January 2006

An exploration of fraternity culture: Implications for programs to address alcohol-related sexual assault.
Table 1
Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for Environmental and Self-Exploration and Predictor Variables—Decision Making and Causality Orientations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Exploration</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>23**</td>
<td>19*</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>-08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Exploration</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18**</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Decision making</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>37**</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Autonomy</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>36**</td>
<td>-18**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Control</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Impersonal</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01

Table 2
Regression Analysis Summary for Decision Making and Causality Orientations Predicting Environmental Exploration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01

Table 3
Regression Analysis Summary for Decision Making and Causality Orientations Predicting Self-Exploration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01

A large proportion of women who attend college have an experience with rape or other forms of sexual assault before and after their matriculation. Research has consistently shown that roughly one out of four college women have experienced rape or attempted rape since the age of 14 (Douglas et al., 1997; Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987; Tudden & Thoennes, 1998). Many researchers have sought to address this problem by assessing changes in men who attend rape prevention programs. Some of these programs have been shown to have desirable effects on participants' attitudes and behavioral intent to rape (Foubert, 2000; Schewe, 2002), while others have shown either fleeting or counterproductive changes in men who see them (Berg, Lomoway & Fitzgerald, 1999; Davis, 2000; Earle, 1996). A review of the rape prevention literature leads to a startling conclusion: studies of programs designed to lower men's likelihood of raping show little to no evidence that authors have considered the culture of the groups they attempt to educate. While some programmatic approaches target particular populations and have elements tailored to
those populations (Davis, 2000) most do not tend to ground themselves in the research literature on the cultural aspects of the groups they seek to target.

Two promising theories that have been applied to rape prevention programming are belief system theory and the elaboration likelihood model. Belief system theory suggests that lasting attitude change results from interventions designed to maintain people's existing self-conceptions (Grube, Mayton, & Ball-Rokeach, 1994). Therefore, to be effective, rape prevention programs should appeal to the way men perceive themselves. While few if any men see themselves as potential rapists (Scheel, Johnson, Schneider, & Smith, 2001), many programs approach men as such (Earle, 1996) and therefore limit their likelihood of lasting success. The elaboration likelihood model suggests that long-term attitude and behavior change occurs when participants are motivated to hear a message, are able to understand it, and perceive the message as personally relevant. Such conditions lead to a type of thinking called central route processing, whereby listeners actively process program content and are far more likely to result in long-term attitude and behavior change. Applying this model to rape prevention has shown signs of success (Foubert, 2000; Heppner, Humphrey, Hillenbrand-Gunn, & Dehord, 1995). If these theories are to be most successfully applied to rape prevention programming, we must first understand how men perceive themselves, what motivates them to hear messages, how can they best understand them, and what makes a message relevant to them. To better understand these complex issues we must study the culture of groups we seek to educate.

Rape prevention programs often target fraternity men (Choate, 2003; Larimer, Lydem, Anderson & Turner; 1999). The emphasis on this population is warranted given that, generally speaking, fraternity men are more likely than male college students to be sexually coercive (Garrett-Goodling & Senter, 1987) and are more likely to use alcohol in an attempt to have sex with women (Boeringer, Shehan, & Akers, 1991). Fraternity men also have more traditional attitudes toward women (Schaefer & Nelson, 1993) and are more likely than other men to believe that women enjoy being physically "roughed up," that women pretend not to want sex, but want to be forced into sex, that men should be controllers of relationships, that sexually liberated women are promiscuous and will probably have sex with anyone, and that women secretly desire to be raped (Boeringer, 1999). A final reason why addressing this population is so important is that fraternities commit over half of all gang rapes on college campuses (O'Sullivan, 1991).

Beyond the aforementioned quantitative findings, qualitative research suggests that fraternity culture includes group norms that reinforce within-group attitudes perpetuating sexual coercion against women (Bowell & Spade; 1996; Martin & Humphrey, 1989). These cultural norms exert powerful influences on men's behavior. Research exploring interactions among male peer groups has shown that their interpersonal exchanges contribute to aggression toward women (Capaldi, Dishion, Stoddmler, & Yoerger, 2001). This aggression can be accounted for, in part, by men's engagement in hostile talk with male peers about women. Participation in this kind of talk serves to socialize individuals into their male peer groups. Such hostile talk among men tends to be mutual with active participation by most men in male peer groups opposing women verbally or physically (Capaldi et al., 2001).

Given the strong connection between alcohol and sexual assault in fraternities, it is necessary to explore the norms of fraternity culture when consuming alcohol and how this culture impacts individuals' decisions about sexually intimate behavior with women. Research has shown that 75% of men and 55% of women involved in rape situations were consuming alcohol or other drugs immediately before the rape took place (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987). In a study of the most successful rape prevention program, to date, fraternity members maintained that in addition to seeing this program (Foubert, 2005), their peers need to be better educated about making responsible decisions concerning sexual intimacy when they and/or their potential partners have consumed alcohol (Foubert & Cowell, 2004). The importance of including alcohol in sexual assault prevention efforts is underscored by research showing that women who have been sexually assaulted report a higher weekly drinking frequency than other women (Larimer, Lydem, Anderson, & Turner, 1999) and are more likely than other women to report high-risk drinking behavior (Silverman, Raj, Mucci, & Hathaway, 2001).

When men are intoxicated, they perceive rape survivors as being less distressed and less disgusted by their attackers than sober men (Norris, George, Davis, Mar- tel, & Leonesio, 1999). Interestingly, the more sexually aggressive a man is, the more he believes women want to have sex and the less honest he believes women are about not wanting to have sex on a particular occasion. This is especially evident when alcohol has been consumed by both parties. Not surprisingly, men who have committed sexual assault and/or report sexually aggressive tendencies toward women admit greater comfort with the use of coer- cive and aggressive techniques in general than nonaggressive men.

In a fictitious taped scenario, non-aggressive men reported believing that men should not continue sexual advances after three verbal protests from a female partner. On average, aggressive men believe that it is acceptable to continue sexual advances past this point and will only identify behavior as problematic when their later arguments with women are met with more vehement resistance. When alcohol is included in such scenarios, sexually aggressive men are more tolerant of coercion and aggression by males toward females than in situations in which alcohol is not involved. In contrast, non-aggressive men are unaffected in their reported point at which they believe men should stop sexual activity when alcohol is involved in scenarios. This finding has sparked the argument that alcohol functions as a disinhibiting cue for sexually aggressive men to assert dominance over women (Bernet, Callhoun, & Stolp, 1998). This notion is particularly important in the context of research showing that men who engage in more serious acts of sexual assault are also more likely to get drunk when they con-
same alcohol than other men (Koss & Gaines, 1993).

It would be to simply tell men to take "no" for an answer and avoid intercourse when they or their partners are intoxicated. Unfortunately, such simplistic methods cannot reasonably be expected to do any more than elicit ridicule from their audi-
cences. Extended interviews with college men show that focusing on a message that implicates men as potential rapists through discussion of respecting a woman's "no," and not engaging in intercourse when drunk are completely rejected by men. While these lessons are obviously impor-
tant for men to learn, when used as the primary emphasis of programmatic inter-
ventions, men resist the approach because they do not perceive themselves as poten-
tial rapists and therefore view the information presented as personally irrel-
vant (Scheel, Johnson, Schneider, & Smith, 2001). Instead, Scheel et al. (2001) suggest emphasizing the role of men to help and emotionally support survivors. This approach can encourage men to exami-
ne ways of preventing rape and sexual assault.

The task of lowering the likelihood that fraternity men will commit alcohol relat-
ed sexual assault is complex and requires a multifaceted exploration of the individ-
ual and cultural issues involved. The aforementioned research shows that fra-
ternity men are more likely to rape; that they are more likely to use alcohol to get sex; and that their group culture may reinforce unhealthy social norms. Many questions regarding fraternity men's cul-
tural norms remain unanswered, particularly those relating to alcohol and consent. What do fraternity men perceive as normative in their behavior and in their culture? What is sexually acceptable and unacceptable when alcohol is involved? What do they think it will take to convince themselves and their brothers not to com-
mit sexual assault under the influence of alcohol? These are the research questions that guided the present study. Given the open-ended nature of this inquiry and the need for depth in our exploration, we chose qualitative methods to explore these essential issues (Patton, 1990).

**METHOD**

**Participants**

Thirty seven traditional age under-
graduate male fraternity members enrolled at a public, southeastern university with an enrollment of approximately 5,000 undergraduate students participated in this study. Each was a current member of 1 of 14 fraternities on campus. Each fraternity agreed to insure that they sent separate rep-
resentatives from their chapter to each of the three focus groups. All fraternities on cam-
pus participated and sent a member to at least two out of three of the focus group interviews held for the present study. Focus group size ranged from 9 to 14 fraternity men. All participants were traditionally aged (18-22), full-time students in good academic standing.

**Procedure**

Prior to generating any data, the prin-
cipal investigator met with members of the representative student organization that oversees the fraternities on campus. The principal investigator informed the repre-
sentatives of the purposes of the study, and told them that the national office of each fraternity that participated in all three focus group interviews would receive a check for $250 to assist in covering their annual insurance bill. Nine of the fourteen fra-
ternities sent a representative to all three focus groups; the remaining five sent rep-
resentatives to two out of three of the focus groups.

To begin each focus group interview, the principal investigator disseminated the purposes of the study, stating that the results would not include any identifi-
cable descriptors linking individual members to their chapters, and that the researchers would use their input to design more effective rape prevention programs on campus and at a national level. Participants were asked a series of questions (see Appendix A) that elicited observations about their behavior and that of their fraternity peers in deciding whether consent preceded and/or played a role in their previous inti-
mate encounters, how such decisions are made when one or both partners have been consuming alcohol, and whether being in an intimate relationship with a partner affects how they define consent. The prin-
cipal investigator also inquired about their thoughts on programming strategies that might lower rates of alcohol-related sexual assault.

**Design and Analysis**

The researchers tape-recorded all three focus group interviews and transcribed these recordings verbatim. Notes on par-
ticipant body language and non-verbal behavior taken by an observer were merged with these transcripts to provide a more holistic assessment of the meaning behind participant comments. Using grounded the-
ory methods, the researchers read through the transcriptions, line-by-line, underlining key phrases or words from the mouths of participants. Then, they openly coded the data, paying special attention to the underli-
ned portions of each transcript. Codes included body language, relationships, reading signals, and fraternity culture, to name a few. Using axial coding, the researchers created categories into which each of these codes fit. Negative cases were accommodated with new categories or revised definitions to existing ones. Cate-
gories included familiarity, grey areas, and asking for consent. Finally, major themes emerged from these categories. These themes are presented in this article as evi-
dence of fraternity culture, particularly that which relates to alcohol and consent. As in most qualitative designs to research, the coding process begins dur-
ing data collection. As qualitative research experts suggest, "codes that account for our data take the form together as nascent theory that, in turn, explains these data and directs further data gathering." (Charmaz, 2000, p. 511). As concepts, beliefs, and behaviors are identified, researchers must then determine how they are related to one another. This often results in the forma-
tion of a theoretical model that describes the collected data. Negative cases of the existing theoretical model can either invalid-
ate a portion of the model or offer new areas of inquiry (Ryan & Bernard, 2000).

In our study, we chose to follow basic grounded theory methods because we
found them to be post-positivistic, accommodating to the social realities of life as a college fraternity man, and suitable for portraying and interpreting our participants’ voices.

Results and Discussion

Participant responses clustered around five major themes. The first four related to the decision-making process that fraternity men undergo as they decide whether or not to be sexually intimate with a woman. The last theme relates to ideas fraternity men have for promising areas of emphasis for rape prevention programming.

Theme 1: Asking for Consent During Intimate Encounters Ranks the Moment

With very few exceptions, most male fraternity members report that they do not ask for consent before engaging in intimate sexual behaviors with women. Men cite being afraid of being rejected and looking foolish if they ask a woman for consent and she subsequently denies his request. They also avoid discovering and revealing that they have misinterpreted a woman’s “signals” if they ask for consent and she says no. Many men agree that by asking for consent, it will “kill the situation.” Instead of obtaining verbal consent, most men prefer to rely on body language and other indicators that a woman wants to engage in intimacy. Asking for consent, clearly, is “the last thing possible.” In the words of one fraternity member, “You don’t ask because chances are, it will be over.” Another man noted that “You could be so far along, that asking doesn’t even matter.”

Theme 2: With women you don’t know, there are certain aspects where consent or lack thereof is clear

Many fraternity men are “always searching for signs” indicating that women want to engage in intimate sexual contact. Focus group members reported that they were able to identify situations in which they believed that the signals they receive from women are clear - either to proceed with intimate behavior or not to proceed. Men believe that women who stand very close to them, pay attention to them, attempt to impress them, persistently initiate sexual contact, and undress in front of them are giving off signals that they want to be intimate. Men report that they know that such women are able to consent to intimacy when they are sober, happy, can stand up to pressure, are not under emotional distress, and are lucid enough to engage in an intelligent conversation.

Fraternity men believe that a woman is still able to consent while she is drinking if she appears to be “normal” and is acting “straight.” Rational thoughts and can hold an intelligent conversation, is not loud and obnoxious, has good coordination and balance, and is not the “token drunk girl” in a room full of people. Others said that a woman who is drinking is able to consent to intimacy if she is in a way with men or just sitting and enjoying a beer. One group member mentioned that he cannot tell if she is able to consent while drinking unless he knows her. For many, the grey area is exonerated when two people are familiar with one another, as discussed later in this article.

Fraternity men identify a woman as unable to consent to intimacy when they see a number of signs indicating intoxication; the smell of beer on her breath, when she is passed out, or throwing up. Additionally, women who have emotional issues, or cannot cognitively focus on a conversation are perceived as unable to consent to intimacy. Other such signs of intoxication include redness in her face, slurred speech, verbalizing her level of intoxication, dancing with her back to the wall to hold herself up, behavior that is out-of-character, stumbling, or overly affectionate gestures.

Theme 3: With women you don’t know, there are certain aspects where consent or lack of consent is very unclear

Many men report being unsure whether a woman can consent to intimate behaviors when she has been drinking at all. They define this situation of uncertainty as the “gray area,” stating that there is really no way to know for sure if and when a woman is too drunk to be able to consent to intimacy. Some men state that there are no clear and specific signals that women can give off to indicate that they are not too drunk to give consent. One person’s advice is, “just don’t go into the gray area”; others follow with “don’t drink” and abstain from sexual intercourse. One fraternity member reported that there is no way to tell if she’s too drunk to consent: “You never know.” Even if she initiates, “there’s no way you’re going to be able to find that clear thing other than being able to pick up on those signals.” Another stated that “you can’t tell because of different tolerance levels.” Similarly, a participant reported that when alcohol is involved “I just don’t think there’s ever a 100% certainty.”

Theme 4: With women you know, there is much more clarity in what constitutes consent given the context of being in a relationship

The most prevailing theme that emerged from the three focus group interviews was that familiarity is an important factor in determining how intoxicated a woman is, how to interpret her body language, and the likelihood that fraternity men will ask for consent before engaging in intimate behaviors with a woman. Being in some type of a relationship with a woman, whether a long-term dating relationship or a friendship, allows men to feel more comfortable asking for consent, interpreting the signals she gives off, and determining her level of intoxication if she is drinking. Not knowing a woman very well can lead to misinterpretation and misunderstanding.

One man states, “You may make a decision with people you have absolutely no clue and there’s a lot more chance for misinterpretation and for misjudgment.” According to many fraternity men, being in a dating relationship dispels the uncertainty of her ability to consent to intimacy and her level of intoxication if she is drinking. Many believe that when they know a woman well enough, they know how much alcohol it takes for her to become too drunk to consent. Additionally, her signals that indicate her level of intoxication are more clear to them. For instance, a fraternity man explains that after two beers, “I know that that’s right where she starts to get drunk.” Another male claims that in a dating relationship, “you don’t have to question yourself on whether or not she’s going to want to do certain things, and you should be able to make the whole decision.”
for yourself.” Fraternity men report that asking a girlfriend for consent is easier than asking an unfamiliar woman. They iterate that in a dating relationship, they feel more comfortable asking for consent because they feel confident in interpreting a girlfriend’s signals, the possibility of rejection is limited, and “basically nothing is at stake.”

Many men said that in a dating relationship they seek what they term prior consent before consuming alcohol and engaging in intimacy. They view one of the benefits of being in a relationship with a woman is that consent can be discussed more openly and freely before engaging in intimate activity. Many of the fraternity men in this study agreed that engaging in sexual intercourse with a drunken girlfriend was okay because they had discussed it beforehand. In fact, two men agreed that if both the man and woman are drunk, “for some reason, it’s just okay, whether that’s right or wrong” by the standards of their institution or the state.

One focus group member talked about consent and the difference between being in a monogamous relationship with a woman and dating around. With a girlfriend, “it’s like, you had the conversation. It’s not like you’re going to totally lose her affection if you ask her, whereas if you’re caught up in the game with some other girl, you are trying to find out. You’re kind of testing the waters…” Asking an unfamiliar female for consent to engage in intimate behaviors is risky, and many fraternity men would rather attempt to read her body language for signals than ask for consent and risk the rejection.

When asked what signals indicate that a woman who is drinking is still able to consent to physically intimate activity, one fraternity man admits to being unsure if a woman who is drinking is able to give consent, stating that “you can only tell that if you know her. If you meet her for the first time, you can’t make that judgment.” Another man agrees that, “You have to know a person really well to be able to make a decision like that.” Fraternity men explain that an unfamiliar woman who is drinking could lead to a “dangerous situation.” Because they are not familiar with her, they are not able to determine how drunk she may be. In fact, men fear that she could be masking her intoxication. One male advises, “I think if you don’t know a girl and you see that she has a drink in her hand, then it would be wise not to hook up with her….” A few focus group members candidly verbalized that they would have sex with a woman who is drinking if they were in an intimate relationship with her; they had sex in the past, and she was not too drunk. Clearly, familiarity plays a major role in fraternity men’s decisions to engage or not to engage in intimate behaviors with women who have been drinking. Still, another man stated “For me, even if she’s your girlfriend and you know you could, if she’s wasted, there’s no point to it.” Another added “you have to know her before you can judge how drunk she is and whether or not she is able to give consent.”

Theme 5: Program ideas include a confrontation workshop for guys who have a history of making bad decisions, hearing survivors’ stories, and bystander intervention Fraternity men had many ideas to offer about how rape prevention programmers should approach their chapters when trying to educate them about alcohol-related sexual assault. They provided advice for program tone and content. With regard to tone, they emphasized that the style of the program should be personal, meaningful and devoid of scare tactics. With regard to content, fraternity men said they needed to hear about the effects of sexual assault. They also wanted to know how to intervene with their peers before, during and after a sexual assault. Furthermore, they wanted to better understand women’s perspectives on the definitions of rape and consent.

Fraternity men expressed an interest in educational programs that incorporate real-life rape stories from survivors themselves, rather than role-playing scenarios or fictitious skits. They mentioned the need to bring men and women together to discuss differing perspectives concerning consent, alcohol, intimacy, and sexual assault. Their hopes were to develop a better understanding of the female perspective, which would, in turn, prevent confusion when interpreting women’s body language and give them little reason to resort to mind-reading. The fraternity men also suggested that educational programming efforts address small groups of men across various chapters, rather than single chapters at one time.

The men in this study were particularly interested in learning effective strategies for intervention. They admitted that a few of their brothers have histories of questionable or inappropriate behavior while drinking, and that it would be helpful to learn how to confront a brother who may be about to make a poor choice before anything serious happens. They also wanted to spread the message that although they have a responsibility to their brotherhood to prevent sexual assault, those who choose to rape will be held responsible. Many expressed concerns with the difficulty of confronting a fraternity brother.

Focus group participants indicated that presenters of educational programs do not necessarily need to be members of fraternities. They do need to be “sympathetic” to and understanding of fraternity life and culture. Most men advocated for a male presenter who is an “in-group” member and takes a non-blaming approach to sexual assault education. The content of future programs should focus on the concepts of fraternal brotherhood, being held accountable to the group, trust, respect, morals, preserving or improving the reputation of the chapter, status, stability, and setting examples for others through positive and appropriate male behavior.

Implications Several implications are apparent from the comments of fraternity men in the present study. First, it is clear that fraternity men need to be educated more successfully with regard to how alcohol affects their and their partner’s decision-making abilities and capacity to provide consent during sexually intimate encounters. In addition, education is needed to teach fraternity men how consent is defined and
how to best determine whether their potential partners are in a state of mind where they can provide freely given consent.

Given that fraternity men are least likely to ask for consent in their encounters in situations where they arguably should be the most cautious and clear (with women they have not met), rape prevention programs must devise successful means to help fraternity men understand the dangerous situations they put themselves and their partners in when consent is not verbal and freely given.

Fraternity men discussed at length their reliance on signs such as body language to determine whether they believe consent is present. Such signs can easily be misinterpreted. As we work to educate women on protecting themselves, it is all the more clear that it is appropriate to encourage women to be clear and verbal if they do not wish to engage in intimate sexual behavior. It is even more apparent that fraternity men need to overcome their fear of "killing the situation" and learn to ask for consent and respond appropriately to the response from their potential sexual partner.

Fraternity men were better able to articulate how they believe the tone of a prevention program should be than they were able to come up with specific content suggestions. Above all, they suggested that a group of "insider" peers should be the presenters. These peers should neither blame nor preach to the audience and must remain sympathetic to the situations encountered by audience members. Some suggested that the audience consist of small groups of fraternity men from different fraternities. This was seen as a technique that will keep the focus on an in-group fraternity dialogue, without the dynamics of trying to gain and keep the attention of a large group of social norms, inside jokes, and social attitudes that could impede the efficacy of receiving a program's message.

Limitations

One obvious limitation of the present study is that it took place on one campus with only 37 people, and given its qualitative nature, cannot be confidently generalized. In addition, although participants were assured of confidentiality and anonymity by the researcher, the groups consisted of members of numerous fraternities, and participants might have been less willing to disclose personal information or chapter information in a group with members of other fraternities where leaking such information to other fraternities could have had negative consequences on their own chapter's reputation. Essential practice may not have revealed negative attitudes and behaviors so as to save face for themselves and their chapter in this situation.

Conclusion

It will come as no surprise to educators who work with college men, fraternities, and in the rape prevention movement to hear that fraternity men struggle with issues of defining consent in their intimate encounters with women, particularly when alcohol is involved. The results of the present study help take our knowledge of this struggle to new levels of specificity. Now that we better understand the particularities of fraternity men's reluctance to ask for consent, their perceptions of difference between women they know and women they do not know, and their lack of clarity on how alcohol affects consent, we are now better able to target those attitudes and behaviors where the most confusion is present. Hopefully in doing so, we can continue to reduce the rate of alcohol-related sexual assault on our nation's college campuses, and in the many other settings where rape and sexual assault are so prevalent today. While the field of rape prevention has come a long way from programs with effects that lasted only a day and then rebound to pre-test levels (Earle, 1996; Davis, 2000) to those with effects documented to last for a full academic year (Foubert, 2005), we must continue to improve our prevention methods to a day at the week for our efforts to become obsolete.
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1. Do issues of alcohol and consent for sexually intimate encounters concern you at all when you think about your chapter? If so, how?
2. To what degree do you think about asking for consent before being intimate with someone?
3. From your past physically intimate encounters with women, how did you go about deciding if she was willing to be physically intimate?
4. Under what conditions do you know a woman is able to consent to be intimate with you?
5. How can you tell when a person is unable to consent to intimacy?
6. Have you ever been unsure if someone was able to give consent? Under what circumstances?
7. How can you tell when a woman is intoxicated?
8. What signals might tell you that a woman is too drunk to give consent?
9. What signals might tell you that a woman, while consuming alcohol, is still able to agree to physically intimate activity?
10. Does being in a relationship with someone (for example a girlfriend or someone you’ve gone out with several times) affect whether or not you would be physically intimate with her after she’s been drinking? If so, how?
11. If a woman is drunk, does that impact whether you or someone you know would try to hook up with her by the end of the night? Why and how?
12. When it comes right down to it, under what conditions would you be intimate with someone if alcohol was involved? Is this the same for your fraternity brothers?
13. What do you think would be the most effective way to conduct a program for fraternity men that would result in them engaging in fewer risky intimate actions with women who have been drinking?
14. What kind of format should the program take (lecture, discussion group, video)?
15. What approach should be used?
16. What should be discussed (definition of consent, legal ramifications, affects of unwanted sexual encounter on women and/or men)?
17. How should it be discussed?
18. If our ultimate goal is to get fraternity men to have fewer sexual encounters with women who have been drinking, what would it take to reach this goal? Can this be done in a program?