live in a rape culture and until we as a society stand united and willing to face sexism, racism, classism and all the other isms, then we will never be able to truly prevent oppression or violence, especially sexual violence. Therefore, more research and education are needed to increase awareness and applicability of strategies to end sexual violence in the most effective ways possible.

With such high prevalence of sexual coercion and violence, we need to learn ways in which we might begin to understand and develop more effective methods to prevent sexual violence from occurring. It is important that we hear from front-line workers and prevention coordinators about how to address primary prevention initiatives. By discovering what has been effective in the current shift and what lessons have been learned, it is the hope that we can find ways to facilitate the engagement of more agencies and communities in primary prevention techniques and programs.

In this research project, the purpose of which is to examine sexual violence prevention coordinators' opinions, attitudes, skills, and behaviors as related to primary prevention programs, Radical feminist theory (Saulnier, 1996) and Bronfenbrenner's

ecological systems theory (1979) are examined because they are the most useful theories to help build or construct an approach to primary prevention programs. This was an exploratory study which focused on the first year of the shift from secondary to primary prevention from the prevention coordinators' points of view in order to give insight into making the shift easier and more effective in the future. This type of data will raise awareness of what is working and what is not working within the current approaches and methods of shifting programs from secondary to primary prevention. This study sought to assist the community in becoming more aware of ways to help make the shift in attitudes and practices for programs and individuals involved in primary prevention efforts.

The agencies selected to receive funding had to base their interventions on the social ecological model (SEM) and the public health model, and for some agencies this was the first time that their intervention programs would be theory driven. The agencies are also tasked with conducting evaluations; again, for most agencies, this is the first time that they will be formally evaluating their intervention programs. North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services (NC DHHS), in collaboration with the funded agencies, will evaluate the programs for effectiveness of model and intervention. The current study is neither attempting to look at effectiveness of the model nor of the interventions. This research study is designed to examine the lived experiences of the prevention coordinators in the shift and their individual processes of change to primary prevention of sexual violence.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHOD

The main goal of this research study was to discover ways to improve the shift from secondary to primary prevention efforts by exploring and analyzing the lived experiences of prevention coordinators working in rape crisis centers in North Carolina, one of four states fully funded by the CDC to begin moving from secondary to primary prevention. This CDC pilot project itself shows a commitment to addressing sexual violence by initiating and supporting prevention programs based on a new approach. There is little research on primary prevention of sexual violence, so the effectiveness of this approach is an emerging issue. Listening to the voices of prevention coordinators and seeing them as real people who have spent a year in transition will reveal lessons learned, successes gained, barriers encountered, and will provide answers that are interpersonal, as well as developmental, in nature. Due to the fact that this study used a multiple case study approach, much of this chapter will be devoted to an explanation of case study research and specifically how it was utilized.

This research utilized a multiple case study design (Yin, 1984) to explore the factors that support or hinder the shift in focus from secondary to primary prevention of sexual violence. Due to the lack of research on this topic and population, this exploratory phenomenological approach was selected to gain insight into how prevention coordinators perceive their experience. This means that one should keep in mind that whatever information emerged from the data is what was discovered in this study. There

were no preconceived notions about what type of data or answers to research questions would come about from the research investigation (Yin, 1984). Instead, what was discovered was that which the participants allowed us to discover.

Seven prevention coordinators were selected from the larger group of research participants used in a previous study conducted by the North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services and the researcher. This previous study assessed the knowledge gained and attitudes held by prevention coordinators and their supervisors after the first training on theory and principles of the primary prevention approach to sexual violence. The original sample was comprised of 33 participants (17 prevention coordinators and 16 supervisors) who received training on primary prevention and the use of the ecological model in addressing sexual violence prevention programs. Criteria for participation in the original study were that participant agencies had received rape prevention education funding and that this training counted as two of the three mandated trainings they were required to attend during one fiscal year. There were 17 programs in North Carolina selected to receive these funds. To receive the funds, each program had to send its prevention coordinator and its immediate supervisor to the trainings. Of the 33 participants, 4 were males and 29 were females; 8 were African American, 18 were European American, 3 were Multi-Racial, 1 was Hispanic and 3 were self identified as Other. Participants ranged in age from 23 to 66.

Yin (1984) stated that “a multiple case study relies on the logic of replication analogous to that used in multiple experiments. Analysis in such studies must follow cross-experiment logic rather than within-experiment design and logic” (p. 48). Yin

(1984) also stated that the rationale for using a multiple case design is so one can select cases that directly produce contrary results for predictable reasons. Yin (1984) claimed that “the development of a rich, theoretical framework is an important step in such replication procedures. Any framework developed through the application of replication logic should state the conditions under which a particular phenomenon is likely to be found as well as the conditions when it is not likely to be found” (p. 49).

In the analysis of the original study of 33 cases, it became clear to the researcher that some prevention coordinators were doing better than others in understanding the shift from secondary to primary prevention. Some coordinators had a background in sexual violence with little to no background in the field of prevention education, like working with Planned Parenthood or public health education in areas like sexually transmitted infection prevention, smoking cessation, etc., while others had a strong prevention background with little knowledge of sexual violence. This researcher noted that it was difficult to predict which group, those with a background in sexual violence or those with a background in prevention, would be most successful in this shift to primary prevention of sexual violence. Thus, the multiple case study design was selected to enable the researcher to answer how and why questions within the real world context of the prevention coordinators.

Yin (1984) stated, “A case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident...The case study inquiry copes with the technically distinctive situation in which there will be many more variables of

interest than data points... In this sense, the case study is not either a data collection tactic or merely a design feature alone but a comprehensive research strategy” (p. 13).

Multiple case studies capture real-world context and the replication of more than one case study enhances validity of the findings (Galloway & Sheridan, 1993). Each case will be viewed as if it were an individual case study which follows a replicating logic (Yin, 1994).

The current study was conducted using a multiple case study design. The researcher interviewed seven prevention coordinators. This study also utilized three forms of data collection. First, the researcher examined the archival data collected in pre, post and 10 week follow-up surveys collected at the trainings which all 17 programs were required to attend during the first year of the pilot project. Next, the researcher examined the annual progress reports that each agency completed for their funding sources (the North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and the CDC). Finally, multiple case studies using semi-structured interviews were conducted. The study involved examining reported perceptions, knowledge, and detailed histories related to the research questions. Explanation of the three sources of data collection will be discussed in detail in the next section on research design.

A pilot case study was conducted to help refine data collection for both the content of the data and procedures that were followed. Yin (2003) states that a pilot case study “is more formative, assisting you to develop relevant lines of questions – possibly even providing some conceptual clarification of the research design as well” (p. 79).



The researcher conducted a pilot case study to gauge accuracy of questions, gaps in questions, and flow of questions. The researcher conducted a pilot case study using one prevention coordinator who was not included among the seven interviewed later with the semi-structured questionnaire which was revised after the examination of the archival data and annual reports. The procedures and questionnaire that were to be used for the case studies were utilized and the participant was asked to provide input on the process as a whole as well as on the questions, but this data was not utilized in the data analysis. The researcher then made adjustments to the questionnaire and procedures based on the pilot case study outcomes.

Phenomenological research posits no preconceived ideas about what will be discovered; thus, the only areas that are utilized in this research proposal from the literature review are the background ideas associated with each research question. The questions can be related to ecological systems theory, (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) and radical feminist theory (Saulnier, 1996). Radical feminist theory was important as many rape crisis centers arose out of the women's movement and were based in feminist thought and influenced the start of rape crisis centers as well as their approach to prevention. The ecological systems theory is relevant to the topic of sexual violence prevention due to the fact that this is the theory that the CDC is encouraging prevention coordinators to utilize in the development of primary prevention programs and that this model offers a framework for understanding how a host of factors influence sexual violence. Thus, these two theories can both be applied in the effort to better understand sexual violence and its prevention. Although the researcher hoped that this study would provide further insight

into the process of prevention coordinators making the shift from secondary to primary prevention and would produce some helpful suggestions for future prevention coordinators, programs and funding sources, the researcher had no preconceived notions or assurance that answers would emerge. The design of this research proposal was developed to provide insight into the following qualitative research questions:

- 1) What themes emerged related to the participants' attitudes about the shift from secondary to primary prevention of sexual violence?
- 2) What themes emerged regarding the participants' perceived support or barriers from supervisors, agency, grantors and community during the transition process?
- 3) What themes were consistent across cases?
- 4) What were the best- practices of the shift in focus from secondary to primary prevention of sexual violence reported by each participant to the researcher?
- 5) How do the prevention coordinators perceive the training and technical assistance that they have received to aid in the transition to primary prevention?
- 6) What advice would the prevention coordinators offer to make this shift easier in the future and what skills do they think are needed to be successful?

#### Research Design

This study utilized a phenomenological approach which seeks to discover the shared meaning of experiences for multiple individuals on their shift from secondary to primary prevention (McCaslin & Scott, 2003). Despite the extensive literature review in

Chapter 2, a researcher who is knowledgeable about the proposed topic and the available literature on the gaps in the literature or the areas that have been understudied and is able to design a useful research study that will produce meaningful research and knowledge.

The first type of data includes an archival evaluation of a study conducted for the first two trainings held for the rape prevention education grantees. This included a pre, post, and 10 week follow-up survey with quantitative and qualitative questions. The second type of data collection examined the selected cases' studies annual report to the funders. The third form of data collection, the multiple case study design, included seven sites where the prevention coordinators were interviewed utilizing the phenomenological semi-structured interview technique.

### *Participants*

Participants in the study were seven female prevention coordinators who had been with their agency for one year working under the rape prevention education grant. The ages of the participants ranged from 23 to 66 years of age and an effort was made to include participants of various ages and ethnicity. All of those interviewed volunteered to be interviewed.

The researcher sent out a volunteer participation form to all prevention coordinators who qualified and selected seven volunteers to participate in the case study. The researcher attempted to get a mix of stand-alone rape crisis programs and dual rape crisis and domestic violence programs, as well as a mix of representing rural and urban programs. The participants included prevention coordinators who have been working

with the agency in another role for more than one year and those who were new hires for the position of the prevention coordinator.

### *Researcher as the Interviewer*

The researcher is in some ways an insider and in others an outsider. The researcher is not a prevention coordinator nor has she been a part of all of the training and technical assistance provided for the programs. But, the researcher has been part of the larger CDC project and has assisted in some of the trainings. The researcher was formerly employed with the North Carolina Coalition Against Sexual Assault and is associated in the minds of the participants with that organization; however, when the interviews took place, the researcher was working elsewhere. The positives for being an “insider” are that the researcher is familiar with most of the agencies and with the work they are doing in their prevention programs. This facilitated gaining access to participants for the study. But, this could have posed a problem since the participants might still have seen the researcher in her former role of working with the funders and might not have been as open with her as they might have been with a complete outsider. The interviewer kept a non-judgmental, non-biased position with the participants, and she assured the participants that she had no personal or professional agenda related to her former employment positions. In order to reduce any personal bias associated with interviewing or interpreting the research data, the researcher kept a journal to document her personal feelings, attitudes, or biases that arose during the process. The journal was shared with the auditor who read, commented, and discussed the researcher’s feelings and biases. She

also discussed with research assistants and committee team members ways to reduce research bias.

### *Auditor*

An auditor was utilized to provide secondary analysis of the data to insure that the interpretation of data by the researcher was unbiased. The auditor selected for this study had no investment in the outcome of this study. She was someone with a background in counseling and sexual violence. She was trained utilizing articles from Hill, Thompson, & Nutt-Williams (1997) and Hill, Nutt-Williams, Heaton, Thompson, and Rhodes (1996) for examples and guidance. She reviewed journals, transcripts, codes, and met with the researcher to discuss the process, outcomes, logic, bias and conclusions. The auditor provided comments, suggested changes in name of codes or recommend codes or themes be divided or combined.

The auditor also verified consistency among data methods, interpretations, and conclusions. The auditor's role in qualitative analysis helps ensure validity of the data. This is similar to the use in quantitative analysis of interrater agreement coefficients or other ways to estimate reliability and validity (Hill, Thompson, & Nutt-Williams, 1997).

Once final themes were extracted from the data sets, the auditor verified the codes, themes, and researcher's journal to screen for researcher bias and to ensure validity. The auditor and the researcher negotiated any discrepancies and agreed on the final codes and themes. The auditor verified the steps taken by the researcher to arrive at the interpretations and analysis, verified logic of the research process, verified that a

systematic process was undertaken, and verified that the themes and codes were derived from the data and were not due to biases.

### Instrumentation

The goal of this study was to give a voice to seven prevention coordinators in North Carolina about their first year experiences with the shift to a primary prevention initiative and to extrapolate useful lessons for the future from their experiences. The three types of data that the researcher used were the archival data, annual reports and, finally, semi-structured interviews. Descriptions of the three data sources follow.

#### *Archival Data Collection and Analysis*

All participants were asked to complete a pre, post and ten week follow up survey following a major training for the prevention coordinators and their supervisors. The same coders who coded the case studies in the current study also coded the data collected in the earlier surveys.

#### *Annual Reports*

The annual reports that each program completed to receive funding for the prevention coordinator were requested for use by the researcher. These reports contain financial and other questions of interest to the funders, such as the types of programs being planned or conducted, successes realized by the programs, and the like. This information was useful to the researcher since this is a report each program completed for the first full fiscal year of the new grant for primary prevention in order to justify meeting its goals and objectives for moving from secondary to primary prevention. The researcher asked all grantees for access to this report but it was each agency's decision

whether or not to share this report. The annual report helped provide some background information for each of the selected programs. This aided in the creation of the research design, aided in revision of the questionnaire prior to the pilot study and aided in data analysis. Again, the qualitative questions for this report were coded by the same coders used for the case study.

### *Semi-Structured Interview Protocol*

A case study protocol was developed and implemented. The protocol contained the procedures, general directions, and questionnaire. Yin (2003) stated that having a case study protocol is essential when conducting multiple case studies. The case study protocol was one way of increasing reliability of the study and is a way to guide the researcher in being able to replicate a single case study several times. Yin (2003) stated that a case study protocol should include an overview of the case study project, field procedures, and questionnaire. The protocol allows the researcher to stay targeted on the subject and objectives. The case study protocol was created and followed for all case studies (See Appendix C).

The questionnaire for the semi-structured interview (see Appendix A) was created based on the current literature review, coding and review of archival data and annual reports, and the qualitative pilot case study. The original semi-structured interview questions and procedures utilized in the pilot study were modified for clarity.

### Procedure

A multiple case study design was employed using a semi-structured interview process. The researcher conducted the interviews individually with each of the seven

participants. Interviews were conducted via telephone in order to ensure confidentiality. Ladany, O'Brien, Hill, Melincoff, Knox, & Peterson (1997) conducted phone interviews believing that participants were more likely to reveal sensitive personal information if they knew that their identities were more protected. Furthermore, using the telephone instead of face-to-face allowed for a more relaxed and confidential interview process. The research does note that face-to-face interviews do have advantages such as the interviewer being able to develop more rapport and to see more of the participant's nonverbal behaviors. The semi-structured interview was conducted to gain perspectives from the prevention coordinators' perceptions, experiences and attitudes during the first year of transition to primary prevention.

The researcher first sent a letter to all potential participants to describe the research project and included a participant consent form that asked for volunteers (see Appendix B for consent letter and form). Once participants replied, the researcher scheduled a time to discuss the research further and to make sure volunteers met selection criteria for the research. Once consent was obtained and criteria were met, the researcher set up a time to conduct the semi-structured interview via telephone.

Each interview began by obtaining consent to record the conversation on a digital recorder; continued with demographic information questions; proceeded to the interview questions, and finished with a few probing questions related to some of the answers that the participants gave. Appendix A includes a list of all the interview questions.

Interviews were digitally recorded and later transcribed. Once the interviews were transcribed, the researcher sent a copy to the participant for participant check. Once all



participants' interviews were reviewed and clarified, they were coded by the researcher and other trained coders.

### Data Analysis

The following steps were utilized for the data analysis and reduction: (a) Archival data from the training that the grantee received were transferred to rich text format so the data could be analyzed, first by hand coding, and then by using Atlas ti software package (see <http://www.atlasti.com/product.html> for a description of Atlas ti). (b) Data from the annual reports were transferred to rich text format and were analyzed first by hand coding and then by using Atlas ti software package. (c) Once the interviews took place, the interviews were transcribed. (d) Participants reviewed the data collected from the interview to ensure accuracy. (e) Data from the interviews were transferred to rich text format (f) Four coders analyzed the data using a coding process. The coding process will be described later (Basit, 2003; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Coding was done utilizing multiple coders, assisting with the validity of the process. (g) After each coder individually coded each section of data, the codes were checked and inter-rater reliability was deduced using Kappa. Kappa score was .80 before a common coding set was accepted. (h) Once inter-rater reliability of .80 was attained and coders agreed the coding set represented the data, then the coding set was applied to the data. (i) Emergent themes were assessed from the coded data sets which were useful for understanding the process of the shift from secondary to primary prevention as viewed from the prevention coordinators' perspective. (j) The auditor examined the coding set to reinforce validity. (k) After the auditor supported the findings, the results were reported (l) A discussion of

findings will be presented in which the researcher identified and explained uncertainties, rival explanations, and conclusions.

#### *Theoretical framework for analysis*

An interpretivist/constructivist framework was used to interpret the qualitative data. This type of phenomenology stems from hermeneutics, whereby knowledge is socially constructed by all involved in the research process, and research is a product of the values of the researcher (Lopez & Willis, 2004). Hermeneutics goes beyond a general descriptive look at core concepts and essences in data to discover meanings within everyday life practices. Focus could be considered to be on what humans actually experience rather than what they are aware of consciously (Lopez & Willis, 2004).

The theoretical foundation for this study rested on two related theories, the radical feminist theory (Saulnier, 1996) and ecological systems theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Radical feminist theory (Saulnier, 1996) is deemed most useful by the researcher and is the theory from which most rape crisis centers have evolved. Moreover, among its tenets is one that looks at the prevalence of violence against women, particularly in the forms of sexual and physical assaults. This theory holds that violence is political in nature and violence against women is about control and domination (Saulnier, 1996).

The ecological systems theory is especially relevant to the topic of sexual violence prevention and is the theory that the CDC is encouraging prevention coordinators to utilize in the development of primary prevention programs. Thus, the researcher felt that Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory (1979) would provide one

key theoretical framework to aid research question development and development of the case study protocol.

The theoretical frameworks from which the researcher chose to examine the shift in prevention practices include Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory (1979) and radical feminist theory (Saulnier, 1996). The World Health Organization (2002) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2004) both support the application of an ecological model to help best understand the multifaceted nature of violence. According to the CDC, this model is a critical part of an overall framework for working with sexual violence because it includes both protective and risk factors from multiple domains (CDC, 2004). The ecological model was also one model chosen to teach prevention coordinators ways in which to frame their shift to primary prevention. Therefore, the researcher felt that Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory (1979) would provide one key theoretical framework to aid research question development and development of the case study protocol.

The CDC (2004) acknowledges that there are other theoretical models which attempt to describe root causes of sexual violence, including biological, psychological, and feminist perspectives. Thus, these two theories, the radical feminist theory (Saulnier, 1996) and ecological systems theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), were both applied in the development of this research project's goals, objectives, protocol, and questionnaire in an effort to better understand sexual violence and its prevention. Radical feminist theory helped the researcher ask about societal issues that might have influenced or affected the prevention coordinators in their first year, such as addressing rape myths, power and

dominance, and gender-based attitudes about blame and personal responsibility. The ecological systems theory aided the researcher in devising questions that helped explore how the shift in approach had affected the prevention coordinators personally, as well as how the shift influenced their relationships within their agencies and their communities and with collaborating partners in prevention efforts.

### *Coding and Themes*

This study utilized the coding and thematic analyzation method presented in Creswell (2007); which is a simplified version of the Moustakas (1994) method. Creswell's method is fairly easy to understand and use to analyze data (see Creswell, 2007, p. 159-160). Codes are labels or tags given to descriptive or inferential information gathered in qualitative interviews, attached to chunks of words, phrases, whole sentences or paragraphs (Basit, 2003). The specific type of coding used in this project is emic coding, which means that the codes that emerge from the data are a result of the reviewing of the data for inherent concepts and patterns (Miles & Huberman, 1994). There were three types of codes utilized: Descriptive, In Vivo and Pattern. Descriptive codes are more concrete, like events, actions and definitions. In Vivo codes are verbatim text that is taken directly from the transcripts. Pattern codes include an iterative process which provides an explanation. These codes that are derived should reveal themes and uncover perspectives of the participants (Basit, 2003; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Schilling, 2006; White & Marsh, 2006).

A coding team of four trained coders, including this researcher, coded the participants' responses to all qualitative questions. All four coders live in North Carolina

and all were female. One of the coders is Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, while the other three identified as European American. Two of the four coders disclosed being survivors of sexual violence and two coders have been trained and volunteered or worked with a rape crisis agency.

To increase validity and uncover each coder's values, beliefs and background, inter-rater agreement strategies were used (Barbour, 2001). The coders were chosen based on convenience. The coders were trained about the goals of the study and trained in qualitative coding methods. During the training, examples of how to code were given and coders were asked to apply codes to text and then compare their work. The coders were trained using chapter 4 of Miles and Huberman (1994), *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. Coders discussed their backgrounds, biases and expectations before the coding begins and this information is included in Chapter 5.

After each coder coded a section of the data, the coding team discussed initial difficulties, disagreements, and reached an agreement on the levels of detail, when to code, and when to use multiple codes (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The team then individually coded the remaining data. Once all the data was coded, the team members once again discussed their coding sets and checked their codes with one another. For example, one coded a comment as "adaptable" while another used the term "flexible." The coding team discussed the term and agreed on which word best described the data. Another example is that the coding team agreed on the code "out of sequence", but after coding all data sets, the team further refined the term to "lack of logical order." Common codes were identified and agreed upon to make sure that the codes were clearly

understood and were applied the same way by all coders; this increased inter-rater reliability (Barbour, 2001; Schilling, 2006; White & Marsh, 2006).

Once common codes were agreed upon, their validity was supported through the use of an auditor. The auditor was a person who is familiar with sexual violence, primary prevention and is knowledgeable in qualitative process and coding analysis. The person was not directly involved in the case studies.

### *Validity*

Five types of validity were considered in this research study. The validity of this study was established by using different validity checks. First, a pilot case study was conducted in which the researcher selected a prevention coordinator to interview and to provide feedback on the semi-structured interview questions, procedure, and style. Second, participants' checks were conducted in which the researcher asked the participants to read the data analysis of their interview and make sure they agreed with the researcher's interpretation. These were conducted to ensure that the participants felt the researcher captured their feelings and statements accurately. Third, the researcher utilized research reflexivity to help decrease researcher bias, meaning that the researcher openly stated biases and personal beliefs. Fourth, an auditor, someone who is not involved in the research, was used to provide secondary analysis of data to verify the consistency of agreement of research methods, interpretation and the conclusions. The fifth type of validity was triangulation.

Qualitative data involves many issues in validity, reliability, and biases; therefore, the researcher kept a journal throughout the process to help reflect and discover any

biases before the interviews begin, as well as to evaluate her own biases, the process of interviewing, and any other concerns that may have arisen during the process. Whenever a researcher makes certain to continually reveal personal biases and how they may affect the research, the researcher is utilizing a process of validity called researcher reflexivity, which is a validity procedure in qualitative research whereby researchers self disclose personal beliefs, assumptions, and biases (Creswell & Miller, 2000). Reflexivity means being sensitive to the ways the researcher and process have shaped the collected data which includes the role of biases and assumptions which can influence data collection. Personal biases need to be made clear at the outset of all research reports to enhance the credibility of findings (Mays & Pope, 2000). Researcher reflexivity requires that the researchers have an awareness of their contributions to the construction of meanings throughout the process and acknowledge the impossibility of remaining “outside of one’s subject matter while conducting research” (Nightingale & Cromby, 1999, p. 228).

In the present study, the researcher used research reflexivity by self-disclosing, in journal format, all biases and beliefs prior to the start of the research project. The auditor, who reviewed the journals, had discussions with the researcher to help keep the researcher in check and attempt to alleviate the researcher’s biases from affecting the outcomes of the study.

Triangulation is important for the credibility of the findings of a study (Huberman & Miles, 1994). Triangulation was used as a qualitative type of internal validity; the archival data analysis of the trainings as well as the annual reports helped give reliability and validity to some of the issues being brought up in the case study and qualitative

interview questions. The archival data, annual reports and the semi-structured interviews were coded by the coding team and were used to look for common themes among each and across all three types of data. This allowed the researcher to discover if all three forms of data collection encountered similar codes and themes. The rich descriptions that were looked for in the responses during the interviews also gave validity to this research study.

### *Reliability*

Reliability is the extent to which consistent results are obtained if the same procedure were followed by different researchers. There are two strategies that are often recommended to enhance reliability for multiple case study designs. Yin (1982) recommended the use of a field guide or case study protocol (see Appendix C) where the basic theory and type of information collected and excluded are outlined, as well as the procedures, so the study could be replicated. This study documented and developed a case study protocol to increase reliability.

Yin (1982) also suggested using multiple coders. Multiple coders and consensus coding were utilized in this study in a further attempt to incorporate and improve validity by making sure all coders arrived at a consensus on the codes and themes of all qualitative data (the archival data, annual reports and semi-structured interviews).

### Summary

The multiple case study of seven prevention coordinators is written in a story format, an easy to read and understand format based on the article mentioned in the Literature Review about streetwalking prostitutes by Dalla (2000). The article presented



common themes that were well depicted. The researcher decided to use a similar procedure in this study because the method clearly depicts the daily experiences of its participants.

The phenomenological approach, the constructivist perspective, and emic coding were all used to allow the voices of the participants and their individual experiences to be revealed. The researcher took a variety of steps to reduce the possible impact of bias on the part of the researcher (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Researcher reflexivity, case study protocol, an auditor, participant checks, journaling, and the use of a coding team were all used to protect the validity and reliability of findings (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The emerging themes were checked against participants' words to ensure that their voices were accurately interpreted. Results are presented utilizing themes, examples and descriptions to note patterns, plausible explanations, graphs, and figures (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

## CHAPTER 4

### RESULTS

This chapter includes results from the data analysis of the responses to the semi-structured interviews with the seven prevention coordinators about the shift to primary prevention of sexual violence in North Carolina. This research utilizes individual case studies as the evidentiary base for the study and presents individual case themes and then cross-case analysis. The cross-case analysis is used to synthesize the lessons from all of the case studies and is organized by topics or themes. Under each topic, the author draws appropriate examples from the seven cases (Yin, 2003). The qualitative results will be communicated through extended text and typical quotations in support (Schilling, 2006).

Four coders analyzed the archival data, annual reports, and each of the seven case studies using the coding process. Each response was tagged and coded and consisted of a single word, sentence, or multiple sentences. After each coder individually coded the data, the coding team met and created a code book for the retroactive data, annual reports and the seven case studies. Nine codebooks were created to increase internal validity for each section of analysis (See Appendix D). Throughout the process, coding checks were conducted, and following the application of the coding book to the data, inter-rater reliability was deduced using Kappa. Kappa scores were determined for each coder separately for the retroactive data, annual report and the seven case studies. The overall results are reported in the table below (See Table 1). Overall Kappa scores for each

section of analysis are above .80. Kappa scores for each section can be found in Appendix E.

Table 1. Kappa Results

	Coders											
	1x2	N	1x3	N	1x4	N	2x3	N	2x4	N	3x4	N
Overall	0.8655	1234	0.8606	1234	0.8687	1234	0.8736	1234	0.8655	1234	0.8817	1234

Note: Table denotes Kappa between coders. 1x2 = Kappa between Coder 1 and Coder 2. Also N denotes number of total codes.

The previous literature review included a mix of audiences and interventions of sexual violence which helps set the stage for the variety of programs that were funded in North Carolina. The funded programs all developed their own primary prevention interventions and all addressed different populations and targeted areas. Some of the sample prevention initiatives funded included workplace sexual harassment, faith-based teen male program, middle and high school adolescent male programs, college male mentor training, and a safer bars initiative (See Appendix F for complete list). The seven program coordinators interviewed include a mixed representation of agencies such as stand-alone rape crisis centers, combined sexual violence and domestic violence centers, as well as a mix of new hires to their respective agencies for this newly hired prevention coordinator position and those who transitioned within the agency to this new position.

An auditor was sent all sections of the data analysis to reinforce the accuracy of the coding books and the emerging themes. The auditor supported the findings as representative of the data. The researcher kept journals which were used for researcher reflexivity which discussed the length and intensity of the coding process as well as scheduling and life issues occurring with the coding team. The themes that emerged from

the journal related to childcare issues: “We had to end tonight before finishing the next section due to ----- needing to get home to take care of -----,” and “---- was interrupted during the middle of coding tonight to put child to bed.” Another theme was the amount of time and intensity of the analysis process: “I know that this is a tedious process and I feel bad about having the team spend so much of their time for my research,”; “I hate to ask for another team meeting because it is taking up so much of their time”; “It is difficult to schedule time to get together with everyone due to schedules, travel, sickness, family issues etc.”

### Individual Profiles

Each woman’s interview data are presented in an individual profile that summarizes events and attitudes of their first year experience as the prevention coordinator. The participants’ real names were not used to protect their identity and confidentiality, thus a pseudonym was used in its place.

#### *Addison*

*Initial interview.* The interview was conducted over the telephone per Addison’s request. It was conducted during the day and there were no interruptions. The interview lasted for one hour. She was nervous at first but seemed to relax as the interview proceeded.

Addison indicated that she found the shift to primary prevention as “challenging because, you know, it is something we haven’t done before and a lot of people haven’t done before, so it’s like.. ‘Am I doing it right?’- is this, you know, trying to stay on track and making sure that we’re doing what we’re supposed to be doing.” She continued

throughout the interview to mention times of feeling confused and challenged, with statements like: “At first it was kind of, you know, kind of confusing as to, well, what can you do and what can’t you do?” The feeling of confusion was very prominent throughout her interview, confusion about what the shift was, what she could do, what was expected of her, what the agency and community wanted verses what the grant allowed.

Addison did feel that the grantors were supportive and provided helpful trainings. She liked “knowing that we have somebody to go to in the event that we needed help.” But she struggled with the order of events, “that we had to kind of do it backwards... we had to come up with our project first, and then, you know, do our community assessment.. it just kind of went in reverse order.” She also thought that it would have helped her understand the shift to primary prevention and implement the new direction if she had “more tools as far as approaches to use.” She also indicated that she would have liked to have been able to know what kinds of best practices there were and what was effective.

Addison also felt that it was very important for her to network with other prevention coordinators although there was not a lot of time devoted to networking at the required trainings. She indicated that this might have helped generate ideas for programs or new ways of implementing the shift.

*Participant check.* After Addison’s interview was transcribed, it was sent to Addison to review. She reviewed the transcript for accuracy and she did make a few minor corrections and clarifications to a few of her answers. The researcher then discussed with her the changes and she confirmed that all the information was correct.

*Delaney*

*Initial interview.* The interview was conducted via the telephone per Delaney's request. It was conducted during the day and there were no interruptions. The interview lasted for one and a half hours. She stated that she understood the purpose of the study and was a bit anxious but excited about sharing her story.

Delaney had a positive mindset about the first year. She stated that the first year had been "definitely a good opportunity for personal growth for me." She also felt that the trainings offered were "definitely helpful for me." She stated that she learned a lot during the first year but, even with her positive attitude and mindset about the shift, she also found the shift challenging. She stated: "Sometimes it has felt like things haven't progressed as they should have" and she expressed feelings of being overwhelmed: "It felt overwhelming at times for me, when you ask yourself the question, how do you prevent sexual violence?" She, too, experienced confusion with understanding exactly what the shift entailed because, as she said: "there was no specific plan or curriculum" and she "felt like I went into the position not knowing really anything or what it was going to look like. And even the grant itself and what we stated that we were going to be doing was vague." She went on to add that "it would have been nice to have gone into a position that was already developed and established. But I welcomed that challenge." So, even with lots of confusion and uncertainty, she still kept a positive attitude about the process.

Delaney also believed that some of the trainings should have occurred before others. When referring to training that she was receiving during the second year of the

grant, she remarked: “It feels like these are the things that should have happened first,” She also added that the technical assistance “came later than I would have liked” and that was “a challenge and disappointing to initially feel like I was here on my own.”

*Participant check.* Delaney reviewed the transcribed interview for accuracy and she added a few clarifications. The researcher then discussed with her the changes and she confirmed that all the information was correct.

*Ella*

*Initial interview.* Ella was interviewed over the telephone per her request and there were no interruptions. The interview lasted for one hour. She was eager to share her story and experience.

When asked about the shift to primary prevention, Ella stated: “It has been frustrating and – but wonderful at the same time.” Ella also expressed a positive attitude when talking about working during the past year as the prevention coordinator. She said: “I feel like I’m making a difference in our program participants’ lives.” Although she did state: “I knew it was going to be a struggle, but knowing something and actually getting out there and doing it are two completely different things...so I guess I knew it was going to be a struggle.” Part of her struggle was her community’s acceptance of rape myths. She stated: “But he (a male stakeholder in the community) thinks that it’s strictly a female issue... whenever I get out to the community, people are really, really, really tied up with the rape myth acceptance, the different myths and everything. It’s just, it’s frustrating.”

Ella indicated that she found the trainings “extremely helpful” and that they were “absolutely instrumental in the reports that we’re doing.” But, she too felt that the trainings lacked logical order. She stated that “some of the trainings seemed to have come after the fact” and “it’s just been a little backwards.” Even with this lack of order, Ella kept a positive attitude and felt supported by the grantors. She stated: “They’ve also given really good direction as far as what kind of program we needed to do to make sure that we were getting proper saturation.” She also stated that the grantors were “more than willing to help.”

Although Ella felt supported by the grantors for the most part, she also felt that “we haven’t gotten as much feedback as I would have hoped.” An interesting dynamic noted during the interview was that most of the time when she stated something about the grantors that she or others might perceive as a negative comment, she would follow with something like “they’ve done the best that they’ve been able to do.” She was in some ways justifying the lack of grantor support with statements like: “it’s just because the CDC has not gotten them (NC DHHS) the information as far as they wanted.” The prevention coordinators like Ella seemed to know that the CDC played some role in their funding but they did not have direct contact with the CDC, instead, their interactions were with NC DHHS. Ella continued: “There definitely is an understanding that the information provided in training comes to us a little late. I do not want to come across as bad- mouthing... they are honestly doing what they can with what has been provided to them from the CDC.”



*Participant check.* After Ella's interview was transcribed, it was sent to her for review. She reviewed the transcript for accuracy and she did add a few comments to her answers. The researcher then discussed with her the changes and she confirmed that all the information was correct.

### *Grace*

*Initial interview.* The interview was conducted over the telephone per Grace's request. She was at home and there were no interruptions. The interview lasted for two hours. She stated that she understood the purpose of the study and was willing to participate and share her experience over the past year.

Grace stated that the shift to primary prevention was "difficult" due to her and her community's investment in programs the agency already offered. She elaborated by saying that she tried to "preserve as much of the original program" while attempting to make changes to bring the program "closer to the guidelines for primary prevention. So, it's been a challenge." She also felt very overwhelmed at times. She made statements like: "I did find that being RPE Coordinator did mean basically doing it all."

She also questioned the effectiveness of the shift with statements like: "I think I developed a slightly critical perspective about it...I'm not entirely convinced that the model that's used fits sexual violence prevention in the same way that it does general injury prevention." Grace spent some time describing her frustration with trying to understand the concepts that were being presented to her and actually implementing them with a sexual violence prevention focus. She stated she did feel they were good models

for other injury prevention but “I don’t think it really applies so well to something like sexual violence prevention.”

Grace did feel that she was very supported by her agency and especially her supervisor. She stated that her supervisor’s “vote of confidence in me that, you know, I could do this, and that I was the right person to do it... and that she would be there to support me” was a great help to her in the first year of this shift. She added that “it’s kind of the same thing with the state (funders). They’ve been very open about, ‘you know, we’re here for you. If you have any questions, call us’ and they’re very accessible that way. But, at the same time, they’re- I still kind of felt this sense of isolation.” So, even though Grace felt supported by her agency, supervisor and the grantors, she still struggled with a sense of isolation. She continued: “I felt like I was out there trying to do this all by myself... even though there were all these people saying, ‘call me if you need some help.’ It was kind of difficult to figure out, well, what it was that I needed to make this easier.”

Grace, like the other participants, felt that the trainings did not have a logical order to them. She stated that she felt that “if things could have even been delayed so that everything was in place so we could have started with the community assessment. You know, kind of gone in order – a logical order.. rather than, you know, the first thing that we had to do was come up with our interventions. And, then we started working backwards.” The lack of logical order seemed to cause confusion, frustration, and feelings of being overwhelmed.

Grace also seemed to want to justify the grantors' lack of support with statements like: "It would be nice if it had proceeded in a more logical fashion, but that wasn't, you know, the state's fault.. that was CDC.. and they've been very apologetic and they've done what they can, you know, to make it a smooth process for us. So, I don't fault them at all... I just wish that CDC had it together a little bit better."

Grace felt that having the process and trainings occur in a more logical order and "maybe a longer transition time" and "more money so that, you know, there was money for folks to kind of keep doing what they were doing and then begin this process" would have made the past year a bit easier. Grace did feel that more funding would be beneficial in this shift. She stated: "So, it wasn't this abrupt, 'Okay, you've just lost that pot of money. Now you've got this new money and this is the way it has to be done from now on.' Kind of an overlap-if there'd been a year or two of an overlap where, you know, things gradually transitioned over." So, more funding and additional staff to continue doing the work that the agency had been doing as well as easing into the shift might have, in Grace's opinion, been easier.

*Participant check.* After Grace's interview was transcribed, she reviewed it and made some changes and a few additions for clarity of some of her statements. Once Grace made the additions, the researcher discussed with her the changes and she confirmed that all the information was correct and accurate.

*Jane*

*Initial interview.* The interview was conducted over the telephone per Jane's request. It was conducted during the day and there were no interruptions. The interview lasted for one and a half hours. She stated that she was a bit unsure of the interview but was happy to help.

Throughout the interview, Jane possessed a positive mindset and attitude and a sense of hope. She stated: "I think it's also positive how- that this provides an aspect of hope. I think so much of this work in this movement is just, it's sad and it's hard, and it seems endless when you're dealing with survivors. So, I think having primary prevention be a part, kind of gives us all an opportunity to realize that, yes, there are survivors. And, it is hard to be aware of that and to be active in that, but there's also work being done to stop this." She added: "I don't think anybody wants to think about doing this work forever. We would all like to think about putting ourselves out of a job, because we've just reduced the numbers so much." She also stated: "I just keep that hope that- that yeah, this is a – this is a long journey, but I really do believe that we're making small steps every day."

Even with the positive outlook, Jane also struggled with the shift to primary prevention, stating "it's been a big challenge ... both with me and with our community partners" in getting on board with the shift and incorporating "multiple components to our programs." She stated that it was challenging to get enough time with community partners to effectively saturate them with prevention techniques. She also felt

overwhelmed with all the “components involved” in the models and guidelines recommended by the funders for the shift.

Jane also was frustrated with the order of the trainings; as she stated: “Sometimes things seem out of sequence, like doing the evaluation training was helpful, but we’ve been doing interventions for over a year.” But she added: “I think it kind of has to be this way.” She did feel that the grantors were supportive and said “I know that I can – can contact folks to get help and they’ve.. all been receptive and easy to approach.” Jane also expressed frustration with the long- term process when she stated: “I think mainly how long like it’s really going to take. I – you know, I guess I expected things to happen a lot faster.”

*Participant check.* After Jane’s interview was transcribed, it was sent to her for review. She reviewed the transcript for accuracy; she did not make any changes to the document; and she confirmed that all the information was correct.

### *Elizabeth*

*Initial interview.* The interview was conducted over the telephone per Elizabeth’s request. It was conducted during the day and lasted for one and a half hours. She appeared relaxed and eager to share her story.

Elizabeth indicated that she found the shift to primary prevention as “overall good. I just get frustrated ... at some points, feeling like I want to quit and start over the right way. Because it seems like every time we learn something new, we’re learning something we should have already known or should have already done. So, it’s- you know, I get the feeling that I want to stop whatever intervention I’m doing and start

again..in the right order.” Elizabeth stated: “I think the frustrating piece is- the backwards- going backwards in the training... Like learning about evaluations after they’re already expected to be done or doing a community assessment after it should have already been done.” She also was frustrated with the lack of organization with the shift in the first year. She stated: “Even something as simple as what their (the grantors) expectations are and what they want to know goes from like, one week their expectation is this and then a week and a half later they want more.”

She stated that one big challenge for her was “not getting the feedback that you desire.. even when they (the grantors) are unclear... They are giving limited responses to what they’re asking. Or if you ask too soon, they don’t have an answer for it because it has to come down from whomever those powers that may be.” She did add: “I like the idea of the primary prevention moving as a whole and I would definitely support them increasing the number of RPE programs in the state. I think the second batch would be a lot better coming through than this first round, being it’s just all new and – to everyone but now I feel like, as they have gone through it once, it will be there for them to present it in the order in which it will be better understood.”

With all of her frustrations in the first year, Elizabeth still kept a positive attitude and mindset. She stated: “I’m excited about a collective movement towards moving things upstream; we’re going into primary preventions.” She added that you “have to go in and you have to keep maintaining the positive attitude about the longtime goals.” She also stated that “the desire and readiness to move forward has been really influential.” She also felt that being flexible and adaptable were positive attributes needed. She stated:

“You have to do a transition or if you were on the wrong track and now have to change your intervention plans or ideas, be confident and know that even change is good.”

*Participant check.* Elizabeth was given the transcribed interview to review. She reviewed the transcript for accuracy and she confirmed that all the information was correct and accurate.

*Ann*

*Initial interview.* The interview was conducted over the telephone per Ann’s request. It was conducted during the evening and there were no interruptions. The interview lasted for one hour and fifteen minutes. She was nervous at first but seemed to relax as the interview proceeded.

Ann characterized the shift to primary prevention as: “everyone is getting frustrated.” She stated: “The frustration comes when the answers are not known or if you’re doing something and you’re put on hold.” She even added: “I felt like I was going to quit at one point.” Ann also stated that there was confusion and she felt that with this new shift being experimental, it “just leaves you void and wondering what’s next.”

When asked about the grantors, Ann stated: “They have really been very supportive”; they are a phone call away or a workshop away.” She also felt that the trainings were “very helpful.” But, she too felt that the first year lacked logical order and that “the first component should have been the community assessments.” She also felt that she found herself in a very “lonely state” and that she “tried to do it on my own.” So, she experienced a great sense of isolation with this position in the first year, despite the feeling that the grantors were supportive.

*Participant check.* Ann reviewed the transcribed interview and made a few minor changes. The researcher then discussed with her the changes and she confirmed that all the information was correct.

### Common Themes from the Structured Interviews

The themes that emerged from the qualitative data include *need for knowledge of impacts of sexual violence, no feminist theory background, are they partners or not, discounted old way of doing prevention in rape crisis centers, networking with other prevention coordinators, men as allies, and lack of logical order.*

#### *Need for Knowledge of Impacts of Sexual Violence*

Themes emerged regarding the need for sexual violence background and training. Jane stated: “It makes my work so much more real, I guess, when I think about if I had no knowledge of actual survivors and – and had no vision of people, human people, who are suffering from this. I think that it helps motivate me in my work to know , to be aware and be surrounded by the one-on-one work that my colleagues are doing to help women get through this.” Addison stated that the prevention coordinator needed “familiarity with the agency” to understand the basics of the agency purpose and mission. Delaney addressed one of the required trainings where she felt “that specific organization, they were coming from a place of not really having done sexual violence prevention. They- they were very well versed in prevention theory and primary prevention theory as a whole, but not so much with this specific type of prevention. So it would have been helpful to hear from someone who had actually tried to do this type of prevention work.” Ella, when asked if she had worked with a rape crisis center in the past, stated “I have



not.” She also stated that her work in the past year had “been extremely eye opening” as well as “it was amazing to me that, even at a local level, that we had people going ‘Oh well, that just means that it doesn’t happen.’ Ella also expressed frustration and surprise with the attitudes of her community where some people still think “that it’s strictly a female issue.. whenever I get out to the community, people are really, really, really tied up with the rape myth acceptance.. it’s just , it’s frustrating.” Grace stated: “I haven’t done, you know, direct services or anything else.” Elizabeth stated that she felt that a good prevention coordinator would be “someone that is aware-at least has some type of awareness about sexual violence.”

Jane also stated that she believed she can affect change: “I feel like this is the better- most opportunity for change, and I really do feel hopeful about it.” Jane also stated: “I’m not saying I was blind to it before, but, you know, the more aware you become to those kinds of injustices you just start seeing them everywhere. And, I- I think that I’ve passed that on to my family, especially, and my- my friends, you know, because I talk about it... So, I mean, I think it’s kind of invaded my personal life... And, this job has really changed that for me in thinking, ‘Huh. This is something I really like and I like- I like what I do. And, I feel strongly about it.” Jane: “I think so much of this work in this movement is just, it’s sad and it’s hard, and it seems endless when you’re dealing with survivors. So, I think having primary prevention be a part of our agency kind of gives us all an opportunity to realize that, yes there are survivors. And, it is hard to be aware of that and to be active in that, but there’s also work being done to stop this.”

### *Are They Partners or Not*

Participants identified different types of barriers and suggestions for easing the shift to primary prevention efforts. It appears that the participants not only struggled with the concept of primary prevention itself, but also with the way the shift occurred or was imposed on agencies by the funders. The participants felt that there were arbitrary limitations placed on the position duties and the way CDC and NC DHHS structured the process. Some of the participants also spoke of resentment felt by themselves, the agency, or the community about the new approach to prevention. Ann stated: “It has really been kind of a rough road for me.” She stated she found herself “isolated and not from wanting to be isolated... but being that person that was targeted on some of the requirements, job duties.. like sharing the cell phone... what my job description detailed and it was hard on me.” Grace also referred to her sense of isolation: “I still kind of felt this sense of isolation. And, I felt like I was out there trying to do this all by myself.”

The participants also mentioned not being sure about the new shift and its effectiveness for change. Grace stated: “I’m not entirely convinced that the model that’s used fits sexual violence prevention in the same way that it does general injury prevention.” She continued that, “In theory it looks great, it sounds great, but trying to do it, not being on the ground and trying to implement that, in reality it’s very difficult.” And then Grace said, “Again, you know, they’d laid the theoretical foundation for us, but, you know, the practical foundation was really, you know, something that we had to kind of muddle through on our own.”

The participants felt that having a positive mindset was helpful in the shift, staying hopeful and flexible. Elizabeth stated that she feels she has “to go in and you have to keep maintaining the positive attitude about the longtime goal verses sharing with them or letting them see you sweat, so to speak.” Elizabeth: “I’m excited about a collective movement towards moving things upstream” Jane states: “I’ll have to just remind myself and just keep that hope that-that yeah, this is a – this is a long journey, but I really do believe that we’re making small steps everyday.” Ella stated: “but I feel like I’m making a difference in our program participants’ lives ...and being able to help them.” Delaney also commented: “I felt like it really went well and my impression was that it did affect these young people. It motivated me.”

#### *Discounted Old Ways of Conducting Prevention Programs*

The participants seemed to value the old way of conducting education programs based on awareness of sexual violence and on risk-reduction. The larger agencies, with better funding and more staff, seemed to have an easier transition to the requirements of this new grant because they had the resources to hire a person to continue with what the CDC deemed secondary prevention efforts. Addison stated: “I still have a love for, you know, for everything we do... I’ll be honest, I mean, I still do things because, you know, I think it’s important.” Addison also said, “We actually hired somebody.. to do some training.” Grace also mentioned: “we didn’t want to let go of any of the programs that we had, because after all, this- new RPE stuff is supposed to be very- it’s new. It’s experimental. We don’t know that necessarily that this is – you know, that this is the model that will be permanently adopted. I was afraid that, well, maybe after two years,

they'll say, 'well, okay. This doesn't look like it's really working. Just go back and do what you used to be doing.' But, if we had dropped any of our programs, then it would not have been very easy to pick them up again." Grace has a good point that it is hard to invest in an experimental process and to let go of old ways of doing things without having knowledge that the new way will be more effective. If the new shift is not effective, the agency as a whole could be viewed by the community as unstable and unsure about what they are doing.

Another issue that emerged was that the participants did not feel that the way they or their agencies had been addressing sexual violence prevention was being valued by the funders of the new approach, even though those programs had been valued (some for many years) by their communities. All directives, guidelines, and trainers from CDC referred to the established ways of conducting sexual violence prevention programs as secondary prevention, which they defined as, "Immediate responses after sexual violence has occurred to deal with the short-term consequences of violence" (CDC, 2004, p. 3). The agencies viewed their previous efforts as attempts to prevent victimization "before it ever happens" by presenting safety and risk-reduction programs to audiences. Those audiences did sometimes include individuals who had already been victims of sexual abuse or assault, and those individuals did sometimes disclose and come forward to receive support and counseling ("direct services"). So agencies viewed "the old way of doing things" as a combination of prevention and outreach.

Coordinators were confused about the CDC's concept of secondary prevention and where, if at all, primary prevention addressed the issue of risk-reduction. Grace

stated: “Since we’re looking at the (potential) perpetrators in primary prevention of sexual violence, it’s- we’re having to change other people’s behavior with- you know, the difference with injury prevention, you can say, ‘Okay, I’m going to wear my seatbelt, so that I have a better chance of surviving a car accident.’” This mindset is really one of risk reduction and one that a lot of the rape crisis centers embraced prior to this shift to primary prevention. Grace continued: “The injury prevention and public health models are attractively simple and make sense for injury prevention, such as wearing seat belts or bicycle helmets to prevent serious injuries from accidents. In these cases it’s about individuals making choices that benefit them directly. It’s a simple equation: wearing my seatbelt = greater chance that I will survive a car accident. From a primary prevention perspective, this is victim reduction. Intervening before the car accident is more analogous to the primary prevention goal of stopping the perpetration of sexual violence. Within this framework then, the focus should be on changing the knowledge, attitudes and behaviors of drivers so that they’re less likely to cause accidents and hurt others. It’s not about improving their safety and chances of survival; it’s about changing their KAB’s so others will be safe. That’s a harder sell... And sexual violence prevention is even further complicated because of all the baggage that comes with anything having to do with sex and gender.” Grace also stated: “It’s one thing to talk about changing your own behavior to protect yourself. And, I see how that works really well, high school safety, buckling up, not drinking and driving, all those. But, since we’re talking about- we’re not talking about victim reduction in primary prevention when it comes to sexual violence.”

### *Networking with Other Prevention Coordinators*

Another theme that emerged from the interviews was that the prevention coordinators wanted and needed networking with other prevention coordinators. They stated they needed more time to communicate with each other during the required trainings and that they would like to know what the others are experiencing in hopes of learning and clarifying what they are experiencing.

Elizabeth stated that “networking with other people” was a big benefit to the required trainings. Delaney stated: “I would say keep in touch with your other RP coordinators. I was-have been- very supported by the other RP coordinators in the state.” Grace commented that she would have liked more networking with other prevention coordinators: “You know, maybe at some of our meetings when we got together, you know, we would have breaks and there would be lunch, and we had a chance to talk to each other... I know there was some effort to, you know, set up an online, you know, kind of a List Serve kind of thing with the RPE Coordinators, but that didn’t really get off the ground. I mean, you know, the first- when it was first set up, there were a few posts back and forth. But, I think if there was a way, if we had been able to talk to each other more, just kind of to support each other.” She added that she and other prevention coordinators “would share that information with me and I would do the same thing. And, that was very helpful, so I kind of felt like I had this kind of an ally or a buddy.” She continued, noting that “it was always very comforting to know that, you know, this person had some of the same issues, or it was just interesting to know what they were doing. You know, to find out about their approach.” Ann added: “having someone that

you can rely on and having the RPE's, the other RPE's to really correspond with. And if there's any problem that's going on that we can definitely talk that out." She said she would appreciate the opportunity for "speaking with RPE's and finding out that they have the same types of restraints as I have."

Jane stated that it might be helpful if "we could somehow utilize the folks that have been doing it for a while, and have a better understanding of things... maybe utilize them within the training; you're like partnered with our peers who need more help."

### *Men as Allies*

Another theme that arose from the interviews was having men as allies. Jane stated: "I think one thing that's really great is- is the way that this program has helped us think about including men as allies in this movement... recruiting men not just for the sexual violence task force, but for some of our other committees and just volunteer opportunities." Elizabeth added that "I would say one of the greatest successes through our interventions... is having more males involved in the movement, I think, is such a great success within itself but actually having young men trained and educated .. I feel like the long- term effects are so much more positive than we can imagine because we're starting to work with young men, educating them." Ann also mentioned the importance of having men as allies "recruiting the males.. and getting them on board," "Just having them from the community for male mentors.. {that} they come on and really be mentors for these young males because I'm a female." Ann felt that having men as allies would increase the effectiveness of the programs and give the males another male to identify with instead of the information just coming from a female perspective.

### *Lack of Logical Order*

All seven participants clearly stated that lack of logical order was one major issue related to their frustration about the shift to primary prevention. The participants stated that the way the material and trainings were presented was backwards. The North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services was working in conjunction with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in addressing a new way of providing prevention efforts for sexual violence. This process was described to the agencies as a new concept and funded agencies were to be seen as pioneers in a new process/ shift in thinking about primary prevention. North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services held an initial informational workshop for agency directors addressing the changes. The agency directors had to attempt to grasp the concept/models and then submit the grant proposals.

Agencies were tasked with writing a grant which would include two primary prevention programs which addressed two levels of the ecological model. Thus, agencies had to devise two different programs that would be classified as primary prevention under the new definitions, prior to having an understanding of the new shift, definitions etc. and prior to creating a community task force and conducting a needs assessment. After funding was provided, the programs were to implement the stated programs. Once the 17 programs were selected, agencies hired staff to fill the position. The agencies were given four months to hire someone for the position and then the first two required trainings were held. . The funded agencies struggled with the ever- changing guidelines, objectives and order of the process. The process, from the grant writing to the trainings,



all seemed out of order. There was no logical order because it appeared to most participants that the community assessments and creation of community taskforces needed to happen before writing a grant for programs that were funded. The participants stated that it would have been more logical to have conducted the community assessment prior to conducting the intervention. The participants stated that having training on the community assessment first, then conducting the community assessment and then developing the interventions would have been more logical. Most participants felt that the process that they had endured during the past year was backwards. They all stressed the importance for the next round of prevention coordinators to be presented with a more logical order and organization. Most prevention coordinators were frustrated with the lack of order of this process, more so than with any other aspect of the North Carolina primary prevention grant initiative.

Addison stated: “We had to kind of do it all backwards. We had to come up with our project first, and then, you know, do our community assessment, our task force, everything like that, later, when, you know, it should be the community assessment and then, you know, you’re doing.. it just kind of went in reverse order.” Delaney added: “It does feel like the things that are happening now would have been- it would have been better for them to happen earlier, but..” Ella stated in regard to the training and order: “I think it is a little late.” Grace said, “I’m sure you’ve heard this from everybody this – you know, the fact that everything was backwards. You know, that right now, we’re doing the community assessment at the end of the second year... but if things could have even been delayed so that everything was in place so we could have started with the

community assessment. You know, kind of gone in order- the – a logical order.. rather than, you know, the first thing that we had to do was come up with our interventions. And, then we started working backwards.” Jane continued with “I guess, sometimes things seem out of sequence... I think if- in some ways it would have been helpful to have everything organized before we ever started our interventions.” Elizabeth added: “I think the frustrating piece is- the backwards- going backwards in the training.. like learning about evaluations after they’re already expected to be done or doing a community assessment after it should have already been done... do it in a successive order a lot earlier in the grant process.. I just get frustrated because at some points, feeling like I want to quit and start over the right way. Because it seems like every time we learn something new, we’re learning something we should have already known or should have already done. So, it’s – you know, I get the feeling that I want to stop whatever intervention I’m doing and start again.. in the right order.” Ann also stated: “I feel the first component or initiative that should have been taken on should have been the community assessment to find the needs in the communities that were granted.”

### Triangulation

Triangulation is important for the credibility of the findings of a study (Huberman & Miles, 1994). Triangulation was used as a qualitative type of internal validity; the archival data analysis of the trainings as well as the annual reports helped give reliability and validity to some of the issues being brought up in the case studies and qualitative interview questions. The archival data, annual reports and the semi-structured interviews were coded by the coding team and were used to look for common themes among each

and across all three types of data. This allowed the researcher to discover if all three forms of data collection encountered similar codes and themes. The rich descriptions that were looked for in the responses during the interviews also gave validity to this research study.

This section triangulated the semi-structured interviews, archival data, and annual reports, and is used for internal validity. It should be noted that the archival data and semi-structure interviews were confidential, but the annual reports were reports that went directly to the grantor with the agency name attached to any comments. All three data sources were coded by the same coding team and common themes emerged across all three types of data. Thus, based on the triangulation of data and findings, it does appear that there is strong support of internal validity.

### *Frustration*

It appears that across the semi-structured interviews, archival data, and annual reports there was a common theme of frustration. In the previous sections, the data from the semi-structured interviews revealed that each participant showed signs of frustration. This was also prevalent in the archival data. There were comments of frustration with the shift due to its being “difficult to simply drop the activities that are not strictly primary prevention since these services have been a part of our agency for many years. It is unfortunate that the RPE funding could not have been in addition to what was in place to give us more time to transition.” Another comment was “it has been difficult letting pieces of that go while I try to figure out feasible interventions at other levels of the SEM.” Another wrote: “I have seen resentment and a lack of team participation in

accepting the PC position. It has taken a few months for them (other staff) to accept it.” Someone else added: “We really need to figure out what to do to prevent sexual violence!” And finally one person stated: “Instead of being told ‘no’ that’s not primary prevention- provide alternatives, useful material or how to maybe turn it into usefulness.”

The annual report also had some themes of frustration. One person stated that “the biggest challenge was having to change our initial plans and quickly find a new group with which to work.” Another added: “I know that we have explored various ways to foster relationships between other coalitions and networks and the importance of that, but I am still a little unclear to what extent the CDC wants us to be actively involved in those networks.” Someone else added: “I understand that this is a learning process for all...but, I am not 100% confident in the expectations of the CDC.” Another issue of concern and frustration was: “Since all of the RPE agencies are so diverse in their programming, I would like more critical feedback. It is difficult to gauge one’s successes with another’s successes when the program is completely different.”

### *Lack of Organization*

In all three data sources also showed a common theme of lack of organization. In the previous sections, the semi-structured interviews captured this theme through the codes of lack of organization and lack of logical order. In the archival data, one commented: “It would have been helpful to better present the prevention track and outline what would be covered.” Another added: “We got completely off track and now I don’t have the knowledge I hoped to gain.

In examining the annual report, coders found this comment: “One of the initially proposed programs was not able to be carried out... There was also scheduling conflicts with the school in addition to the individual schedules... I decided that we needed to take another route for a second intervention. After speaking (to the funders) the decision was made to put this program on hold until I could work out all of the logistics.”

#### *Networking with Prevention Coordinators'*

Another common theme among all three data sources was the desire to network with other prevention coordinators. In the archival data, someone commented that they: “enjoyed group activities and opportunity to hear from other participants their thoughts and ideas to the issue.” The annual reports also reflected this: : “I have tried to keep lines of communication open between myself and other RPEs, but the programs are completely different and I oftentimes reevaluate what I am doing in relation to another agency’s program.”

#### *Need for Best Practices*

Another common theme between the archival data and semi-structured interviews was the need for best practices to serve as examples.. This theme did not necessarily present itself in the annual reports, but this type of information was also not asked in regards to the output for the annual report. The archival data provided comments like: “I’m ready for implementation, concrete examples”; “Best practices would have been helpful”; “I thought this would be more practical, how exactly can I put powerpoint into practice, what activities can I/we do within our community?”; “An actual working curriculum that addresses all segments of the ecological model in prevention needed”; “I

guess I'm wanting more of the what"; "We need information on how to use the tools"; "Let's talk about the tools!!"; "Wish we would get to concrete material action steps"; and "need more working tools, ideas, recommendations."

### Summary

This chapter presented the lessons and themes from all of the case studies and was organized by themes. Themes reflected the attitudes of the participants' semi-structured interviews. The next chapter, Chapter 5, will include a summary of chapters one through four and will integrate the findings from this study with the existing literature review. The limitations of this study and future research and practice will also be discussed.

## CHAPTER 5

### DISCUSSION

This chapter summarizes the research results and relates them to the goals and purpose of this study. This chapter also includes limitations of the study, its relation to current and previous research, and a discussion of future directions.. The purpose of this study was to utilize a qualitative approach to implement an exploratory examination of the data derived from semi-structured interviews of prevention coordinators' expressed opinions and attitudes about the first year of transition to primary prevention of sexual violence. The main goal of this study was to illuminate the lived experiences of the participants in order to identify themes which could shed light on the transition process and lead to helpful suggestions or recommendations for the future.

A review of the literature gave insights into the prevalence of sexual violence and the need for prevention efforts. Radical feminist theory (Saulnier, 1996) and Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory (1979) were examined because they appeared to be the most useful theories to help build or construct an approach to primary prevention programs. Radical feminist theory was examined because many rape crisis centers were founded by activists in the women's movement and were based in feminist thought. Feminist theory also influenced the approach to sexual violence prevention efforts engaged in by those same community-based rape crisis programs. The ecological systems theory was relevant to the topic of sexual violence prevention due to the fact that

this is the main theory the CDC encouraged prevention coordinators to utilize in the development of primary prevention programs.

In order to accomplish the research goal and questions, the author conducted semi-structured interviews with seven female prevention coordinators employed by agencies which received rape prevention grants in North Carolina.. The semi-structured interview, which allowed participants to elaborate on their first-year experience, was the main form of data collection. The validity of this study was established by using different validity checks. First, a pilot case study was conducted in which the researcher interviewed a prevention coordinator who provided feedback on the semi-structured interview questions, procedure, and style. Second, participants' checks were conducted so that the participants felt the researcher captured their feelings and statements accurately. Third, the researcher utilized research reflexivity to help decrease researcher bias where the researcher openly stated biases and personal beliefs. Fourth, an auditor, someone who is not involved in the research, was used to provide secondary analysis of data to verify the consistency of agreement of research methods, interpretation and the conclusions. The fifth type of validity was triangulation.

Qualitative data involves many issues in validity, reliability, and biases; therefore, the researcher kept a journal throughout the process to help reflect and discover any biases before the interviews began, as well as to evaluate her own biases, reflect on the process of interviewing, and express any other concerns that surfaced during the process. The journals provided researcher reflexivity, which is a validity procedure in qualitative research whereby the researcher self- discloses personal beliefs, assumptions, and biases



(Creswell & Miller, 2000). Reflexivity means being sensitive to the ways the researcher and process have shaped the collected data, including the role of biases and assumptions which can influence data collection. Personal biases need to be made clear at the outset of all research reports to enhance the credibility of findings (Mays & Pope, 2000).

In the present study, the researcher used research reflexivity by self-disclosing, in journal format, all biases and beliefs prior to the start of the research project. The trained auditor, who reviewed the journals, had discussions with the researcher to help keep the researcher in check and to attempt to prevent the researcher's biases from affecting the outcomes of the study. An auditor was also sent all data analysis to aid with accuracy of the coding books and emerging themes. The auditor supported the findings and stated that they were representative of the data. The auditor also reviewed the researcher's coding journal, which was kept throughout the analysis and used as a strategy for researcher reflexivity and to increase validity and help illuminate biases related to the data. The journal spoke to the process, biases, and feelings of the researcher during and after the interviews as well as to issues occurring within the coding team.

Triangulation was used as a qualitative type of internal validity; the archival data analysis of the trainings as well as the annual reports helped give reliability and validity to some of the issues being brought up in the case study and qualitative interview questions. The archival data, annual reports and the semi-structured interviews were coded by the same coding team and were used to look for common themes among each and across all three types of data. This allowed the researcher to discover if all three forms of data collection revealed similar codes and themes. The rich descriptions that

were looked for in the responses during the interviews also gave validity to this research study.

There are two strategies that were utilized, selected from those most often recommended to enhance reliability for multiple case study designs. Yin (1982) recommended the use of a case study protocol (see Appendix C) where the basic theory and type of information collected and excluded, as well as the procedures used, are outlined so the study could be replicated. This study documented and developed a case study protocol to increase reliability.

Yin (1982) also suggested using multiple coders. Multiple coders and consensus coding were utilized in this study in a further attempt to incorporate and improve validity by making sure all coders arrived at a consensus on the codes and themes of all qualitative data (the archival data, annual reports and semi-structured interviews). The research analysis utilized a coding team and Atlas ti computer software. The coding team consisted of four coders who all acknowledged their existing biases before beginning the analysis of the data and also continually checked the codes to the exact wording of the participants to reduce possible coding bias.

Codebooks were created for each interview (see Appendix D). The results addressed the participants' experiences in the first year of the transition to a new way of addressing primary prevention. Validity checks were implemented throughout the coding and analysis by comparing results to the original words of the participants. Each interview was individually coded by each member of the coding team and then the coding team met and created common codes. Once the coding book had been created and applied

to all of the data, inter-rater reliability was deduced using Kappa. Kappa scores were determined separately for each section of analysis and scores are reported in Table 1.

A trained coding team was utilized to improve validity and support the accuracy of themes. The codes were checked against participants' actual words, inter-rater reliability was assessed, strategies were implemented for research reflexivity, and an auditor was used to check common codes and themes for accuracy (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

### Summary of Results

In chapter 4, the individual interviews provided insight into the participants' lived experiences in the first year of transition to a new way of approaching primary prevention of sexual violence. This information provided data on specific and common themes. During the data analysis, numerous common themes emerged from the interviews. The most common themes identified and gleaned by the qualitative data included: the need for knowledge of the impacts of sexual violence, lack of feminist theory background, confusion about shift to primary prevention, resentment that funders discounted the old way of doing prevention in rape crisis centers, a need for networking with other prevention coordinators, a need for men as allies, and the lack of logical order.

Therefore, it seems important that all future coordinators of primary prevention programs have training and an understanding of sexual violence history and impacts as well as an understanding of feminist theory. At the very onset of training, giving prevention coordinators an understanding of radical feminist theory, which is, after all, one of the main theories upon which rape crisis centers were founded, may give them a

solid foundation on which to base their prevention efforts. Feminist theory has many tenants; among them is one that looks at the prevalence of violence against women, particularly in the forms of sexual and physical assaults. This theory holds that violence is political in nature and violence against women is about control and domination (Saulnier, 1996). Therefore, any program designed to prevent sexual violence must surely address the societal and gender issues of control and power.

Training the prevention coordinators about the history of the rape crisis movement would further build on the solid foundation. The rape crisis centers were feminist in nature not only due to their being organized by women who were seeking to change existing power structures, but also because their founders endeavored to establish a female- based power structure in their own organizations. They felt that if they were not able to affect power change in the rape crisis centers, then they would not be able to stop rape in society (Fried, 1994). It is also important to understand that the anti-rape movement has made great strides but is still far from ending sexual violence and the need for rape crisis services.

The lessons of this section identified that training on feminist theory and sexual violence is a must in helping train prevention coordinators. It would be the recommendation that these be the first steps in training prevention coordinators to develop and implement primary prevention programs. Only after these concepts are grasped and coordinators have a solid understanding of these concepts would it be appropriate to introduce Bronfenbrenner's ecological model. The application of the ecological model could aid in understanding the multifaceted and multilayered nature of

violence and give the prevention coordinators additional tools for development of effective prevention programs.

Participants also identified different types of barriers and suggestions for easing the shift to primary prevention efforts. It appears that the participants not only struggled with the concept of primary prevention itself, but also with the way the shift occurred or was imposed on agencies by the funders. The participants felt that there were arbitrary limitations placed on the position duties and the way CDC and NC DHHS structured the process. Some of the participants also spoke of resentment felt by themselves, the agency or the community about the new approach to prevention.

Despite some of the struggles in this first year of transition most participants kept a positive mindset and believed that primary prevention and finding ways to end sexual violence were needed. The participants even with some of the challenges were able to find ways to keep hope alive and the desire to make change. The participants also felt they were supported by the grantors during the process even with the struggles they faced during the first year. The struggles could be impart a result of a new concept and it is hoped that some of the barriers that this first wave faced be lessened in the future and the next wave of prevention coordinators.

Another theme that emerged was that prevention coordinators often felt that their or their agencies' old ways of conducting prevention programs were discounted. One recommendation gleaned from this theme is that maybe there should not have been a sudden and complete shift to primary prevention, not an either/or process. Instead, it could have been just as effective and more acceptable to agencies and their communities

to incorporate or add primary prevention concepts to programs that the agency already had up and running. It appears that this might have allowed the prevention coordinators, agencies, and communities more time in transition and a way to test a new initiative for effectiveness while not giving up programs that had taken years of effort to get accepted and established in schools and communities. Most programs, if they could afford to, would have continued their old prevention efforts as well as including the new. This might be an idea for the future and could well result in more buy-in by agencies, as well as by communities.

Another common theme that emerged from the interviews was that the prevention coordinators wanted and needed networking with other prevention coordinators. They stated they needed more time to communicate with each other during the required trainings and that they would like to know what the others are experiencing in hopes of learning and clarifying what they are experiencing.

The common theme of men as allies also offers another lesson learned. This lesson is significant in that it is important to gain allies in the fight against sexual violence. For many years, sexual violence has been viewed as just a woman's issue, but it is more than that; sexual violence affects everyone, male and female. So, it is important to involve males in the effort to end sexual violence and for men to take a stand against sexual violence.

The final common theme that emerged was lack of logical order and was one of the major issues related to prevention coordinators' frustration with the shift to primary prevention. The participants stated that the order of the material and trainings presented

was backwards. The North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services was working in conjunction with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in addressing a new way of providing prevention efforts for sexual violence. This process was described to the agencies as a new concept and funded agencies were to be seen as pioneers in a new process/ shift in thinking about primary prevention.

The process, from the grant writing to the trainings, all seemed out of order. All the participants seemed to understand that this was a new process and that the first year of this grant would be a learning process. As shown by all participants, feelings were very strong that the community assessment should have come first in the process. This piece seems to be the easiest to remedy in the future. A lesson learned by this is that the community assessment needs to occur prior to writing a grant for funding specific programs. Maybe the first year of the grant could entail training on designing and conducting a community assessment. It is the hope that in the future a more logical order will be utilized in the formation of the request for applications and that funders will take into consideration the fact that money might be better used in the beginning for training, development, and conducting a community assessment. As Addison stated: “The grant itself and what we stated that we were going to be doing was vague.” Once a community assessment has been conducted, it would appear that it would be easier for any agency to develop primary prevention programs specific to the community’s needs. This might also allow for greater community openness and buy-in to the shift to primary prevention of sexual violence.

## Limitations

Like in every study, there are limitations to this study. Internal validity was strengthened by researcher reflexivity, utilizing four trained coders, and utilizing an auditor. The sample size consisted of seven women; this small sample limited the present study. Although the small sample size could limit generalizability, it does offer a baseline for future studies. **The participants also varied in age and experience level, thus the results could be related to the developmental process of life experience.** Another limitation of this study is that all participants are from North Carolina. The perceptions and attitudes of this group could be different from people in other locations. Also, this study only consisted of females and their perceptions and attitudes could be different from males in North Carolina and elsewhere. Therefore, findings of this study may not be generalized to prevention coordinators in other states or to males.

Also, all coders were female. The researcher chose to have all female coders to analyze data from an all female sample. It is unknown if a male coder would have had a different perception of the data. Adding a male coder and male participants might be of interest in the future.

## Implications and Future Research

The themes derived from these data could help professionals gain insight into the lived experiences of first year prevention coordinators' attitudes about an experimental process and a transition in focus on prevention of sexual violence. These common themes could be used in the future to understand more effective ways of integrating new ideas and processes and in making a transition instead of a shift to primary prevention efforts.



One implication is that, first; training on feminist theory and sexual violence is a must in helping train prevention coordinators. It would be the recommendation that these be the first steps in training prevention coordinators to develop and implement primary prevention programs. Only after these concepts are grasped and coordinators have a solid understanding of these concepts would it be appropriate to introduce Bronfenbrenner's ecological model which could aid in understanding the multifaceted and multilayered nature of violence and give the prevention coordinators additional tools for development of effective prevention programs.

Another troubling theme was that it appears that the participants not only struggled with the concept of primary prevention itself, but also with the way the shift occurred or was imposed on agencies by the funders. The participants felt that there were arbitrary limitations placed on the position duties and the way CDC and NC DHHS structured the process. **This first year of the shift to primary prevention appeared to be more of a top-down approach which could be some of the cause for the participants' feelings of frustration toward the process or the funders.** Some of the participants also spoke of resentment felt by themselves, the agency or the community about the new approach to prevention. Using this information, funders could organize strategies to create an open dialogue and make transparent the decisions and reasons behind decisions about how to implement the shift and how to make the concept of primary prevention clearer at the onset of the project. **Another implication with making the process more transparent and less top-down might allow the prevention coordinators to advocate for**

themselves, their agency, their programs, and their former initiatives to possibly decrease their feelings of frustration or helplessness.

Another theme that emerged was that prevention coordinators often felt that the old ways of conducting prevention programs were discounted. One recommendation might be to incorporate or add primary prevention concepts to programs that the agency already had up and running. It appears that this might have allowed the prevention coordinators, agencies, and communities more time in transition and a way to test a new initiative for effectiveness while not feeling like they were giving up programs which had taken years of effort to get accepted and established in schools and communities. Also, it appears that most programs, if they could afford to, would have continued their old prevention efforts as well as including the new. This might be an idea for the future and could well result in more buy-in by agencies as well as communities.

Another common theme that emerged from the interviews was that the prevention coordinators wanted and needed networking with other prevention coordinators. Thus, scheduling time for prevention coordinators to network with each other at trainings and/or encouraging the sharing of information might aid future prevention coordinators and reduce some of the frustrations that were felt by these participants.

A final implication is found in the theme that emerged as lack of logical order. This piece seems to be the easiest to remedy in the future. Maybe in the future, the first year of the grant could entail training on designing and conducting a community assessment. It is the hope that in the future a more logical order will be utilized in the formation of the request for applications and that funders will take into consideration the

fact that money might be better used in the beginning for training, development, and conducting a community assessment. Once a community assessment has been conducted, it would appear that it would be easier for any agency to develop primary prevention programs specific to their community's needs. This might also allow for greater community openness and buy-in to the shift to primary prevention of sexual violence.

The implications in this study go beyond just sexual violence programming to general program development and implementation for other areas of violence prevention. It is hoped that these findings can aid in other areas and allow more effective transitions in not just sexual violence prevention but in the bigger scope of prevention efforts altogether.

Future research is needed to assess the effectiveness of the shift to primary prevention was conducted. It would be helpful to compare the results of the participants in North Carolina to participants in the other states that are a part of this new process and see if the themes that emerged in North Carolina are common among other states or if they are unique to North Carolina. Future research is also needed on the effectiveness of the process by which the shift occurred and whether the programs were successful in their attempts to decrease sexual violence through their specific prevention interventions.

Future research needs to be done to assess this first wave of prevention coordinators at the end of the three year funding cycle in order to see if they report similar or different attitudes or perceptions of this process. It would be interesting to follow these prevention coordinators through the end of this grant and to re-interview them to help gain an understanding of their whole experience, not just the first year of the project. Also, research is needed to examine whether the second wave of prevention

coordinators in the next grant cycle will report similar or different attitudes about transitioning to primary prevention of sexual violence.

This study also only examined female prevention coordinators' attitudes and perspectives. At the present, there is no additional empirical research that supports the findings of this study. Consequently, further research is needed on updating and replicating the instrument and protocol used in this study with different populations and locations.

### Concluding Remarks

Research on primary prevention of sexual violence is relatively new. Primary prevention efforts have only recently begun to gain the interest of funders and, indeed, of society at large. Sexual violence continues to affect our world and its high prevalence suggests that more must be done to prevent it. People of all ages, genders, races, ethnicities, and socio-economic backgrounds are affected by sexual violence and researchers, educators, and mental health providers must join forces with each other and with grassroots activists to develop and implement effective prevention efforts. It is also extremely important to evaluate these efforts and to share the results. The researcher hopes that this study will not only provide new data, but that it also allows a forum for the voices and feelings of these seven prevention coordinators.

## REFERENCES

- AMA diagnostic and treatment guidelines concerning child abuse and neglect (1985).  
*Journal of the American Medical Association*, 254, 796-800.
- Barbour, R. (2001). Checklists for improving rigor in qualitative research: A case of the tail wagging dog? *British Medical Journal*, 322, 1115-1117.
- Basit, T.(2003). Manual or electronic? The role of coding in qualitative data analysis.  
*Educational Research*, 45, 143-154.
- Beasley, C. (1999). *What is feminism?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1992). Ecological systems theory. In R. Vasta (Ed.), *Six theories of child development: Revised formulations and current issues* (pp. 187-248). Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley.
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Ceci, S. J. (1994). Nature-nurture reconceptualized in developmental perspective: A bioecological model. *Psychological Review*, 101, 568-586.
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Evans, G. W. (2000). Developmental science in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: Emerging questions, theoretical models, research designs and empirical findings. *Social Development*, 9(1), 115-125.

- Brownmiller, S. (1975). *Against our will*. New York: Bantam.
- Cahill, A. (2000). Foucault, rape and the construction of the feminine body. *Hypatia*, 15, 43-64.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2004). *Sexual violence prevention: beginning the dialogue*. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Preventive (n.d.). *Health and Health Services Block Grant*. Retrieved on November 2, 2007, from <http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/blockgrant/faqs.htm#What>.
- Collins, P.H. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness and the politics of empowerment*. Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman.
- Cresswell, J. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J., & Miller, D. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory Into Practice*, 39, 124-130.
- Crowell, N.A., & Burgess, A.W. (Eds.), (1996). *Understanding violence against women*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Dalla, R. (2000). Exposing the 'Pretty Woman' myth: A qualitative examination of the lives of female streetwalking prostitutes. *Journal of Sex Research*, 37, 344-353.
- Daro, D., & Salmon-Cox, S. (1994). *Child sexual abuse prevention programs--Do they work?* Washington, DC: National Resource Center on Child Abuse and Neglect.
- D.C. Rape Crisis Center (n.d.) History of the D.C. Rape Crisis Center. Retrieved on November 2, 2007, from <http://www.dcrcc.org/history.htm>.

- Delmar, R. (1986). What is feminism? In J. Mitchell and A. Oakley, & Basil Blackwell (Eds), *What is feminism?* (pp. 8) New York: Pantheon.
- Department of Justice. (2002) *Criminal victimization 2001*. Retrieved on November 11, 2007, from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/cv01.pdf>.
- Department of Justice. (2003). *Criminal victimization 2002*. Retrieved on November 11, 2007, from [www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/cv02.pdf](http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/cv02.pdf).
- Donovan, J. (1985). *Feminist theory: The intellectual traditions of American feminism*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing.
- Dupre A., Hampton, H., Morrison, H., & Meeks, G. (1993). Sexual assault. *Obstetrical and Gynecological Survey*, 48, 640-648.
- Echols, A. (1989). *Daring to be bad: Radical feminism in America 1967-1975*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Eisenstein, Z. (1981). *The radical future of liberal feminism*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.
- Elliott, D., & Mok, D. Briere, J. (2004). Adult sexual assault: prevalence, symptomatology, and sex differences in the general population. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 17, 203-215.
- Ellis, L. (1989). *Theories of rape: Inquiries into the causes of sexual aggression*. New York: Hemisphere Publishing Corporation.
- Fisher, B.S., Cullen, F.T., & Turner, M.G. (2000). *The Sexual Victimization of College Women (NCJ 182369)*. United States Department of Justice, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- Finkelhor, D., & Strapko, N. (1992). Sexual abuse prevention education: A review of evaluation studies. In D. J. Willis, E. W. Holden, & M. Rosenberg (Eds.), *Prevention of child maltreatment: Developmental and ecological perspectives* (pp. 150-167). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Fonow, M.M., Richardson, L., & Wemmerus, V.A. (1992). Feminist rape education: Does it work? *Gender and Society*, 6, 108-121.
- Fried, A. (1994). It's hard to change what we want to change: Rape crisis centers as organizations. *Gender and Society*, 8, 562-583.
- Galloway, J., & Sheridan, S. (1994). Implementing scientific practices through case studies: Examples using home-school interventions and consultations. *Journal of School Psychology*, 32, 385-413.
- Gornick, J., Burt, M., & Pittman, K. (1985). Structure and Activities of Rape Crisis Centers in the Early 1980's. *Crime and Delinquency*, 31, 247-268.
- Hazzard, A., Kleemeier, C., Pohl, J., & Webb, C. (1988). Child sexual abuse prevention: Teacher training workshop curriculum. Atlanta: Emory University School of Medicine.
- Hooks, b. (1990). *Yearning: Race, gender and cultural politics*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Jewkes, R., Sen, P., & Garcia-Moreno, C. (2002). Sexual violence. In Krug E., Dahlberg, L. Mercy, editors. *World Report on Violence and Health* (pp. 213-239). Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.



- Kendal-Tackett, K.A., Williams, L.M., Finkelhor, D. (1993). Impact of sexual abuse on children: A review and synthesis of recent empirical studies. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113, 164-180.
- Kohl, J. (1993). School-based child sexual abuse prevention programs. *Journal of Family Violence*, 8, 137-150.
- Koss, M. P., & Harvey, M. (1991). *The rape victim: Clinical and community approaches to treatment*. Lexington, MD: Stephen Greene Press.
- Lang, S., (2005). Urie Bronfenbrenner, father of Head Start program and pre-eminent 'human ecologist,' dies at age 88. Cornell News Service. Retrieved September 21, 2007 from, The Cornell Chronicle Online Web Site:  
<http://www.news.cornell.edu/stories/Sept05/Bronfenbrenner.ssl.html>.
- Lopez, K. & Willis, D. (2004). Descriptive versus interpretive phenomenology: Their contributions to nursing knowledge. *Qualitative Health Research*, 14, 726-735.
- Martin, P. (1990). Rethinking feminist organizations. *Gender and Society*, 4, 182-206.
- Malamuth, N., & Check, J. (1981). The effects of mass media exposure on acceptance of violence against women: A field experiment. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 5, 436-446.
- Mathison, S. (1988). Why triangulate? *Educational Researcher*, March, 13-17.
- Mays, N., & Pope, C. (2000). Assessing quality in qualitative research. *British Medical Journal*, 320, 50-52.
- McCaslin, M., & Scott, K. (2003). The five-question method for framing a qualitative research study. *The Qualitative Report*, 8, 447-461.

- Miles, M. & Huberman, A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Miller, P. (1989). Chapter one. In *Theories of developmental psychology* (pp. 3-29). New York: W. H. Freeman & Company.
- Nes, J., & Iadicola, P. (1989). Toward a definition of feminist social work: A comparison of liberal, radical, and socialist models. *Social Work, 34*, 12-21.
- Nightingale, D., & Cromby, J. (2002). Social construction as ontology: Exposition and example. *Theory & Psychology, 12*, 701-713.
- North Carolina Coalition Against Sexual Assault (n.d.). *An Incomplete History of the Anti-Rape Movement*. Unpublished.
- North Carolina Council for Women and Domestic Violence Commission (2006). Retrieved on November 17, 2007, from [http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2006/offenses/violent\\_crime/forcible\\_rape.html](http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2006/offenses/violent_crime/forcible_rape.html).
- Phenomenology Online (n.d.) Retrieved on November 3, 2007, from, <http://www.phenomenologyonline.com/glossary/glossary.html#lived%20meaning>
- Randolph, M.K., & Gold, C.A. (1994). Child sexual abuse prevention: evaluation of a teacher training program. *School Psychology Review, 23*, 485-496.
- Rickert, V., Wiemann, C. Vaughan, R., & White, J. (2004). Rates and risk factors for sexual violence among an ethnically diverse sample of adolescents. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine, 12*, 1132-9.
- Saulnier, C.F. (1996). *Feminist theories and social work: Approaches and applications*. New York: The Haworth Press.

- Schilling, J. (2006). On the pragmatics of qualitative assessment: Designing the process for content analysis. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 22*, 28-37.
- Silverman, A.B., Reinherz, H.Z., Giaconia, R.M. (1996). The long-term sequelae of child and adolescent abuse: A longitudinal community study. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 20*, 709-723.
- Sontag, J.C. (1996). Toward a comprehensive theoretical framework for disability research: Bronfenbrenner revisited. *Journal of Special Education, 30*, 319-345.
- Steinem, G. (1980). Erotica and pornography: A clear and present difference. In L. Lederer (Ed.), *Take back the night: Women on pornography.* (p. 35-39). New York: William Morrow.
- Tellijohann, S.K., & Everett, S.A. (1997). Evaluation of a third grade sexual abuse curriculum. *Journal of School Health, 67*, 149-154.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2006). Extent, nature, and consequences of rape victimization: findings from the national violence against women survey. Washington: National Institute of Justice. Retrieved on November 15, 2007, from, <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/210346.pdf>.
- Tong, R. (1989). *Feminist thought: A comprehensive introduction.* San Francisco, CA: Westview Press.
- Truman, D.M., Tokar, D.M., & Fischer, A.R. (1996). Dimensions of masculinity: Relations to date rape supportive attitudes and sexual aggression in dating situations. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 74*, 555-562.

- U.S. Department of Justice (1994). *Violence Against Women's Act*. Retrieved on November 2, 2007, from, <http://www.usdoj.gov/ovw/laws/vawa/vawa.htm>.
- U.S. Department of Justice. (2006). *Uniform Crime Report*. Retrieved on November 11, 2007, from, [http://www.fbi.gov/uct/cius2006/offenses/violent\\_crime/forcible\\_rape.html](http://www.fbi.gov/uct/cius2006/offenses/violent_crime/forcible_rape.html).
- White, M., & March, E. (2006). Content analysis: A flexible methodology. *Library Trends*, 55, 22-45.
- Willis, E. (1989). Forward. In Alice Echols, *Daring to be bad: Radical feminism in America 1967-1975*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- World Health Organization (2002). *World Report on Violence and Health*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Web Document: Retrieved September 19, 2007, from the WHO Web Site: [http://www.who.int/violence\\_injury\\_prevention/violence/interpersonal/ip3/en/](http://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/violence/interpersonal/ip3/en/)
- Yeater, E.A., & O'Donohue, W. (1999). Sexual assault prevention programs: Current issues, future directions, and the potential efficacy of interventions with women. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 19, 739-771.
- Yin, R. (1984). *Case study research: Design and methods* (1<sup>st</sup> ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishing.
- Yin, R. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.

## APPENDICES

## Appendix A

### Semi-Structured Interview Questionnaire

1. What is your current age?
2. What is your ethnicity?
3. For what amount of time have you been in the current position of prevention coordinator?
4. For what amount of time have you been working at this agency?
5. Are your prevention effort based in Rural, Urban or both areas?
6. What was your occupation prior to being the Prevention Coordinator?
7. Describe your experience in the last year being the prevention coordinator.
8. What has influenced your views on prevention?
9. What events that have influenced you the most? In what ways?
10. Describe your experience in working at this agency.
11. Do you feel like you are a part of the agency team or an outsider and why?
12. Do you feel different in any way since becoming the prevention coordinator?
13. In which areas do you feel you have grown the most?
14. In which areas of your prevention work do you feel that you need assistance? (i.e. program development, needs assessment etc.)
15. What have been some of your greatest challenges as the prevention coordinator?
16. What have been some of your greatest successes as the prevention coordinator?
17. What parts of the transition from secondary to primary prevention have been the most helpful?
18. What parts of the transition from secondary to primary prevention have been the most frustrating?

## Appendix B

### **INFORMED CONSENT FORM for RESEARCH**

Moving from secondary to primary prevention of sexual violence: Attitudes, Perceptions, and Experiences of Rape Crisis Prevention Coordinators

Principal Investigator: Jeannie Adair

Faculty Sponsor: Dr Nassar-McMillan

#### **INFORMATION**

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be interviewed by the researcher which will be recorded. The recording will be transcribed and used for qualitative research purposes. After the research is completed all recordings will be erased. The recordings will be transcribed by an outside agency who will have entered into a confidential agreement with the researcher. Once transcribed and coded all recordings will be erased. You are invited to take part in a research study which will examine current sexual violence prevention coordinators' experience with the transition from secondary to primary prevention. The only known risk to your participation would be a breach of confidentiality. The steps taken to limit this are described below. While there may be no benefits to you directly, information gained from this study may assist in the development of improved prevention programs, trainings, and technical assistance. If you decide to take part, you will be interviewed by the researcher, Jeannie Adair. You will be asked questions about your experience as the prevention coordinator. The interview will take one two hours. You will also be given the option to look over the data from the interview to make sure that the researcher accurately captured your thoughts and opinions.

#### **CONFIDENTIALITY**

The information in the study records will be kept strictly confidential. No reference will be made in oral or written reports which could link you to the study.

Your signed consent will be kept as record of your participation in this research but this record will be kept confidential. Your name will not be used in any information related to your participation. You will be asked to use a pseudonym during the interview. Your participation is voluntary. No penalty will occur if you decide not to participate. You may stop answering question on the forms at any time. You will receive a copy of this agreement in written form.

## CONTACT

If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact the researcher, Jeannie Adair. If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Dr. David Kaber, Chair of the NCSU IRB for the Use of Human Subjects in Research Committee, Box 7514, NCSU Campus (919/515-3086) or Mr. Matthew Ronning, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Research Administration, Box 7514, NCSU Campus (919/513-2148)

## PARTICIPATION

Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed your data will be returned to you or destroyed at your request.

## CONSENT

**“I have read and understand the above information. I have received a copy of this form. I agree to participate in this study with the understanding that I may withdraw at any time.”**

Subject's signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Investigator's signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_



## Appendix C

### Case Study Protocol

#### A. Introduction and purpose of the case study

The purpose of this research is to examine prevention coordinators' lived experiences as related to the shift from secondary to primary prevention with the ultimate goal of shaping effective prevention approaches for the future. In the past, rape crisis programs have provided advocacy and education programs from a secondary prevention perspective. The CDC has started a new project in hopes to move toward a new focus on prevention, specifically, a movement toward the primary prevention of sexual violence. For decades, rape crisis centers, evolving out of a grassroots movement, relied on the expertise of front-line workers who gained knowledge from survivors of sexual violence. Most current professionals in the field still gain experience from first-hand work "in the trenches" instead of learning theory or receiving formal training in sexual violence issues or prevention.

This research examines the factors that influence the prevention coordinators both positively and negatively, whether they have gained knowledge of the theories and models the CDC is utilizing, and what the adjustment experience has been for each individual.

This qualitative multiple-case study is conducted from a phenomenological perspective which allowed the voices of the providers to emerge and reduce the personal bias of the researcher. The use of phenomenological research means that there were no

research hypotheses formulated ahead of time; the goal was to hear the voices and lived experiences of the participants and their perspectives related to the shift to primary prevention. One goal of phenomenological research is to discover themes that emerge from the participants to help understand the phenomena being investigated. The use of qualitative case studies is essential for this research in order to understand the lived experiences of the prevention coordinators within this shift from secondary to primary prevention of sexual violence.

Due to the numbers of people being sexually victimized and the long term effect sexual violence has on its victims, there was and is a great need for effective prevention programs (Yeater & O'Donohue, 1999). The voices of the prevention coordinators, specifically those who are implementing the new process, will be heard in regards to their views on the shift, how they view the shift personally both within their agency and community, and how they think society has viewed the topic of sexual violence and this recent shift in focus.

In the past, most programs that were being implemented have not been formally evaluated for effectiveness (Crowell & Burgess, 1996) and many prevention coordinators have not been formally trained to conduct prevention programs. The intent of this research is to provide input from those who are implementing this new systems change and to see what types of skills these prevention coordinators possess to weather the transition from secondary to primary prevention of sexual violence.

There are many stakeholders related to this project, including members of the state and federal government who are its funders. This type of data will raise awareness of

what is working and what is not working within the current approaches and methods of shifting programs from secondary to primary prevention. This study seeks to assist the community in becoming more aware of ways to help make the shift in attitudes and practices for programs and individuals involved in primary prevention efforts.

#### B. Research questions

This study is a phenomenological qualitative multiple case study; thus, research questions are used as guides to direct the research. The goal of phenomenological research is to uncover the lived experiences and voices of the participants and their perspectives. The purpose of this study was to uncover the voices of prevention coordinators working at rape crisis programs and reveal their attitudes and perspectives related to the shift in focus from secondary to primary prevention of sexual violence. The research agenda will be framed by the research questions. The following research questions will be examined:

- 1) What themes emerged related to the participants' attitudes about the shift from secondary to primary prevention of sexual violence?
- 2) What themes emerged regarding the participants' perceived support or barriers to the process of shifting to primary prevention, from supervisors, agency, grantors, and community?
- 3) What themes were consistent across cases?
- 4) What are the reported best- practices of the shift in focus from secondary to primary prevention of sexual violence of each participant reported to the researcher?

- 5) How do the prevention coordinators perceive the training and technical assistance that they have received to aid in the transition to primary prevention?
- 6) What advice would the prevention coordinators offer to make this shift easier in the future and what skills would they recommend are needed to be successful?

Learning the answers to these questions will lead to further research on sexual violence primary prevention efforts.

### C. Theoretical framework

An interpretivist/constructivist framework is used to interpret the qualitative data. This type of phenomenology stems from hermeneutics, whereby knowledge is socially constructed by all involved in the research process, and research is a product of the values of the researcher (Lopez & Willis, 2004). Hermeneutics goes beyond a general descriptive look at core concepts and essences in data to discover meanings within everyday life practices. Focus could be considered to be on what humans actually experience rather than what they are aware of consciously (Lopez & Willis, 2004).

The theoretical foundation for this study rested on two related theories, the radical feminist theory (Saulnier, 1996) and ecological systems theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Radical feminist theory (Saulnier, 1996) is deemed most useful by the researcher and is the theory from which most rape crisis centers have evolved. Moreover, among its tenets is one that looks at the prevalence of violence against women, particularly in the

forms of sexual and physical assaults. This theory holds that violence is political in nature and violence against women is about control and domination (Saulnier, 1996).

The ecological systems theory is especially relevant to the topic of sexual violence prevention and is the theory that the CDC is encouraging prevention coordinators to utilize in the development of primary prevention programs. Thus, the researcher felt that Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory (1979) would provide one key theoretical framework to aid research question development and development of the case study protocol.

The theoretical frameworks from which the researcher chose to examine the shift in prevention practices include Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory (1979) and radical feminist theory (Saulnier, 1996). The World Health Organization (2002) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2004) both support the application of an ecological model to help best understand the multifaceted nature of violence. According to the CDC, this model is a critical part of an overall framework for working with sexual violence because it includes both protective and risk factors from multiple domains (CDC, 2004). The ecological model was also one model chosen to teach prevention coordinators ways in which to frame their shift to primary prevention. Therefore, the researcher felt that Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory (1979) would provide one key theoretical framework to aid research question development and development of the case study protocol.

The CDC (2004) acknowledges that there are other theoretical models which attempt to describe root causes of sexual violence, including biological, psychological, and

feminist perspectives. Thus, these two theories, the radical feminist theory (Saulnier, 1996) and ecological systems theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), were both applied in the development of this research project's goals, objectives, protocol, and questionnaire in an effort to better understand sexual violence and its prevention. Radical feminist theory helped the researcher ask about societal issues that might have influenced or affected the prevention coordinators in their first year, such as addressing rape myths, power and dominance, and gender-based attitudes about blame and personal responsibility. The ecological systems theory aided the researcher in devising questions that helped explore how the shift in approach had affected the prevention coordinators personally, as well as how the shift influenced their relationships within their agencies and their communities and with collaborating partners in prevention efforts.

#### D. Data collection procedures

A multiple case study design is employed using a semi-structured interview process. The researcher conducts interviews individually with each of the participants. Interviews are conducted via telephone in order to ensure confidentiality. Ladany, O'Brien, Hill, Melincoff, Knox, & Peterson (1997) conducted phone interviews believing that participants were more likely to reveal sensitive personal information if they knew that their identities were more protected. Furthermore, using the telephone instead of face-to-face allowed for a more relaxed and confidential interview process. The research does note that face-to-face interviews do have advantages such as the interviewer being able to develop more rapport and to see more of the participant's nonverbal behaviors. The semi-structured interview was conducted to gain perspectives from the prevention

coordinators' perceptions, experiences and attitudes during the first year of transition to primary prevention.

The researcher first sends a letter to all potential participants to describe the research project and included a participant consent form that asked for volunteers (see Appendix B for consent letter and form). Once participants reply, the researcher schedules a time to discuss the research further and to make sure volunteers met selection criteria for the research. Once consent is obtained and criteria are met, the researcher sets up a time to conduct the semi-structured interview via telephone.

Each interview begins by obtaining consent to record the conversation on a digital recorder; continued with demographic information questions; proceeded to the interview questions, and finished with a few probing questions related to some of the answers that the participants gave. Appendix A includes a list of all the interview questions.

Interviews are digitally recorded and later transcribed. Once the interviews are transcribed, the researcher sends a copy to the participant for participant check. Once all participants' interviews are reviewed and clarified, they are coded by the researcher and other trained coders.

#### E. Data collection

The following steps are utilized for the data analysis and reduction: (a) Archival data from the training that the grantee received were transferred to rich text format so the data could be analyzed, first by hand coding, and then by using Atlas ti software package (see <http://www.atlasti.com/product.html> for a description of Atlas ti). (b) Data from the annual reports are transferred to rich text format and were analyzed first by hand coding

and then by using Atlas ti software package. (c) Once the interviews take place, the interviews are transcribed. (d) Participants reviewed the data collected from the interview to ensure accuracy. (e) Data from the interviews are then transferred to rich text format (f) Four coders analyze the data using a coding process. Coding was done utilizing multiple coders, assisting with the validity of the process. (g) After each coder individually coded each section of data, the codes were checked and inter-rater reliability was deduced using Kappa. Kappa score was .80 before a common coding set was accepted. (h) Once inter-rater reliability of .80 is attained and coders agreed the coding set represented the data, then the coding set is applied to the data. (i) Emergent themes are assessed from the coded data sets which were useful for understanding the process of the shift from secondary to primary prevention as viewed from the prevention coordinators' perspective. (j) The auditor examines the coding set to reinforce validity. (k) After the auditor supports the findings, the results are reported (l) A discussion of findings will be presented in which the researcher identified and explained uncertainties, rival explanations, and conclusions.



## Appendix D

### Coding Book

#### **Codes\_1: Archival Data**

**Challenging:** Failed to meet expectations, to get to the point.

**Confusing:** Less clear, created by using social ecological model and spectrum of prevention, not clearly defined.

**Difficult:** Hard, different, to transition to primary prevention or shift to other levels, to apply to sexual assault.

**Disrespect:** Cutting off activities/conversations/comments, interrupting, using privilege and power.

**Frustration:** Unclear, unsure, sense of wasting time.

**Group Activities:** group work, role plays, discussion, small group exercises.

**Helpful Training:** A training that offered assistance, knowledge, step by step guidance, examples, explained theory, and explained primary prevention in a way that was understood.

**Implementation:** How to use material in real world.

**Interactive:** More interactive activities.

**Knowledgeable:** Well informed, has knowledge about topic, has knowledge about prevention and sexual violence issues.

**Lack of Ability to Separate Job Duties:** Co-workers lack of knowledge of job duties/ description, change in roles, lack of team participation, resentment.

**Lack of Flexibility:** To have choice in training sessions, decisions made for you, no choice, mandating training and people from agency.

**Lack of Interaction:** More time to spend working and finishing group activities, discussion, role plays.

**Lack of Organization:** Less prepared, power point slides did not match handouts, losing focus on topic, tangents without tying back to point, off track.

**Lack of Support:** No help from co-workers to pick up the slack, or lack of money to hire someone to do old job duties.

**Lack of Tools:** Lack of concrete examples, practical applications, ideas, action steps.

**Need for Best Practices:** More practical, putting into practice, working curriculum, what works, how to use tools effectively.

**Need for More Diversity:** Desire to have different speakers, more diversity among presenters, and content among the prevention training.

**Need for Practical Application:** Wanting more training and examples of how to apply material in a practical manner.

**Networking Skills:** Having skills to be able to network in the community, building partnerships, interaction with participants, etc.

**Networking with Prevention Coordinators:** Wanting to talk with, share ideas, network with other prevention coordinators, and share experiences.

**Overwhelmed:** Being challenged with ending sexual violence, not feeling they know how to prevent sexual violence, seeing the big picture but not sure how to make an impact.

**Practical Applications:** Examples and ways to put prevention interventions into practice.

**Recognition:** Appreciation, consideration of audience.

**Repetitive:** Covering the same information presented, need variety of information, receiving same information, duplicated information.

**Required Training:** Trainings that were mandated by grant stipulations.

**Resentment:** Feeling that the position of prevention coordinator was different from other staff and that other staff resented the new position and their duties or lack of.

**Secondary Educator:** Person providing education that would fall in more of a secondary prevention category.

**Time Restraints:** Not enough time to finish training, questions/answers, activities, feeling of being rushed near the end of the training.

**Train to Knowledge Level:** Need trainings that meet participant's needs and levels of need, tailoring to participants.

**Transition Difficulty:** Difficulty letting go of old job duties.

**Transition Time:** Making transition from secondary to primary prevention more gradual.

### **Codes\_2: Annual Report Data**

**Agency Support:** Supportive of new position within the agency, understanding of shift and reasons behind moving to primary prevention, hiring someone to take over old job duties, being on board with the shift and projects, assisting the Prevention Coordinator in the shift, trainings, projects etc.

**Agency Turnover:** Turnover in an agency where there have been at least one person to leave the agency.

**Awareness:** Conducting program and campaigns that bring awareness about the agency.

**Awareness of Sexual Violence:** Making community more aware of sexual violence issues.

**Challenging:** Failed to meet expectations, to get to the point, new information, new approach.

**Community Acceptance of Rape Myths:** Community misconceptions about rape; accepting rape myths as facts.

**Community Knowledge:** Having knowledge about the community in which they are working, knowing key gatekeepers, resources, etc.

**Community Networking:** Working as partners with the community and agencies in the community.

**Community Openness:** Finding groups in the community who are open to rape crisis programs, open to multiple session programs, open to primary prevention efforts.

**Community Support:** Supportive of new position, shift, understanding and awareness of shift and reasons behind moving to primary prevention, participating on task forces.

**Community Turnover:** Turnover in the community with key partners, key partners resign, change jobs, move, etc.

**Confusion:** Not clear, not knowing what the expectations are of the prevention coordinator and/or the programs.

**Curriculum Lacked Participator Activities:** (In Vivo) The curriculum that was used lacked activities that were relevant to their specific population.

**Flexible:** Ability to be adaptable with the ever changing expectations, flexibility in being able to learn as you go and change and adapt to new directions, ability to be fluid.

**Frustration:** Unclear, unsure, sense of wasting time, not being allowed to perform certain job duties that this individual did in the past.

**Group Activities:** Group work, role plays, discussion, small group exercises.

**Justification for Lack of Grantor support:** Making excuses or reason why the grantors were not able to help, be supportive, provide information, answer questions, advise, etc.

**Lack of Community Support:** Lack of community buy-in on primary prevention efforts, rape crisis etc.

**Lack of Prevention Background:** Not having any background in any type of prevention work.

**Lacked Relevance to Rural Community:** (In Vivo) The information received did not pertain to certain rural community needs.

**Long-term Process:** Long process, longer time than expected to see change, forecasting a long time to see effectiveness.

**Men as Allies:** Including men as allies in the movement to end sexual violence. Recruiting men to help with primary prevention activities etc.

**Need for Additional Trainers:** The prevention coordinator or the agencies desire to have more trainers, noting the need for more than one person to help with this position and program.

**Need for Parental Support:** The desire to have parents more involved in prevention efforts.

**Need for Training on Community Assessment:** (In Vivo) The prevention coordinator's request for training on how to conduct a community assessment.

**Need for Training of Evaluation:** (In Vivo) The prevention coordinator's request for training on how to conduct evaluations.

**Need for Training on How to Implement:** (In Vivo) The prevention coordinator's request for training on how to implement new prevention program and concepts.

**Need for Training on Sustainability:** (In Vivo) The prevention coordinator's request for training on how to make the prevention program and position more sustainable.

**Networking Skills:** Learning or knowing how to network in the community, community organizing, speaking to the public, etc.

**Networking with Prevention Coordinators:** The prevention coordinator desire to talk with, share ideas, network with other prevention coordinators, share experience, etc.

**Primary Prevention:** Understanding concepts, definitions and/or implementation of primary prevention efforts.

**Principles of Effective Prevention:** These principles include: comprehensive (strategies in multiple settings addressing a range of risk and protective factors); varied teaching methods (including interactive programs utilizing different activities); sufficient dosage (the need to expose the participants to the intervention/program enough times to produce desired effects and sustain the effects); theory driven, (programs must have a scientific justification or rationale); positive relationships,(the promotion of strong, positive relationships between adults and children); appropriately timed, (programs which are started early enough in a child's life to maximize impact); sociocultural relevance, (tailoring programs to the needs of the community as well as cultural norms, practices and beliefs); outcome evaluation, (the need for programs to have clear goals and objectives and systematically evaluate how well a program has met the goals and objectives); and well- trained staff, (staff who are sensitive, competent and are sufficiently trained and supported) (Nation, Crusto, Wandersman, Kumpfer, Seybolt, Morrissey-Kane and Davino, 2003).

**Required Training:** Trainings that were mandated by grant stipulations.

**Saturation:** Conducting multiple session programs.

**Saturation Difficulties:** Difficulty finding time, space, community openness to having more than one session as required per grant.

**Seeking Knowledge:** The prevention coordinator was reading, researching, and seeking information on own, being proactive, and taking initiative.

**Social Ecological Model Knowledge and Usage:** Knowledge of the social ecological model and using it as a guide to developing prevention programs.

**Supervisor Support:** The prevention coordinators feeling that they were supported by their immediate supervisor in their new role as prevention coordinator, their job duties, support in the agency as well as the community.

**Taboo Topic:** (In Vivo) Prevention coordinator's reference that the topic of sexual violence is still a taboo topic, one that people do not like to openly discuss.

**Teacher Education:** The prevention coordinator belief that training teachers about the importance of primary prevention of sexual violence.

**Used Evidence Based Curriculum:** The prevention coordinator used a curriculum that had been evaluated on other populations, use of a boxed curriculum, or parts of a boxed curriculum.

### Codes\_3: Addison

**Acceptance of New Role:** Accepting and understanding job role and duties outlined by the grant, by the Prevention Coordinator, agency and/or community.

**Additional Trainings:** Trainings that the Prevention Coordinator sought out on own or that were recommended by their agency.

**Agency Support:** Supportive of new position within the agency, understanding of shift and reasons behind moving to primary prevention, hiring someone to take over old job duties, being on board with the shift and projects, assisting the Prevention Coordinator in the shift, trainings, projects etc.

**Challenging:** Failed to meet expectations, to get to the point, new information, new approach.

**Comfortable:** The extent to which the Prevention Coordinator communicates their comfort in knowledgeable and understanding of job duties and process.

**Community Knowledge:** Having knowledge of the community that you are working in, familiarity with community.

**Community Support:** Supportive of new position, shift, understanding and awareness of shift and reasons behind moving to primary prevention, participating on task forces.

**Community Turnover:** Turnover of key stakeholders in the community in which the Prevention Coordinator had been partnering with for support of shift to primary prevention.

**Confusion:** Showing uncertainty about decision or situations. Being less clear, not clearly defined, questioning if what they are doing is correct, not having the ability to differentiate between things.

**Difficult:** Hard, different, to transition to primary prevention or shift to other levels, to apply to sexual assault, stressful.

**Ease of Transition:** Things that made the transition easier for the prevention coordinator like having additional staff to take over job duties that the prevention coordinator could no longer provide.

**Grantor Accessibility:** The prevention coordinator believed that the grantors were accessible and that they could contact them if they needed help or assistance.

**Grantor Support:** The grantors were helpful, supportive, providing trainings, conference calls, technical assistance, and availability for Prevention Coordinator to contact for help.

**Helpful Training:** A training that offered assistance, knowledge, guidance, examples, and explanations.

**Knowledge of Primary Prevention:** Having some kind of background, knowledge or experience with primary prevention efforts.

**Lack of Ability to Separate Job Duties:** The prevention coordinator and/or co-workers lack of knowledge of job duties/ description, change in roles, lack of team participation, resentment, not understanding shift in duties, reasons why Prevention Coordinator is no longer allowed to do certain agency duties, like direct services, being on call, agency as well as prevention coordinators having a hard time adjusting to new job duties.

**Lack of Knowledge:** Prevention Coordinators lack of knowledge of primary prevention, theories, and models.

**Lack of Knowledge of Models/Theories:** The prevention coordinator does not have knowledge of models or theories that support primary prevention of sexual violence.

**Lack of Logical Order:** The required trainings and ways the information was presented to the Prevention Coordinators was backwards, reverse order.

**Lack of Tools:** The prevention coordinators desire for tools or approaches to help guide and aid them in implementing primary prevention efforts.

**Lack of Utilizing Grantor Support:** Not contacting the grantors for support.



**Listserv Suggestions:** Recommendations and suggestions made over the listserv that was designed for the prevention coordinators.

**Need for Additional Trainers:** The prevention coordinator or the agencies desire to have more trainers, noting the need for more than one person to help with this position and program.

**Need for Best Practices:** More practical, putting into practice, working curriculum, what works, how to use tools effectively, new ideas, knowledge of what works and what does not work.

**Networking Skills:** Having skills to be able to network in the community, building partnerships, interaction with other Prevention Coordinators.

**Networking with Prevention Coordinators:** Wanting to talk with, share ideas, network with other prevention coordinators, share experiences, etc.

**New Knowledge:** Learning new concepts, theories, models, approach to prevention. Learning about primary prevention for the first time.

**Recommended Trainings:** From the Rape Prevention Education Listserv, hosted by North Carolina Coalition Against Sexual Assault and North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services.

**Required Trainings:** Trainings that were mandated by grant stipulations.

**Secondary Prevention:** Providing more sprinkling programs, bullying, healthy relationships in elementary and high schools.

**Secondary Prevention Educator:** Someone hired to conduct awareness programs, more secondary education, sprinkling programs.

**Team Member:** Feeling a part of the agency team, an insider.

**Train to Knowledge Level:** Need trainings that meet participant's needs and levels of need, tailoring to participants.

**Transition Difficulty:** Letting go of old job duties.

**Transition Time:** Making transition from secondary to primary prevention more gradual, allowing Prevention Coordinator, agency and community time to understand new role and job duties.

**Well Rounded:** Being well rounded with education, work experience, knowledge of agency, issue, community.

#### **Codes\_4: Delaney**

**Additional Trainings:** Trainings that were recommended by their agency.

**Agency Frustration:** The agency, as a whole, did not know or understand what this new program would look like, uncertainty about primary prevention, not knowing as an agency where this project was going or what it would look like, and frustration with grant stipulations.

**Agency Support:** Supportive of new position within the agency, understanding of shift and reasons behind moving to primary prevention, hiring someone to take over old job duties, being on board with the shift and projects, assisting the Prevention Coordinator in the shift, trainings, projects etc.

**Challenging:** Failed to meet expectations, to get to the point, new information, new approach.

**Community Networking:** Working as partners with the community and agencies in the community.

**Community Openness:** Finding groups in the community who are open to rape crisis programs, open to multiple session programs, open to primary prevention efforts.

**Community Support:** Supportive of new position, shift, understanding and awareness of shift and reasons behind moving to primary prevention, participating on task forces, community buy-in.

**Confusion:** Showing uncertainty about decision or situations. Being less clear, not clearly defined, questioning if what they are doing is correct, not having the ability to differentiate between things, vague.

**Difficult:** Hard, different, difficult to transition to primary prevention or shift to other levels, to apply to sexual assault, stressful.

**Education Background:** The prevention coordinators' belief that PC's would benefit from having some kind of educational background that discusses theories, assessments, etc.

**Failure to Meet Expectations:** Disappointment, wanting more support, etc.

**Frustration:** Unclear, unsure, sense of wasting time, not being allowed to perform certain job duties that this individual did in the past.

**Grantor Support:** Helpful, supportive, providing trainings, conference calls, technical assistance, availability for Prevention Coordinator to contact for help.

**Guidance on How to Set Goals:** (In Vivo) The prevention coordinator requested training on how to set goals.

**Helpful Training:** A training that offered assistance, knowledge, step by step guidance, examples, explaining theory, explaining primary prevention.

**Lack of Community Impact:** Not feeling that the shift to primary prevention has impacted the community.

**Lack of Community Support:** Barriers in the community that hinder primary prevention efforts.

**Lack of Grantor Support:** Not feeling completely supported by the grantors, grantors not being very helpful.

**Lack of Knowledge of Sexual Violence:** No knowledge of prevention specifically directed toward sexual violence, no working knowledge of sexual violence.

**Lack of Logical Order:** The required trainings and ways the information was presented to the Prevention Coordinators was backwards, reverse order.

**Need for Additional Trainers:** Needing/wanting another trainer or several people on board to assist with primary prevention efforts.

**Need for Best Practices:** Needing more practical, able to put into practice, working curriculum, knowing what works, knowing how to use tools effectively, desire for new ideas, knowledge of what works and what does not work.

**Need for Funding:** Need for funding to keep the program going, to hire staff, to continue with interventions.

**Need for Practical Applications:** Wanting more training and examples of how to apply material in a practical manner.

**Need Training on Networking:** (In vivo) The prevention coordinator's desire to having training on how to effectively network, being taught and given examples and gaining networking skills.

**Networking Skills:** Having skills to be able to network in the community, building partnerships, interaction with other Prevention Coordinators.

**Networking with Prevention Coordinators:** The prevention coordinator wanting to talk with, share ideas, network with other prevention coordinators, share experiences, etc.

**New Knowledge:** Learning new concepts, theories, models, approach to prevention, and progression of learning. Learning about primary prevention for the first time.

**Overwhelmed:** Being challenged with ending sexual violence, not feeling they know how to prevent sexual violence, seeing the big picture but not sure how to make an impact.

**Positive Mindset:** Helpful, supportive, attitude, motivation, and persistence.

**Program Expectation:** Expectations of the Prevention Coordinators on how they feel their programs, interventions etc. should have progressed.

**Questioning Effectiveness of Change:** Wondering if primary prevention of sexual violence is really possible.

**Repetitive:** Same information presented, need variety of information, receiving same information, duplicated information.

**Required Trainings:** Trainings that were mandated by grant stipulations.

**Saturation:** Conducting multiple session programs.

**Secondary Prevention Educator:** Someone hired to conduct awareness programs, more secondary education, sprinkling programs.

**Successful Program:** A program that the prevention coordinator felt had been a success in shift to primary prevention in the first year of transition, having support, having the program run smoothly.

**Support:** The prevention coordinator's feeling that they were supported by their agency, community, grantors and the like, that they had guidance, etc.

**Support by other Prevention Coordinators:** The prevention coordinator's feeling that they were supported by other PC's in the state, that they could call on others for help and guidance, etc.

**Sustainability:** Ability to keep the program/interventions in place, going, continuing with primary prevention efforts, keeping the taskforce going.

**Team Member:** Feeling a part of the agency team, an insider.

**Train to knowledge level:** Need trainings that meet participant's needs and levels of need, tailoring to participants.

**Uncertainty of Agency Impact:** Not having a clear idea of the impact the shift to primary prevention has had on the agency as a whole.

#### **Codes\_5: Ella**

**Agency Support:** Supportive of new position within the agency, understanding of shift and reasons behind moving to primary prevention, hiring someone to take over old job duties, being on board with the shift and projects, assisting the Prevention Coordinator in the shift, trainings, projects etc.

**Challenging:** Failed to meet expectations, to get to the point, new information, new approach.

**Community Acceptance of Rape Myths:** Community misconceptions about rape; accepting rape myths as facts.

**Community Knowledge:** Having knowledge of the community that you are working in, familiarity with community.

**Community Networking:** Working as partners with the community and agencies in the community.

**Community Openness:** Finding groups in the community who are open to rape crisis programs, open to multiple session programs, open to primary prevention efforts.

**Community Support:** Supportive of new position, shift, understanding and awareness of shift and reasons behind moving to primary prevention, participating on task forces.

**Confident:** The prevention coordinator felt that they were on the right track, that they could figure things out, etc.

**Confusion:** Showing uncertainty about decision or situations. Being less clear, not clearly defined, questioning if what they are doing is correct, not having the ability to differentiate between things, vague.

**Difficult:** Hard, different, difficult to transition to primary prevention or shift to other levels, to apply to sexual assault, stressful.

**Difficulty Putting Knowledge into Practical Application:** “Knowing something and actually getting out there and doing it are two completely different things.”

**Eye Opening:** An experience that caused the prevention coordinator to suddenly to learn or understand what was not previously known.

**Flexible:** Ability to be adaptable with the ever changing expectations, flexibility in being able to learn as you go and change and adapt to new directions, ability to be fluid.

**Frustration:** Unclear, unsure, sense of wasting time, not being allowed to perform certain job duties that this individual did in the past.

**Grantor Support:** The prevention coordinator perception that the grantors were helpful, supportive, providing trainings, conference calls, technical assistance, availability for prevention coordinator to contact for help.

**Helpful Training:** A training that offered assistance, knowledge, step by step guidance, examples, explaining theory, explaining primary prevention.

**Increase Community Awareness:** Increasing the communities awareness of primary prevention efforts.

**Justification for lack of Grantor support:** Making excuses or reason why the grantors were not able to help, be supportive, provide information, answer questions, advise, etc.

**Knowledgeable:** Well informed, has knowledge about topic, has knowledge about prevention and sexual violence issues.

**Lack of Community Support:** Lack of community buy-in on primary prevention efforts, rape crisis etc.

**Lack of Grantor Support:** Not feeling completely supported by the grantors, grantors not being very helpful.

**Lack of Knowledge of Sexual Violence:** No knowledge of prevention specifically directed toward sexual violence, no working knowledge of sexual violence.

**Lack of Logical Order:** The required trainings and ways the information was presented to the Prevention Coordinators was backwards, reverse order.

**Lack of Prevention Background:** Not having any background in any type of prevention work.

**Lack of Resources:** Due to size of community serving, the prevention coordinator did not believe they had sufficient resources to reach the community's needs.

**Mental Shift:** (In Vivo) The prevention coordinators thoughts about having to shift their mind about how to address sexual violence prevention, having one idea and/or experience and having to shift mindset. The ability to make the mental shift from secondary to primary prevention.

**Need Additional Trainings on Needs Assessment:** The prevention coordinator desire to having training on understanding and conducting a needs assessment.

**Need for Community Support:** The prevention coordinator's desire to having more support from their community to make the shift more effective.

**Need for Effective Interventions:** Wanting interventions that are proven to be effective.

**Need for Parental Support:** The desire to have parents more involved in prevention efforts.

**Need for Prevention Experience:** Having some kind of prevention background or experience, the prevention coordinator felt would be beneficial to this position.

**Need for Training of Evaluation:** (In Vivo) The prevention coordinator's request for training on how to conduct evaluations.

**Need for Training on How to Implement:** (In Vivo) The prevention coordinator's request for training on how to implement new prevention program and concepts.

**Networking Skills:** Having skills to be able to network in the community, building partnerships, interaction with other Prevention Coordinators.

**New Knowledge:** Learning new concepts, theories, models, approach to prevention, and progression of learning. Learning about primary prevention for the first time.

**Overwhelmed:** Being challenged with ending sexual violence, not feeling they know how to prevent sexual violence, seeing the big picture but not sure how to make an impact.

**Passionate:** (In Vivo) Someone who is passionate, who shows great interest and excitement in working to end sexual violence.

**Positive Agency Impact:** The prevention coordinator believed that the shift to primary prevention has had a positive impact on the agency, given the agency some credibility in being chosen to be part of this shift.

**Positive Mindset:** Helpful, supportive, attitude, motivation, and persistence.

**Proactive:** (In Vivo) Anticipating next steps, acting in advance and dealing with difficulties.

**Redefining Prevention:** (In Vivo) The prevention coordinators belief that they are redefining what sexual violence prevention in their agency and community looks like.

**Required Trainings:** Trainings that were mandated by grant stipulations.



**Seeking Knowledge:** The prevention coordinator was reading, researching, and seeking information on own, being proactive, taking initiative, etc.

**Supervisor Support:** The prevention coordinators feeling that they were supported by their immediate supervisor in their new role as prevention coordinator, their job duties, support in the agency as well as the community.

**Supervisor Experience:** (In Vivo) Recommended by the prevention coordinator when selecting new prevention coordinators that they possess supervisor or managerial experience.

**Sustainability:** Ability to keep the program/interventions in place, going, continuing with primary prevention efforts, keeping the taskforce going.

**Team Member:** Feeling a part of the agency team, an insider.

**Those People Who do Not Think Prevention is the way to go:** (In Vivo) The prevention coordinator stated that one of the greatest barriers was “those people who do not think prevention is the way to go.”

**Train to Knowledge Level:** Need trainings that meet participant's needs and levels of need, tailoring to participants.

**Transition Difficulty:** Letting go of old job duties.

**Well Rounded:** Being well rounded with education, work experience, knowledge of agency, issue, community.

**Willingness to Learn:** Skill needed for good PC is openness and willingness to learn new information, etc.

### **Codes\_6: Grace**

**Acceptance of New Role:** Accepting and understanding job role and duties outlined by the grant, by the Prevention Coordinator, agency and/or community.

**Agency Support:** Supportive of new position within the agency, understanding of shift and reasons behind moving to primary prevention, hiring someone to take over old job duties, being on board with the shift and projects, assisting the Prevention Coordinator in the shift, trainings, projects etc.

**Challenging:** Failed to meet expectations, to get to the point, new information, new approach.

**Clear Prevention Coordinators Job Description:** Having a clear job description of the prevention coordinator's roles and responsibilities for the prevention coordinator, as well as, for other staff at the agency, having this in place appeared to help the prevention coordinator navigate through the agency and understand the position a bit more.

**Community Impact:** The prevention coordinator believed that the shift to primary prevention had impacted the community in a positive way.

**Community Knowledge:** Having knowledge of the community that you are working in, familiarity with community.

**Community Openness:** Finding groups in the community who are open to rape crisis programs, open to multiple session programs, open to primary prevention efforts.

**Community Support:** Supportive of new position, shift, understanding and awareness of shift and reasons behind moving to primary prevention, participating on task forces.

**Conflict of Somebody who has Direct Service Background:** (In Vivo) In hiring someone within the agency there is the potential of conflict if they have direct service background due to the position of the prevention coordinator not been allowed to provide direct services.

**Confusion:** Showing uncertainty about decision or situations. Being less clear, not clearly defined, questioning if what they are doing is correct, not having the ability to differentiate between things, vague.

**Consistent Message:** (In Vivo) The prevention coordinator stated the importance of sending consistent messages in the programs.

**Critical Perspective:** (In Vivo) The prevention coordinator stated they developed a slightly "critical perspective" of the shift to primary prevention, the theories behind the shift and whether it is applicable to sexual violence prevention.

**Difficult:** Hard, different, difficult to transition to primary prevention or shift to other levels, to apply to sexual assault, stressful.

**Difficulty Putting Knowledge into Practical Application:** Having a difficult time understanding or implementing the trainings and knowledge into practical applications.

**Difficulty Using More than One Level of the Social Ecological Model:** The prevention coordinator was finding it difficult to implement programs that addressed a second level of the social ecological model.

**Education Background:** The prevention coordinators' belief that PC's would benefit from having some kind of educational background that discusses theories, assessments, etc.

**Eye Opening:** An experience that caused the prevention coordinator to suddenly to learn or understand what was not previously known.

**Frustration:** Unclear, unsure, sense of wasting time, not being allowed to perform certain job duties that this individual did in the past.

**Grantor Accessibility:** The prevention coordinator believed that the grantors were accessible and that they could contact them if they needed help or assistance.

**Grantor Support:** The grantors were helpful, supportive, providing trainings, conference calls, technical assistance, and availability for Prevention Coordinator to contact for help.

**Helpful Training:** A training that offered assistance, knowledge, guidance, examples, and explanations.

**Isolation:** Feeling as if they were alone, not feeling support, feeling as if they had to figure out things on their own.

**Justification for lack of Grantor support:** Making excuses or reason why the grantors were not able to help, be supportive, provide information, answer questions, advise, etc.

**Knowledge of Primary Prevention:** Having some kind of background, knowledge or experience with primary prevention efforts.

**Lack of Ability to Separate Job Duties:** The prevention coordinator and/or co-workers lack of knowledge of job duties/ description, change in roles, lack of team participation, resentment, not understanding shift in duties, reasons why Prevention Coordinator is no longer allowed to do certain agency duties, like direct services, being on call, agency as well as prevention coordinators having a hard time adjusting to new job duties.

**Lack of Agency Impact:** The prevention coordinator did not think that the shift had had an impact on the agency.

**Lack of Collaboration:** The prevention coordinator did not collaborate with other agencies and groups in the first year of the shift.

**Lack of Community Support:** Lack of community buy-in on primary prevention efforts, rape crisis etc.

**Lack of Direct Services:** The prevention coordinator did not have a background in direct services.

**Lack of Grantor Support:** Not feeling completely supported by the grantors, grantors not being very helpful.

**Lack of Implementation:** The prevention coordinator has not implemented a program yet.

**Lack of Knowledge:** Prevention Coordinators lack of knowledge of primary prevention, theories, and models.

**Lack of Knowledge of Models/Theories:** The prevention coordinator does not have knowledge of models or theories that support primary prevention of sexual violence.

**Lack of Logical Order:** The required trainings and ways the information was presented to the Prevention Coordinators was backwards, reverse order.

**Lack of Networking with Prevention Coordinators:** Not having the time or space to network with other prevention coordinators.

**Listserv Suggestions:** Recommendations and suggestions made over the listserv that was designed for the prevention coordinators.

**Long-term Process:** Long process, longer time than expected to see change, forecasting a long time to see effectiveness.

**Need for Additional Trainers:** The prevention coordinator or the agencies desire to have more trainers, noting the need for more than one person to help with this position and program.

**Need for Best Practices:** More practical, putting into practice, working curriculum, what works, how to use tools effectively, new ideas, knowledge of what works and what does not work.

**Need for Community Support:** The prevention coordinator's desire to having more support from their community to make the shift more effective.

**Need for Effective Interventions:** Wanting interventions that are proven to be effective.

**Need for Funding:** Need for funding to keep the program going, to hire staff, to continue with interventions.

**Need for Parental Support:** The desire to have parents more involved in prevention efforts.

**Need for Practical Applications:** Wanting more training and examples of how to apply material in a practical manner.

**Need for Training of Evaluation:** (In Vivo) The prevention coordinator's request for training on how to conduct evaluations.

**Networking in Schools:** The prevention coordinator's belief that they need to network in the school system, build relationships, educated, etc.

**Networking Skills:** Having skills to be able to network in the community, building partnerships, interaction with other Prevention Coordinators.

**Networking with Prevention Coordinators:** Wanting to talk with, share ideas, network with other prevention coordinators, share experiences, etc.

**New Knowledge:** Learning new concepts, theories, models, approach to prevention. Learning about primary prevention for the first time.

**No Direct Service Background:** Not having any background or training about direct services with survivors of sexual violence.

**Overwhelmed:** Being challenged with ending sexual violence, not feeling they know how to prevent sexual violence, seeing the big picture but not sure how to make an impact.

**Positive Mindset:** Helpful, supportive, attitude, motivation, and persistence.

**Practical Applications:** Examples and ways to put prevention interventions into practice.

**Prevention Experience:** Having experience or background in prevention work.

**Primary Prevention:** Understanding concepts, definitions and/or implementation of primary prevention efforts.

**Program Cuts:** (In Vivo) Having to make cuts in services/programs in the agency due to grant stipulations.

**Questioning Effectiveness of Change:** Wondering if primary prevention of sexual violence is really possible; questioning whether the theory or model being used for primary prevention of sexual violence is an effective way of prevention. Questioning if the model being used fits into prevention of sexual violence. Viewing sexual prevention efforts as more complicated than other injury prevention topics where this model has been applied in the past.

**Required Trainings:** Trainings that were mandated by grant stipulations.

**Retention of Staff:** The agency the prevention coordinator has been working has had no turnover of staff, they have retained all staff.

**Saturation:** Conducting multiple session programs.

**Saturation Difficulties:** Difficulty finding time, space, community openness to having more than one session as required per grant.

**School Resistance:** The schools resisting changes about the prevention programs.

**Secondary Educator:** Person providing education that would fall in more of a secondary prevention category.

**Secondary Prevention:** Providing more sprinkling programs, bullying, healthy relationships in elementary and high schools.

**Seeking Knowledge:** The prevention coordinator was reading, researching, and seeking information on own, being proactive, taking initiative, etc.

**Successful Intervention:** An intervention that the prevention coordinator felt had been a successful.

**Supervisor Support:** The prevention coordinators feeling that they were supported by their immediate supervisor in their new role as prevention coordinator, their job duties, support in the agency as well as the community.

**Taboo Topic:** (In Vivo) Prevention coordinator's reference that the topic of sexual violence is still a taboo topic, one that people do not like to openly discuss.

**Team Member:** Feeling a part of the agency team, an insider.

**Theoretical Groundwork:** (In Vivo) Trainings rich in information about theory and models, theoretically based.

**Transition Difficulty:** Letting go of old job duties.

**Transition Out of This:** The prevention coordinators desire to transition out of this position.

**Transition Time:** Making transition from secondary to primary prevention more gradual.

### **Codes\_7: Jane**

**Acceptance of New Role:** Accepting and understanding job role and duties outlined by the grant, by the Prevention Coordinator, agency and/or community.

**Agency Support:** Supportive of new position within the agency, understanding of shift and reasons behind moving to primary prevention, hiring someone to take over old job duties, being on board with the shift and projects, assisting the Prevention Coordinator in the shift, trainings, projects etc.

**Challenging:** Failed to meet expectations, to get to the point, new information, new approach.

**Clear Prevention Coordinator's Job Description:** Having a clear job description of the prevention coordinator's roles and responsibilities for the prevention coordinator, as well as, for other staff at the agency, having this in place appeared to help the prevention coordinator navigate through the agency and understand the position a bit more.

**Community Impact:** The prevention coordinator believed that the shift to primary prevention had impacted the community in a positive way.

**Community Knowledge:** Having knowledge of the community that you are working in, familiarity with community.

**Community Networking:** Working as partners with the community and agencies in the community.

**Community Openness:** Finding groups in the community who are open to rape crisis programs, open to multiple session programs, open to primary prevention efforts.

**Community Support:** Supportive of new position, shift, understanding and awareness of shift and reasons behind moving to primary prevention, participating on task forces.

**Difficulty Using More than One Level of the Social Ecological Model:** The prevention coordinator was finding it difficult to implement programs that addressed a second level of the social ecological model.

**Easier for New Hire:** The prevention coordinator's belief that the shift from secondary to primary prevention would be easier for a new hire to the agency versus someone who had been conducting secondary prevention programs with the agency.

**Education Background:** The prevention coordinators' belief that PC's would benefit from having some kind of educational background that discusses theories, assessments, etc.

**Ending Sexual Violence:** The prevention coordinator stating "we would all like to think about putting ourselves out of a job."



**Facilitator Skills:** Having the skills necessary to be an effective facilitator, a good presenter, planner of lessons and programs, etc.

**Flexible:** Ability to be adaptable with the ever changing expectations, flexibility in being able to learn as you go and change and adapt to new directions, ability to be fluid.

**Frustration:** Unclear, unsure, sense of wasting time, not being allowed to perform certain job duties that this individual did in the past.

**Grantor Support:** The prevention coordinator perception that the grantors were helpful, supportive, providing trainings, conference calls, technical assistance, availability for prevention coordinator to contact for help.

**Helpful Training:** A training that offered assistance, knowledge, step by step guidance, examples, explaining theory, explaining primary prevention.

**Hopeful:** (In Vivo) Having hope that interventions made a difference.

**Isolation:** Feeling as if they were alone, not feeling support, feeling as if they had to figure out things on their own.

**Justification for lack of Grantor support:** Making excuses or reason why the grantors were not able to help, be supportive, provide information, answer questions, advise, etc.

**Knowledge of Impact of Sexual Violence:** Having an understanding of the impacts and effects of sexual violence.

**Knowledge of Primary Prevention:** Having some kind of background, knowledge or experience with primary prevention efforts.

**Knowledge of Sexual Violence:** Having a background in rape crisis, education background where they explore the effects of sexual violence, etc.

**Lack of Ability to Separate Job Duties:** The prevention coordinator and/or co-workers lack of knowledge of job duties/ description, change in roles, lack of team participation, resentment, not understanding shift in duties, reasons why Prevention Coordinator is no longer allowed to do certain agency duties, like direct services, being on call, agency as well as prevention coordinators having a hard time adjusting to new job duties.

**Lack of Community Impact:** Not feeling that the shift to primary prevention has impacted the community.

**Lack of Community Support:** Lack of community buy-in on primary prevention efforts, rape crisis etc.

**Lack of Logical Order:** The required trainings and ways the information was presented to the Prevention Coordinators was backwards, reverse order.

**Lack of Organization:** Less prepared, power point slides did not match handouts, losing focus on topic, tangents without tying back to point, off track.

**Lack of Prevention Background:** Not having any background in any type of prevention work.

**Long-term Process:** Long process, longer time than expected to see change, forecasting a long time to see effectiveness.

**Men as Allies:** Including men as allies in the movement to end sexual violence. Recruiting men to help with primary prevention activities etc.

**Need for Community Support:** The prevention coordinator's desire to having more support from their community to make the shift more effective.

**Networking with Prevention Coordinators:** Wanting to talk with, share ideas, network with other prevention coordinators, share experiences, etc.

**Overwhelmed:** Being challenged with ending sexual violence, not feeling they know how to prevent sexual violence, seeing the big picture but not sure how to make an impact.

**Passionate:** (In Vivo) Someone who is passionate, who shows great interest and excitement in working to end sexual violence.

**Positive Mindset:** Helpful, supportive, attitude, motivation, and persistence.

**Practical Applications:** Examples and ways to put prevention interventions into practice.

**Prevention Experience:** Having experience or background in prevention work.

**Principles of Effective Prevention:** These principles include: comprehensive (strategies in multiple settings addressing a range of risk and protective factors); varied teaching methods (including interactive programs utilizing different activities); sufficient dosage (the need to expose the participants to the intervention/program enough times to produce desired effects and sustain the effects); theory driven, (programs must have a scientific justification or rationale); positive relationships,(the promotion of strong, positive relationships between adults and children); appropriately timed, (programs which are started early enough in a child's life to maximize impact); sociocultural relevance, (tailoring programs to the needs of the community as well as cultural norms, practices and beliefs); outcome evaluation, (the need for programs to have clear goals and objectives and systematically evaluate how well a program has met the goals and objectives); and well- trained staff, (staff who are sensitive, competent and are sufficiently trained and supported) (Nation, Crusto, Wandersman, Kumpfer, Seybolt, Morrissey-Kane and Davino, 2003).

**Progress:** Making progress, having mini-successes, making headway, etc.

**Questioning Effectiveness of Change:** Wondering if primary prevention of sexual violence is really possible; questioning whether the theory or model being used for primary prevention of sexual violence is an effective way of prevention. Questioning if the model being used fits into prevention of sexual violence. Viewing sexual prevention efforts as more complicated than other injury prevention topics where this model has been applied in the past.

**Repetitive:** Covering the same information presented, need variety of information, receiving same information, duplicated information.

**Required Trainings:** Trainings that were mandated by grant stipulations.

**Restructuring Order:** restructuring the order of training, materials, etc. for the future.

**RPE List serve:** being a part of the listserv for the RPE, place to correspond with other PC's and RPE grantees and grantors, place where information is posted, training recommended, articles posted, a place to ask questions and ask for input from other grantees.

**Saturation:** Conducting multiple session programs.

**Saturation Difficulties:** Difficulty finding time, space, community openness to having more than one session as required per grant.

**Secondary Prevention:** Providing more sprinkling programs, bullying, healthy relationships in elementary and high schools.

**Secondary Prevention Educator:** Someone hired to conduct awareness programs, more secondary education, sprinkling programs.

**Seeking Knowledge:** The prevention coordinator was reading, researching, and seeking information on own, being proactive, taking initiative, etc.

**Supervisor Support:** The prevention coordinators feeling that they were supported by their immediate supervisor in their new role as prevention coordinator, their job duties, support in the agency as well as the community.

**Sustainability:** Ability to keep the program/interventions in place, going, continuing with primary prevention efforts, keeping the taskforce going.

**Team Member:** Feeling a part of the agency team, an insider.

**Tertiary:** Types of prevention that address survivors overcoming effects of sexual violence and reduction of reoccurrence.

**Train to Knowledge Level:** Need trainings that meet participant's needs and levels of need, tailoring to participants.

**Transition Difficulty:** Letting go of old job duties.

**Well Rounded:** Being well rounded with education, work experience, knowledge of agency, issue, community.

**Willingness to Learn:** Skill needed for good PC is openness and willingness to learn new information, etc.

## Codes\_8: Elizabeth

**Acceptance of New Role:** Accepting and understanding job role and duties outlined by the grant, by the Prevention Coordinator, agency and/or community.

**Agency Support:** Supportive of new position within the agency, understanding of shift and reasons behind moving to primary prevention, hiring someone to take over old job duties, being on board with the shift and projects, assisting the Prevention Coordinator in the shift, trainings, projects etc.

**Awareness:** Conducting program and campaigns that bring awareness about the agency.

**Awareness of Sexual Violence:** Making community more aware of sexual violence issues.

**Challenging:** Failed to meet expectations, to get to the point, new information, new approach.

**Confusion:** Not clear, not knowing what the expectations are of the prevention coordinator and/or the programs.

**Consistent Message:** (In Vivo) The prevention coordinator stated the importance of sending consistent messages in the programs.

**Education Background:** The prevention coordinators' belief that PC's would benefit from having some kind of educational background that discusses theories, assessments, etc.

**Eye Opening:** An experience that caused the prevention coordinator to suddenly to learn or understand what was not previously known.

**Flexible:** Ability to be adaptable with the ever changing expectations, flexibility in being able to learn as you go and change and adapt to new directions, ability to be fluid.

**Frustration:** Unclear, unsure, sense of wasting time, not being allowed to perform certain job duties that this individual did in the past.

**Helpful Training:** A training that offered assistance, knowledge, step by step guidance, examples, explaining theory, explaining primary prevention.

**Importance of Primary Prevention Work:** (In Vivo) The prevention coordinator stated that primary prevention of sexual violence was important.

**Isolation:** Feeling as if they were alone, not feeling support, feeling as if they had to figure out things on their own.

**Knowledge of Sexual Violence:** Having a background in rape crisis, education background where they explore the effects of sexual violence, etc.

**Lack of Ability to Separate Job Duties:** The prevention coordinator and/or co-workers lack of knowledge of job duties/ description, change in roles, lack of team participation, resentment, not understanding shift in duties, reasons why Prevention Coordinator is no longer allowed to do certain agency duties, like direct services, being on call, agency as well as prevention coordinators having a hard time adjusting to new job duties.

**Lack of Community Support:** Lack of community buy-in on primary prevention efforts, rape crisis etc.

**Lack of Grantor Support:** Not feeling completely supported by the grantors, grantors not being very helpful.

**Lack of Logical Order:** The required trainings and ways the information was presented to the Prevention Coordinators was backwards, reverse order.

**Lack of Organization:** Less prepared, power point slides did not match handouts, losing focus on topic, tangents without tying back to point, off track

**Media attention:** (In Vivo) Primary prevention interventions have allowed media to be able to becoming more interested in sexual violence prevention.

**Men as Allies:** Including men as allies in the movement to end sexual violence. Recruiting men to help with primary prevention activities etc.

**Need to be Accommodating:** To have choice in training sessions, decisions made for you, no choice, mandating training and people from agency.

**Networking in Schools:** The prevention coordinator's belief that they need to network in the school system, build relationships, educated, etc.

**Networking with Prevention Coordinators:** Wanting to talk with, share ideas, network with other prevention coordinators, share experiences, etc.

**Not helpful trainings:** The prevention coordinator did not find the required trainings to be beneficial. She did not learn anything new, etc.

**Positive Mindset:** Helpful, supportive, attitude, motivation, and persistence.

**Required Trainings:** Trainings that were mandated by grant stipulations.

**Secondary Prevention:** Providing more sprinkling programs, bullying, healthy relationships in elementary and high schools.

**Secondary Prevention Educator:** Someone hired to conduct awareness programs, more secondary education, sprinkling programs.

**Supervisor Support:** The prevention coordinators feeling that they were supported by their immediate supervisor in their new role as prevention coordinator, their job duties, support in the agency as well as the community.

**Time Restraints:** Not enough time to finish training, questions/answers, activities, feeling of being rushed near the end of the training.

**Train to Knowledge Level:** Need trainings that meet participant's needs and levels of need, tailoring to participants.

**Transition Difficulty:** Letting go of old job duties.

**Well Rounded:** Being well rounded with education, work experience, knowledge of agency, issue, community.

**Willingness to Learn:** Skill needed for good PC is openness and willingness to learn new information, etc.

### **Codes\_9: Ann**

**Agency Support:** Supportive of new position within the agency, understanding of shift and reasons behind moving to primary prevention, hiring someone to take over old job duties, being on board with the shift and projects, assisting the Prevention Coordinator in the shift, trainings, projects etc.

**Agency Turnover:** Turnover in an agency where there have been at least one person to leave the agency.

**Clear Prevention Coordinator's Job Description:** Having a clear job description of the prevention coordinator's roles and responsibilities for the prevention coordinator, as well as, for other staff at the agency, having this in place appeared to help the prevention coordinator navigate through the agency and understand the position a bit more.

**Comfortable:** The extent to which the Prevention Coordinator communicates their comfort in knowledgeable and understanding of job duties and process.

**Community Knowledge:** Having knowledge of the community that you are working in, familiarity with community.

**Community Networking:** Working as partners with the community and agencies in the community.

**Community Support:** Supportive of new position, shift, understanding and awareness of shift and reasons behind moving to primary prevention, participating on task forces.

**Confusion:** Not clear, not knowing what the expectations are of the prevention coordinator and/or the programs.

**Difficult:** Hard, different, difficult to transition to primary prevention or shift to other levels, to apply to sexual assault, stressful.

**Focus:** (In Vivo) To be clear and focused on a particular point or purpose.

**Frustration:** Unclear, unsure, sense of wasting time, not being allowed to perform certain job duties that this individual did in the past.

**Grantor Support:** The prevention coordinator perception that the grantors were helpful, supportive, providing trainings, conference calls, technical assistance, availability for prevention coordinator to contact for help.

**Helpful Training:** A training that offered assistance, knowledge, guidance, examples, and explanations.



**Isolation:** Feeling as if they were alone, not feeling support, feeling as if they had to figure out things on their own.

**Justification for lack of Grantor support:** Making excuses or reason why the grantors were not able to help, be supportive, provide information, answer questions, advise, etc.

**Lack of Ability to Separate Job Duties:** The prevention coordinator and/or co-workers lack of knowledge of job duties/ description, change in roles, lack of team participation, resentment, not understanding shift in duties, reasons why Prevention Coordinator is no longer allowed to do certain agency duties, like direct services, being on call, agency as well as prevention coordinators having a hard time adjusting to new job duties.

**Lack of Direct Services:** The prevention coordinator did not have a background in direct services.

**Lack of Grantor Support:** Not feeling completely supported by the grantors, grantors not being very helpful.

**Lack of Logical Order:** The required trainings and ways the information was presented to the Prevention Coordinators was backwards, reverse order.

**Men as Allies:** Including men as allies in the movement to end sexual violence. Recruiting men to help with primary prevention activities etc.

**Need for Agency Buy-in:** To be effective in the shift from secondary to primary prevention the agency has to buy-in to the process of change.

**Need for Funding:** Need for funding to keep the program going, to hire staff, to continue with interventions.

**Networking in Schools:** The prevention coordinator's belief that they need to network in the school system, build relationships, educated, etc.

**Networking Skills:** Having skills to be able to network in the community, building partnerships, interaction with other Prevention Coordinators.

**Networking with Prevention Coordinators:** Wanting to talk with, share ideas, network with other prevention coordinators, share experiences, etc.

**New Knowledge:** Learning new concepts, theories, models, approach to prevention, learning about primary prevention for the first time.

**Overwhelmed:** Being challenged with ending sexual violence, not feeling they know how to prevent sexual violence, seeing the big picture but not sure how to make an impact.

**Positive Mindset:** Helpful, supportive, attitude, motivation, and persistence.

**Repetitive:** Covering the same information presented, need variety of information, receiving same information, duplicated information.

**Required Trainings:** Trainings that were mandated by grant stipulations.

**Resentment:** Feeling that the position of prevention coordinator was different from other staff and that other staff resented the new position and their duties or lack of.

**Saturation Difficulties:** Difficulty finding time, space, community openness to having more than one session as required per grant.

**Secondary Prevention Educator:** Someone hired to conduct awareness programs, more secondary education, sprinkling programs.

**Seeking Knowledge:** The prevention coordinator was reading, researching, and seeking information on own, being proactive, taking initiative, etc.

**Team Member:** Feeling a part of the agency team, an insider.

**Transition Difficulty:** Letting go of old job duties.

## Appendix E

### Table 2. Weighted Kappa

	Coder 1 X Coder 2	N	Coder 1 X Coder 3	N	Coder 1 X Coder 4	N	Coder 2 X Coder 3	N	Coder 2 X Coder 4	N	Coder 3 X Coder 4	N
Archival Data	0.8554	166	0.8795	166	0.8916	166	0.8323	166	0.8675	166	0.8434	166
Annual Report	0.8351	194	0.8763	194	0.8866	194	0.8454	194	0.8557	194	0.8969	194
Case 1 Addison	0.8667	75	0.9200	75	0.8400	75	0.8933	75	0.8667	75	0.8133	75
Case 2 Delaney	0.8571	112	0.8214	112	0.8929	112	0.8739	112	0.8393	112	0.9107	112
Case 3 Ella	0.9016	122	0.8361	122	0.8525	122	0.8852	122	0.9180	122	0.8689	122
Case 4 Grace	0.8734	237	0.8565	237	0.8397	237	0.8819	237	0.8481	237	0.8903	237
Case 5 Jane	0.8723	141	0.8298	141	0.8582	141	0.9007	141	0.8440	141	0.9149	141
Case 6 Elizabeth	0.9158	95	0.8526	95	0.8947	95	0.8737	95	0.9368	95	0.8316	95
Case 7 Ann	0.8261	92	0.8913	92	0.8696	92	0.9130	92	0.8478	92	0.9348	92
Total Case 1-7	0.8741	874	0.8535	874	0.8604	874	0.8879	874	0.8673	874	0.8856	874
Overall Total	0.8655	1234	0.8606	1234	0.8687	1234	0.8736	1234	0.8655	1234	0.8817	1234

APPENDIX F

Table 3. Rape Prevention Education Grid for Funded Programs 2007

Primary Prevention Activity 1	Level of socio-ecological model of Activity 1	Primary Prevention Activity 2	Level of socio-ecological model of Activity 2
1. Workplace Sexual harassment		Faith-based teen male program	
2. Discussion groups with middle and high school adolescent males.	Individual	College-aged male mentors working with middle and high school adolescents(males or both?) on rape prevention.	Relationship
3. School-based primary prevention programs with each targeted grade receiving two programs a year over the course of three consecutive years.	Individual, community	Partner with the School Resource Officer at one high school to recruit and train students as peer educators for the prevention of sexual violence in their community.	Relationship
4. Skills building program for Boys & Girls Club staff about sexual violence, sexual harassment and rape culture.	Relationship	Develop and implement a multiple session (twice a month for 5 months) educational program for club participants (co-ed, ages 11-15) on topics of sexual violence.	Individual/Community
5. Implement & evaluate discussion groups among men that explore prevalent notions of masculinity and their relationship with sexual violence.	Individual	Assist churches, local camps, and assisted living facilities establish and implement employee and volunteer screening and training policies for caregivers to lessen the opportunity for sexual violence perpetration.	Community
6. Develop a sexual violence prevention plan that will reach college-aged students.	Individual	The Re-socialization of Masculinity (Sexual Violence vs Sexual Respect/Healthy Relationships). College-aged students with specific emphasis on Greek Organizations	Community
7. Peer Education Program to help educate the campus community on sexual violence prevention.	Relationship	Campus Administrative Task Force working toward collaborative multi-level prevention of sexual violence	Community
8. Men Against Rape (MAR), a campus-based student group.	Relationship	A six-week program for co-ed classrooms	Individual Level
9. TBD (To Be Determined)	TBD	Ongoing programming with Middle School Students	Relationship and Community
10. Six week program that will alleviate peer pressures for men to be sexual aggressors.	Relationship & Individual	Self Defense and Empowerment program for University students male and female?	Community
11. Safe Bar Initiative SBI: Drink Check, SBI: Safe Star	Individual/Community	Adolescent Male Anti-Violence Initiative	Relationship
12. Mentorship Program between 7 <sup>th</sup> grade at-risk boys and College Athletes. .	Individual / Relationship	“Keeping your kids safe.” How parents, especially mothers, can keep their children safe	Relationship
13. Middle schools in creating healthy relationships and bullying	Relationship	Job Corps Center working on how to build a healthy relationship	Individual/Relationship

<b>Primary Prevention Activity 1</b>	<b>Level of socio-ecological model of Activity 1</b>	<b>Primary Prevention Activity 2</b>	<b>Level of socio-ecological model of Activity 2</b>
14. College freshman on increasing their awareness and education on prevention of sexual abuse.	Individual / Relationship	TBD	TBD
15. Teen programs at churches	Individual	TBD	TBD
16. Violence Prevention Summit. The Summit is to engage stakeholders in identifying/assessing and addressing needs of the community in regards to sexual violence.	Community and Societal	Men for Change: Engage male students involved in fraternities and/or athletic association (utilizing the Men Can Stop Rape program out of Washington, DC).	Individual, Societal, Relationship, and Community
17. Town Meeting at Christ Deliverance Tabernacle		TBD	TBD