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ABSTRACT

It is estimated that one in four college women will experience a sexual or attempted sexual assault. Disturbing as these statistics are, there still remains a lack of agreement on what is needed to create an effective college-based sexual assault prevention program. By reviewing a risk assessment survey conducted in 2003 at University of Hawai‘i Mānoa (UHM), conducting focus groups with students, and completing one-on-one interviews with key stakeholders; this research seeks to bridge gaps in knowledge regarding effective sexual assault prevention programming.

Findings revealed three main themes: (1) creating a responsible community, (2) honoring the culture of place, and (3) transforming system approach at UHM. Based on these findings, I make several recommendations. Recommendations are: educating students about sexual assault and prevention, empowering male students with positive roles, and engaging students to work collaboratively with administration and faculty as agents for change in the creation of a responsible community.
PREFACE

*Ho’omoe wai kāhi ke kāo’olina.*

Let’s all travel together like water flowing in one direction (Pukui, 1983, p. 118).

The above ‘Ōlelo No’ea (Native Hawaiian proverb) depicts the spirit of culture and community. The Native Hawaiian proverb encourages living in harmony with the people and the world around you. It describes belief in the connection between linking who you are based on your culture, with how you act and what you value as important. The combination of these qualities and experiences impact your values and ability to engage others to empower themselves; to journey together towards a common destination, as water flowing gracefully in one direction, towards home.

As a Native Hawaiian scholar, I am deeply rooted in cultural values that place strong emphasis on *kaiāulu* (community) and *kuleana* (responsibility). My culture is the foundation for values, such as responsibility, respect, and integrity that guide me as a feminist-sociologist-criminologist, researcher-researched, teacher-student in sexual assault prevention at UHM. Based on who, and where I am, I find myself surfing the hyphens, or as Michelle Fine (1994) so eloquently stated: I am “working the hyphens” of my positionalities (p. 70). Fine (1994) talked about “working the hyphen” between the researcher and the researched, which requires researchers to consider how they colonize the “other” in qualitative research (p. 70). Fine has challenged researchers to examine the hyphen, in which “self-other” join in the politics of everyday lives (1994, p. 70). By engaging in reflexivity about my many selves in the hyphenated space, I gained a critical consciousness about ways to authentically represent the voices and experiences in study.
That being said, I believe that effective sexual assault prevention at UHM requires an integration of Native Hawaiian cultural values for building strategies to improve the well-being of all our students. Therefore, reflecting on the knowledge and life experiences of my kūpuna (elders); I am inspired to entitle my thesis: Ho’ōmāna o Mānoa: Engaging and Empowering Students, Preparing the Groundwork for a Sexual Assault Prevention Program at the University of Hawai‘i Mānoa.

This research and thesis title includes a discussion of the Native Hawaiian concept of ho’ōmāna (empower). It is vital to understand that this empowerment not be based on the system of patriarchy, which uses a wide array of social control policies and practices to ratify male power and to keep women subordinate to men (Renzetti, Curran, & Carr, 2003). Rather, ho’ōmāna reflects compassion for all people, and a responsibility for well-being. It gives voice to the expertise of our kūpuna and culture as sources of knowledge and skill that promote and sustain community strength and responsibility. Therefore, it is by engaging students at UHM in the development and implementation of a sexual assault prevention program, that they are then able to ho’ōmāna and advocate, as agents for change, in the prevention of sexual assault on campus.

Consequently, UHM has an opportunity to contribute to the field of sexual assault prevention. As a research university of international standing, UHM is the flagship campus of the University of Hawai‘i system. Sixty-nine percent of UHM students are undergraduates, 57 percent are of Asian or Pacific Islander ancestry, and 56 percent are women (University of Hawai‘i Mānoa Strategic Plan, 2011-2015). UHM is positioned to be among the world’s leading indigenous serving institutions as demonstrated by its commitment to access and success of Native Hawaiian students and faculty. UHM’s
special distinction derives from its Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific orientation and unique location. Nearly all of the programs at UHM have developed strengths in Native Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific studies, which have created an international reputation for the University. UHM also offers instruction in more Asia-Pacific languages than any other institution in the United States of higher learning and is home to five Title VI Centers; which includes the comprehensive Hawai‘i‘inui‘akea School of Hawaiian Knowledge. UHM’s 2011-2015 strategic planning goals build on the vision of education defined as the “Mānoa Experience,” which provides students challenging and distinctive academic programs, innovative teaching and service, and world-class research and scholarship reflective of global perspectives and a culturally diverse island state (University of Hawai‘i Mānoa Strategic Plan, 2011-2015, p. 5).

One of the main goals stated in the UHM 2011-2015 strategic plan is to provide: a transformative educational experience for students by engaging them as participants in learning from the very first day of class, and by partnering them directly with faculty to develop active researchers and scholars at all levels (University of Hawai‘i Mānoa Strategic Plan, 2011-2015). This research study has a similar destination, to successfully promote, implement and conduct transformative learning for students in sexual assault prevention at UHM. We have the opportunity and responsibility to engage students to become empowered agents for as intergral partners in the policies, practices, and decision making at UHM.

The transformative learning environment for students at UHM is unique by virtue of our location as an island state. UHM’s uniqueness is further enhanced through the concept of kaiāulu (community). Kaiāulu happens when the members practice shared
values, making them visible to all. For UHM to be perceived as a truly “Hawaiian Place of Learning”, core values must be manifest in all areas of endeavor to establish a foundation for the teaching and transformative learning community (University of Hawai‘i Mānoa Strategic Plan, 2011-2015, p. 5).

Therefore, UHM must build a strong learning environment through a culture of community engagement that bridges theory and practice. Our cultural and ethnic diversity provides the necessary perspectives for effective community engagement and kuleana (responsibility). Reflecting on the Native Hawaiian culture of place will encourage, engage, and empower UHM students, to become outstanding activists at UHM, and contributing citizens in the larger communities in which they will someday live and work; all built on the balanced foundation of pono (righteousness).

By learning and living within the Native Hawaiian perspective, which includes the concept of pono, UHM has the capability to be grounded in the strengths of family, community, and responsibility. Interdependence and shared responsibilities are encouraged, and the greater good of the community is placed above individual interests. The Native Hawaiian worldview encompasses relationships, is giving, and intimately bound to the land and genealogy. This worldview is a source of empowerment, resilience, and sustainability. Therefore, it would be a course of wisdom to emulate Native Hawaiian values of equity, respect and responsibility. One way to do this is to encourage all students at UHM to participate as agents of change in the creation of a campus learning and living environment free of sexual assault.
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CHAPTER ONE

HO'OMANA O MĀNOA: ENGAGING AND EMPOWERING STUDENTS

PREPARING THE GROUNDWORK FOR SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION

PROGRAM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI‘I MĀNOA

‘A‘ohe ‘ulu e loa‘i ka pōkole o ka lou.

No breadfruit can be reached when the picking stick is too short.


Preparing the Groundwork

There is no success without preparation; is the meaning behind the above Native Hawaiian proverb. Success requires resourceful and practical preparation. This research thesis begins with an explanation of sexual assault on college campuses, and at the University of Hawai‘i Mānoa (UHM). Equipped with a “proper picking stick,” or accurate understanding of sexual assault will provide this researcher with the necessary knowledge and skills to better reach the “breadfruit” or goal of thesis. Reaching the goal of creating a successful sexual assault prevention program at UHM required preparing the groundwork. This groundwork includes the following discussion of sexual assault on college campuses.

The statistics for college sexual assault are unsettling, painting a painful portrait of its widespread prevalence. The 2000 National College Women Sexual Victimization (NCWSV), a large-scale survey involving 4,446 college women nation-wide concluded that about one in four female students will experience a completed or attempted sexual assault during her undergraduate experience (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000). The University of Hawai‘i Mānoa (UHM) has 11,200 women enrolled, and based on the statistics, the startling reality is that 2,820 of these students will be or have been sexually assaulted (UHM Women’s Center, PAU Violence
Program, 2011). This means that institutions of higher education can expect approximately 35 sexual assaults per 1,000 female students each academic year. The NCWSV (2000) survey also found that college women are at higher risk for sexual assault than their non-collegiate peers (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000).

In addition, the American College Health Association (ACHA) implements a random sample assessment survey annually, the National College Health Assessment (NCHA) at 47 post secondary institutions including UHM. The NCHA (2004) survey consisted of 47,202 participants nationally, of which 442 were from UHM. The survey collected data on a variety of health topics including questions related to the respondents’ experiences with sexual assault and sexual violence within the last school year. Comparing UHM data to the entire NCHA (2004) sample resulted in similar findings:

- 2.3 percent of UHM students reported verbal threats for sex as compared to 3.6 present of all NCHA respondents;
- 8.0 percent of UHM students reported sexual touching against their will as compared to 9.2 percent of all NCHA respondents;
- 3.2 percent of UHM students reported attempted sexual penetration against their will as compared to 2.8 percent of all NCHA respondents (ACHA, 2004).

As for the academic impact of sexual assault on students the NCHA (2004) survey had one related question. It asked, “Within the last year has sexual assault affected your academic performance?” Of the UHM students who reported some form of sexual assault within the past year, six percent responded affirmatively, saying that they had received a lower grade on an exam, received an incomplete, or withdrew from a class due to a sexual assault (ACHA, 2004).
In 2003 the Program Against Violence to Women (PAVW), a project of the UHM Women’s Center, implemented the UHM Student Survey on Violence Program (SSVP). The survey was conducted with undergraduate students to document levels of sexual assault, rape, stalking, relationship violence, willingness to report incidents to the authorities, and attitudes about violence against women. The survey defined sexual assault as: “unwanted touching of a sexual nature like forced kissing, touching of the genitals, grabbing, fondling. Sexual assault included indecent exposure, obscene phone calls or emails, and rape.” (Bopp, 2005, p. 5).

Survey findings indicated that UHM students experienced levels of sexual assault and relationship violence similar to those reported nationally. Women were significantly more likely to report experiencing sexual assault and relationship violence than men; and males were significantly more likely than females to endorse attitudes that supported violence against women. Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders were significantly more likely to report experiencing relationship violence than members of other ethnic groups; and Asians, Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders were significantly more likely than Caucasians to endorse attitudes that supported violence against women. The researcher of the study claimed that: “gender, place of origin, previous victimization, and attitudes about violence against women were important indicators for whether or not students said they would report future violence” (Bopp, 2005, p. 6).

The purpose of the 2003 UHM SSVP was to report violence against women and to encourage UHM to institutionalize an effective sexual assault prevention program. Due to the extraordinary ethnic diversity at UHM and the limited amount of research about sexual assault and relationship violence among Native Hawaiians, Pacific Islander, and Asian college students,
findings from the survey were utilized to contribute to improving prevention efforts with these particular populations (Bopp 2005).

Data for the UHM SSVP was collected from UHM students in undergraduate lecture courses in the fall semester of 2003. A total of 794 surveys were collected, with 724 usable for analysis. The principle researcher did not state why 70 of the surveys collected were not utilized for analysis. For the UHM SSVP survey only findings from the female undergraduate respondents (N=435) were examined. In the fall semester of 2003 there were 7,284 female undergraduates attending UHM (UH Institutional Research Office, 2004).

The principle researcher of the 2003 UHM SSVP stated that the primary focus of the study was to collect and analyze data on findings from levels of sexual assault experienced by female respondents. While findings for both male and female respondents were reported for most measures, since women were overwhelming the victims of sexual and relationship violence (Bachman & Saltzman, 1995; Graffunder, Noon, Cox, & Wheaton, 2004; Tjaden & Theonnes, 2000) findings about levels of sexual violence experienced by the female respondents was the primary focus.

The 2003 UHM SSVP survey found that:

- 10 percent of the respondents reported experiencing sexual assault;
- 11 percent of the respondents experienced partner violence;
- 10 percent of the respondents of the respondents reported being stalked;
- 2 percent of the respondents reported having been raped;
- 5 percent those crimes were reported to campus security and/or police (Bopp, 2005).
Furthermore, previous research on sexual assault on college campuses demonstrates that exposure to sexual assault is associated with a multiplicity of negative outcomes; including increased substance abuse, and depressive symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder (Acierno, Brady, Gray, Kilpatrick, Resnick, & Best, 2001). In turn, many of these negative outcomes as a result of sexual assault have detrimental effects on college success (Yeater & O’Donohue, 1999). These negative consequences often associated with sexual assault on college campuses demand that effective prevention programs be developed and implemented.

Recognizing that sexual assault against women can increase substance abuse, stress, and depressive symptoms; most colleges and universities today have made attempts to address sexual assault on campus through education or prevention programs (Katz, 1995, 2006). In the past, schools have focused on programs for women to educate them on strategies to reduce their risk of being sexually assaulted (Lonsway, 1996). Many programs of this nature were focused on self-defense or awareness raising techniques for women to protect themselves.

Studies evaluating programs aimed at increasing women’s awareness of sexual assault and their assertive responses have generally shown these programs to be successful in providing women with risk avoidance strategies (Gray, Lesser, Quinn, & Bounds, 1990; Hanson & Gidycz, 1993). Although these risk-avoidance programs have reported more cautious dating behavior among women, they have also generated controversy due to the implications of locating the responsibility with women. Sexual assault deterrence strategies may empower and protect individual women; but many suggest that true sexual assault prevention and education must target the real and potential perpetrators of sexual assault (Lonsway, 1996).

Starting in the 1990s, efforts have shifted from programming exclusively for women to programming that included men. Alan Berkowitz (2002), well-known advocate for sexual assault
prevention, stated that statistically, most sexual assaults are committed by men. With this in mind, Berkowitz (2002) suggested that a shift from providing only self-defense for women to programming for men is necessary to address the perpetrator population.

Men must take responsibility for preventing sexual violence, because a vast majority of assaults are perpetrated by men against women, children, and other men. Although only a small number of men commit sexual assault, all men can influence the culture and environment that allows other men to be violent (p. 1).

However, research about the effects of sexual assault programming for men is limited (Heppner, Humphrey, Hillendrand-Gunn, & DeBord, 1995). For example, there is little research available on attitudinal changes over time as a result of sexual assault programming for men (Breitenbecher, 2000). While, some studies report a change in attitude toward sexual assault against women immediately following and up to nine months subsequent to such programming (Berkowitz, 2002; Foubert, 2000), other studies found little or no change in the attitudes of men towards sexual assault (Gidycz, Layman, Rich, Crothers, Gilds, Matorin, & Jacobs, 2001).

An example of a study that found little or no change in the attitudes of men towards sexual assault after attending a sexual assault prevention program was the Gidycz et al. (2001) study. The study involved approximately 1,100 students from a large Ohio university that attended two hour long sessions on sexual assault and acquaintance rape prevention. Participants were given factual information on the pervasiveness of sexual assault on college campuses and legal definitions of sexual assault and rape. Following the informational portion of the program participants were given a survey that included statements about sexual assault and rape, questioned respondents if the statements were myths or fact, and attitudinal measures. Nine weeks following the program, participants were asked to complete a post-test. Gidyz et al. found
that men, after a nine month post program, displayed sexually aggressive attitudes. Based on the findings in the study, the authors recommended that sexual assault prevention programming be improved by providing information that was more relevant to the participants by personalizing the content; which would result in more positive attitudinal changes in men regarding sexual assault and other forms of sexual violence (Gidyz et al., 2001).

Research Questions and Goals

I conducted a pilot study in preparing the groundwork for the design of a sexual assault prevention program at UHM. Given the lack of evidence for sexual assault prevention programs focusing on men; my research questions responded to the view that men need to be included in sexual assault prevention programming at UHM. Because, to date, little is known regarding how to motivate men to become agents of change in the cause of sexual assault prevention, this research project was exploratory and aimed to understand how all students made sense of their attitudes in relation to sexual assault at UHM. Thus, the goal of this research was in preparing the groundwork for a sexual assault prevention program for UHM. The following research questions were addressed:

1. How do we prepare the groundwork for a sexual assault prevention program at UHM?
2. How do we engage and empower all the students to become agents of change in sexual assault prevention programming at UHM?
3. How do we create and sustain a kaiāulu (community) of kuleana (responsibility) in collaboration among students, administrators, and faculty in the design and development of an effective sexual assault prevention program at UHM?

Therefore, the objectives of this research identified unique resources that exist, the ways in which students were already working against sexual assault; and the potential for social
change as a responsible community at UHM. To examine these areas, five focus groups were conducted with UHM students to: listen to the students’ stories and to hear their voices regarding sexual assault at UHM. Many of the student members in the focus groups were able to share their views on what characteristics would comprise a successful sexual assault prevention program at UHM.

In addition, five one-on-one interviews from a diverse group of major stakeholders at UHM were conducted and analyzed to: listen to the interviewees insights and learn from their individual and departmental experiences. Interviewees described how they and their departments were involved in sexual assault prevention, and what resources were provided. Interviewees also gave their impressions on what would contribute towards community collaboration and sustainability of a sexual assault prevention program at UHM.

Key stakeholders included interviews from the departments and offices of: Athletics, Campus Security, Counseling Center, Gender Equity, Health Center, Housing, Judicial Affairs, and Women’s Center at UHM. Key stakeholders were identified and asked to participate in this survey based on their individual, and or department involvement in sexual assault prevention and education at UHM. Two of the key stakeholders who participated in this study were referred to me by other interviewees. Those particular stakeholders were referred because of their connection with and collaborative efforts in sexual assault prevention at UHM.

To discuss implications for preparing the groundwork for a successful sexual assault prevention program at UHM; concepts from routine activities theory, feminist theory, male peer support theory, and the bystander model of prevention are discussed. Embedded in theories of community responsibility and pro-social bystander behavior, this research evaluated the
effectiveness of teaching sexual assault prevention to individuals of the UHM community as potential bystanders rather than solely as potential perpetrators or victims of sexual assault.

**Prevention Programs at UHM**

To advocate for an inclusive, comprehensive, and campus-wide sexual assault prevention program at UHM, it is important to review the history of sexual assault prevention resources at UHM. The following is a background of the various types of sexual assault prevention programs at UHM.

In 1992 UHM instituted Creating Options for a Rape-Free Environment (CORE), a peer based education project initiated by the Sex Abuse Treatment Center (SATC) at Kapiʻolani Medical Center for Women and Children; a statewide program valued for its leadership and expertise in providing treatment services for survivors of sexual assault, preventing sexual assault, and effecting change through public policy, awareness and education. Funding for CORE came from SATC and the UHM Office of the Vice President. However, each year after receiving initial funding for CORE, the UHM Office of the Vice President decreased their share of the program funding until SATC could no longer sustain the project. Thus, in 1995, after only three years of operating, CORE no longer had sufficient funding to continue offering their services and resources in sexual assault prevention at UHM (Bopp, 2005).

Three years later, in 1998, the Sex Assault Prevention Team (SAPT) a peer based program was initiated by the UHM Women’s Center with a very limited two year state funded grant of $13,453 to conduct sexual assault “train the trainer” workshops for other UH campuses. The two year state funded grant ended in 2000, and with no additional funding available, these workshops were no longer conducted. A year later, beginning in 2001 and ending in 2002, *Unspeakable Acts* a peer based theater program that addressed sexual violence against women
was initiated by the Gender Equity Counselor’s Office with a one time nominal grant of $250. The grant’s funding allowed the theater program to operate for only one year (Bopp, 2005).

In October 2001 and October 2003 the UHM Gender Equity Office and Women’s Center was awarded Campus Violence Prevention grants from the U.S. Department of Justice, Violence Against Women’s Office to fund a project known as the Program Against Violence to Women (PAVW). PAVW’s purpose was to provide prevention and education for UHM students about sexual assault, stalking, and relationship violence. Grant requirements included the development of a Campus Community Partner Response (CPR) team and training of staff and students. The first grant in 2001 also included the implementation of a campus needs assessment survey to determine the levels of sexual assault and relationship violence experienced by UHM students (Bopp, 2005).

In 2003 the PAVW survey was implemented with undergraduate students at UHM to determine levels of sexual assault, stalking, relationship violence, rape, willingness to report incidents to the authorities, and attitudes about violence against women. Survey findings indicated that UHM students experienced levels of sexual assault and relationship violence similar to those reported nationally (Bopp, 2005).

In October of 2003, a second PAVW grant was awarded by the U.S. Department of Justice. In October 2006 PAVW was awarded a third grant by the U.S. Department of Justice; which provided an additional two years of funding for $199,999 (Bopp, 2005). The third grant provided much needed additional funding for education and training at UHM about sexual assault and relationship violence.

PAVW’s prevention efforts focused on training incoming students, campus security, and judicial affairs staff about sexual assault and relationship violence (Bopp, 2005). During the
2005 calendar year, 92 workshops on sexual assault and sexual harassment prevention were presented to the campus community by a variety of sponsors at UHM. Some of those sponsors included: Vice Chancellor’s Office, Center for Teaching Excellence, Office of Faculty Development, Housing Department, and Athletics Department (Report on Sexual Harassment Complaints at the University of Hawai‘i Mānoa, 2005).

Additionally, 55 workshops addressing sexual assault prevention, 15 workshops addressing prejudice reduction and social justice, and 22 workshops addressing students’ rights and responsibilities were conducted. Several of these workshops have become annual sessions at UHM, with some mandated. In addition, there has been an increasing ability to work collaboratively with various departments at UHM concerned with sexual assault prevention. Many of the workshops addressing sexual assault, sexual orientation discrimination, and prejudice reduction were co-created and presented by several offices, which included: Vice Chancellor of Students, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Gender Equity Counselor’s Office, Civil Rights Counselor’s Office, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Student Office, Program Against Violence to Women, University Health Services, and Women’s Center (Report on Sexual Harassment Complaints at the University of Hawai‘i Mānoa, 2005). The following examples are noteworthy:

- Twice a year the Center for Teaching Excellence facilitates training for all new Teaching Assistants (TA’s), the workshop on sexual assault and harassment is now a plenary session required for all new TA’s;
- Once a year the Center for Teaching Excellence and Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs facilitates a New Department Chair’s sexual assault and harassment prevention;
• New Student Orientation program which serves the majority of our incoming first year students has incorporated a segment on sexual assault and harassment awareness into its healthy choices component;

• International Student Services Office includes a component on sexual assault and harassment prevention in their orientation twice a year, and includes a section in their student manual (Report on Sexual Harassment Complaints at the University of Hawai‘i Mānoa, 2005).

In addition to the above, beginning in 2010, a promising sexual assault prevention and education organization, called MEN OF STRENGTH (MOS) was established at the University of Hawai‘i Hilo (UH Hilo). UH Hilo is a model institution of higher learning that is dedicated to excellence in research and education. UH Hilo’s intercultural campus environment is an engaging atmosphere of learning where knowledge is created and shared, values and wisdom are preserved, and each can learn from one another. UH Hilo’s vision and goals are to promote students to the highest levels of achievement; with the focus to continuously improve the quality of life of the people of Hawai‘i, the Pacific region, and the world (UH Hilo Strategic Planning Committee, 2010-2015). UH Hilo’s vision and goals help to create an environment that engages and empowers the students to become agents for change through active participation in sexual assault prevention programs, such as MOS.

MOS is designed to acknowledge, celebrate, encourage, and honor the role and responsibility that men have to become agents of change, thus contributing in positive ways in the prevention of sexual assault. MOS is based on the educational principles developed by *Men Can Stop Rape* for their “Strength Campaign” but is adapted to be culturally relevant to UH Hilo and to Hawai‘i Island (UH Hilo, Men of Strength, Our Community, Our Kuleana, 2010). Some
of the educational principles that UH Hilo MOS has adapted are: mobilization of college males to prevent sexual assault and violence against women, building young men’s capacity to challenge the harmful aspects of traditional masculinity, value alternative visions of male strength, and embrace their vital role as allies with women and girls in fostering healthy relationships and gender equity (UH Hilo, Men of Strength, Our Community, Our Kuleana, 2010). Recognizing and appreciating that it is a Hawaiian place of learning and teaching, UH Hilo has also incorporated the Native Hawaiian concepts of kaiāulu (community) and kuleana (responsibility) into their MOS program identity and content.

Despite the progress in sexual assault prevention at UHM and UH Hilo, findings indicate that students believe they are not being encouraged to share in the responsibility of creating a caring and compassionate community. Student members of all focus groups voiced concern about the lack of collaboration on campus, between students, administrators, and faculty around sexual assault prevention and education. That being said, most students also acknowledged a desire to participate in preparing the groundwork for a sexual assault prevention program at UHM.

The interviewees also noted the lack of community collaboration regarding sexual assault prevention. However, their concerns were focused more on transforming system approaches at UHM. Interviewees agreed that there is much work to be done in the area of sexual assault prevention. There was a consensus that efforts to prevent sexual assault on campus have been stymied by departments which are isolated and fragmented from other departments on campus. The individual interviewees acknowledged that in preparing the groundwork for a sexual assault prevention program at UHM, there must be collaboration between departments and a genuine commitment by all to thrive as a responsible community.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

ʻAʻohe pau ka ʻike i ka hālau hoʻokahi.

All knowledge is not learned in just one school.

One can learn from many sources (Pukui, 1983, p. 24).

Evoking the Sweet Waiawī

My Papa, kupuna kāne (grandfather), with whom I spent most of my formative childhood days, was one of my main sources of knowledge. I recall his rich wisdom and remember his reflective words: “Honey-girl, know where the sweet waiawī (guava) are, and know why they are there.” I can easily evoke these younger times; hear his loving warm voice, smell the sweet scent of the waiawī, taste the sugary juiciness, and feel the sticky syrup run down my chubby cheeks. The lesson my Papa was sharing with me was the importance of knowing where the waiawī were, and knowing why they were there. The lesson was taught and learned; there are many sources of knowledge, as there are many waiawī on a tree; and knowledge, like the sweet waiawī, is both a gift to learn and a responsibility to share. To this day, the smell of the sweet waiawī makes my heart smile, evoking a yearning for those carefree childhood days with my Papa.

My Papa’s lessons and wisdom have guided me throughout my life, and throughout this journey of research and discovery. Native Hawaiian ways of knowing and ways of learning are inculcated deep in my heart, in my naʻau (where knowledge and learning cultivate action). I am a Native Hawaiian scholar and educator. I am also a feminist-sociologist-criminologist. I am the researcher-the researched. I have one voice, with many tones and timbres. I have learned to ‘surf the hyphens,’ working between the hyphens of my various standpoints (Fine, 1994).
Therefore, the literature review is thick and diverse, and completed after the collection and analysis of the data. This researcher utilized grounded theory methods from sociologists Glaser and Strauss (1967) in reviewing the literature. In *The Discovery of Grounded Theory* (1967), Glaser and Strauss countered the ruling methodological assumptions. Their book proposed that systematic qualitative analysis had its own logic and could generate theory. For Glaser and Strauss (1967) the defining components of grounded theory practice included:

- Simultaneous involvement in data collection and analysis;
- Constructing analytical codes and categories from data;
- Making comparisons during each stage of analysis;
- Advancing theory development during each step data collection and analysis;
- Memo-writing to elaborate categories, specify their properties, define relationships between categories, and identify gaps;
- Sampling aimed toward theory construction, not population representativeness;
- Conducting literature review after developing an independent analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

Engaging in these practices helped this researcher to control the research process, which increased the analytical power of the research study (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Engaging in these processes also empowered my voice; a composition composed of Native Hawaiian scholar and educator, feminist-sociologist-criminologist, and researcher-researched.

The literature review begins with a discussion of Native Hawaiian epistemology, moves to indigenous methodologies, and then features feminist standpoint theory from emerging and existing literature. Additionally, the literature review will include background information on sexual assault prevention, in general, and specifically, on college campuses. Integrated in the
literature review will be a discussion on the culture of rape on college campuses, troublesome masculinities, and perspectives of men’s empowerment as agents of change. Theoretical frameworks for sexual assault prevention are incorporated. In particular, the value of kaiāulu, (community), and kuleana (responsibility) models, such as, feminist male peer support and bystander approaches are evaluated as promising sexual assault prevention and education programming at UHM.

Native Hawaiian Ways of Knowing and Learning

My voice was first trained and educated in Native Hawaiian ways of ‘ike (knowing) and na’au (ways of learning and acting). How one knows, and what one views as important ends up being the center of our identity. It was a way for this researcher to navigate on the journey of discovery, to determine what was worthy of knowing and learning; and how this knowledge will help to build and support communities that are sustained by a shared sense of responsibility.

Native Hawaiian epistemology is a long-term idea that is ancient and modern, central and marginalized. It is a distinct feature of our culture; one which is changed by time and influence. It is constant. This is the voice heard throughout the research study, in particular, in the methods chosen and in the analyses of data collected.

Manulani Aluli Meyer (2003), Native Hawaiian scholar and educator, pointed to key differences that distinguish the West’s Enlightenment model from Native Hawaiian ways of knowing and learning. Her Ho‘oulu (2003) outlined several thematic areas in which the Native Hawaiian method contrasts sharply with the traditional Western science built on positivism, that emphasizes method, definition, explicitness, singular meaning, and individual effort. Meyer (2003) made clear that a different base of assumptions is prerequisite to an appreciation of the nuances of meaning implicit in things Native Hawaiian. The notion that epistemologies are
products of culture and therefore vary among different cultures is not startling or new. For the last century the global philosophic community has been engaged in heated debate over the shortcomings of the Enlightenment West model, focused most recently by the critical perspectives raised by feminism, multiculturalism, and postcolonial studies (Rowe, 2008). Meyer (2003) noted several salient features that distinguish Native Hawaiian epistemology, including the spiritual context from which knowledge emerges and the strong link to family and community.

Meyer (2003) stated that what distinguishes Native Hawaiian epistemology is the spiritual context from which knowledge emerges and the strong link between knowledge and the ʻāina (land). The importance placed on the way personal relationships shape and validate knowledge experiences further differentiate the Native Hawaiian model from that of the Enlightenment West. Meyer’s (2003) work tells us that from a Native Hawaiian perspective knowledge is embodied and situated, contextualized by time and place and knower. What can be known is infused with spirituality, relationship, responsibility, and reciprocity. Therefore, it is acknowledged that the context from which this research emerged was within the memory of the lessons taught by my Papa, and the sweet scent of the waiawī. The values of responsibility and reciprocity inform the analyses of data collected for this study. Value and meaning are found in all the voices of the focus group participants, and the individual interviews. Following is a discussion on indigenous methodologies.

**Indigenous Methodologies**

Since this study is grounded in the culture of place at UHM, a methodology that is relevant and sensitive to the cultural aspects of the host culture is vital. Native Hawaiians are the indigenous people of the Hawaiian Islands and share many cultural similarities with other
indigenous populations around the world. According to Smith (1999), internationally renowned researcher in Māori and indigenous education, for many years, indigenous research has been conducted and dominated by western thought and interpretation. With regard to indigenous populations, Smith (1999) explains that the researched need training to take over the role of the researchers. Since I am Native Hawaiian, I must learn to apply quantitative and qualitative tools which are responsible, respectful, and appropriate in conducting research based at UHM. The “Mānoa Experience” provides students world-class research and scholarship reflective of global perspectives in a culturally diverse island state. Therefore, an awareness of indigenous perspectives, especially values, is critical today, as diversity of culture, language, ethnicity, and national origin continues to be the focus of reclaimed identity and sovereignty for indigenous peoples. This awareness of indigenous perspectives was eloquently acknowledged in the following quote from the *Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of the Heritage of Indigenous People*: “The effective protection of the heritage of the indigenous peoples of the world benefits all humanity. Cultural diversity is essential to the adaptability and creativity of the human species as a whole” (Daes, 1995, p. 1).

A notable part of my indigenous methodology was inspired in part, by the work of Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999), who wrote powerfully on decolonizing research methodologies for indigenous peoples. Smith (1999) argued that to begin to undo the negative effects of colonization, which included substantial amounts of research on indigenous peoples, the Western research methodology itself has to be decolonized. By decolonizing western methodologies, my research aimed to re-center and reposition myself within my native land. From this vantage point, I challenged the viewpoints of those outside of our communities who see us as less than a “norm” that is based within their worldview rather than within ours.
Therefore, identity is central to the concept of value in Native Hawaiian communities (Porima, 2005). Identity is built on perspectives that value proper relationships with spiritual power inherent in every location, ancestral lineage, living family members, and obligations to the collective good of the community (Kawakami, 1999; Kawakami & Aton, 1999; Meyer, 2003; Osorio, 2004). Value is viewed in terms of practical and respectful impact on the lives of the people and communities involved (Meyer, 2003). To tap into data that penetrated below the surface of rigor as defined by Western epistemology, I considered paradigms that included cultural identity, culture of place, relationships, and impact in terms of immediate and long-term contributions and service to the community.

I was fortunate enough to have had a Papa, and parents, who groomed me for success in academia and mainstream life. They stressed the value and importance of our Native Hawaiian identity and culture through ways of knowing and ways of learning. My research benefitted from collaborations of both indigenous cultural perspectives and Western perspectives. I was taught to appreciate my kuleana (responsibility) to learn about the cultural practices of my kūpuna (elders) and in return, draw on my positions and skills, (surfing the hyphens) in predominantly Western institutions to create a place and space for the practice of indigenous practices. I welcomed the opportunity to acknowledge indigenous points of view, and to promote and protect the value of my kūpuna. My Papa guided and taught me Native Hawaiian ways of knowing and learning, so that indigenous ways would eventually become part of the standard procedure for this research study, and any future studies conducted by this researcher.

I am therefore advocating Native Hawaiian methodologies that are “of, for, by, and with us” (Pihama, Cram, & Walker, 2002; Porima, 2005). Our culture of place, our culture of community, and ways of knowing and learning are particularly valuable and valid. When this
acknowledgment comes within the context of choice of methodologies, as indigenous researchers, we increase the likelihood that the methods utilized will be decolonized.

While academic researchers consider their methods as the design of the experiment, representative sampling, and validity of the instrument to be the beginning of a project; indigenous researchers begin their efforts by collaborating with the researched to build a community. An ongoing concern for this researcher was the power relationships in this collaborative process. How do groups and individuals with different goals and values come to respect each other’s expertise and reach the common goal of preparing the groundwork for a successful sexual assault prevention program at UHM? From the outset of this research, I focused on the need to “hear the voices of the students” to value their voices as contributing members in the UHM community. The key stakeholders echoed community building, but advocated for collaboration between the administration, the various departments, and faculty in sexual assault prevention at UHM.

This researcher also acknowledges that not all Western methodologies are culturally insensitive, and that this recognition leads to better understanding and development of research strategies and methods. Native Hawaiian ways of knowing and learning is inclusive and rejoices in the communities’ dynamic and diversified responses to initiatives. The following is a discussion of Feminist Standpoint Theory which encourages a community of culture and respect.

**Feminist Standpoint Theory**

Feminist standpoint theorists began by rejecting positivism’s claim of creating a view from nowhere in favor of the claim that each subject is specific, located in a particular time and place. Thus a knower has a particular perspective on the object. At the same time, this position, a standpoint that encourages a community of culture and responsibility, gives access to the

Hartsock (1983, 1985), a political scientist who pioneered the notion of standpoint, stated that a standpoint is “achieved rather than obvious, a mediated rather than immediate understanding” (1985, p. 132). Capitalists and workers experience the same immediate reality and may even interpret it in similar ways. The difference between their standpoints is that the workers have the potential to get beneath the surface through analysis and struggle, to get a different, deeper understanding. Hartsock (1985) used the example of varying ways to understand power. Capitalists, she argued can know power only as a commodity. However, if workers engage in class struggle and reflect on their position, they can begin to understand power as a relationship of domination. Hartsock (1985) built her analysis on a critique of Marxist epistemology, which, she maintained, missed the mark in the application of its own logic. She is convinced by the logic of historical materialism that to understand people you have to start with the circumstances under which they meet their daily needs for food, clothing, and shelter.

However, in privileging the standpoint of the worker, Marxist epistemology ignored the most fundamental site of production, those places where the satisfaction of people’s needs was directly produced, particularly the domestic setting. Both in wage work and in the home, women’s work kept them involved in a world of directly meeting needs “in concrete, many-qualitied, changing material processes” (Hartsock, 1985, p. 235). This standpoint, the one of meeting human needs, the standpoint of women, is the one that Hartsock (1985) privileged. From this standpoint, we are able to understand power as potentially nonhierarchical, as a capacity.
As Hartsock (1995) faulted Marxism for violating its own assumptions, Haraway (1990, 1993), an anthropologist, made a similar critique of positivism. Haraway (1993) noted that positivism is based on the primacy of data, that is, information that is directly detectable through the senses. Positivist epistemology is, then, logically grounded in the materiality of people’s bodies. Yet, positivism denies the presence of these bodies in making its claims to validity. For example, those dominating the production of knowledge in the Western tradition have, for the most part, been upper-class, white, and male, and their observations shaped by their specific experience. Haraway (1993) agreed with positivist arguments that it is through our sensory experience, our bodies, that we have access to the world, but that very grounding is both the basis of valid knowledge and a limit on it. She coined the term “embodied vision” (p. 199) to emphasize that our vision is located in some specific place, that our knowledge is “situated” (p. 199), and thus partial.

How can we compensate for the partiality of any perspective? Haraway (1993) says the best way to gain a critical perspective on one’s situated view is to know how things look from a different position. Access to two ways of looking at a phenomenon reveals the limits and constructedness of each. Because each of us experiences life and our selves in multiple facets that are “stitched together imperfectly” (Haraway, 1988, p. 586), empathy is possible and, through it, two knowers in distinct situations can make a partial connection. By translating across distinct perspectives and connecting ever-shifting situated knowledge, we can rationally build some collective, community-based agreement on the whole. Women cross boundaries between perspectives as a matter of daily life: I can attest to that fact, as I surf the hyphens of my various positionalities every day of my life.
Smith also noted (1987, 1990) that the sexual division of labor, both within sociology and between professional and domestic work, created a breach between the means by which we develop our understandings of social life and the concrete work of keeping social life going. Thus, the standpoint of women in sociology offers leverage to integrate two perspectives. It gives us the opportunity to see sociology as a masculine institution that plays a role in the broader practices by which we are all organized and managed, what Smith calls “the relations of ruling” (Smith, 1990, p. 34). Sociological practices “convert what people experience directly in their everyday world into forms of knowledge in which people as subjects disappear and in which their perspectives on their own experience are transposed and subdued by the magisterial forms of objectifying discourse” (p. 4). Smith’s (1990) imagery is powerful: she says we reach out through our conceptual frameworks to catch bits of the empirical world and retreat to our office to organize the data to fit our frameworks. The pictures we end up with are more likely to correspond to official organizational charts than to the daily experience of the voices in our research. Sociological practices “convert what people experience directly in their everyday world into forms of knowledge in which people as subjects disappear and in which their perspectives on their own experience are transposed and subdued by the magisterial forms of objectifying discourse” (p. 4). The result is a sociology that is alienated from social life. According to Smith (1990) making ideology is letting concepts and abstractions dominate and obscure those material relations (Smith, 1994, p. 34). Therefore, we need to look closely behind facts and abstractions and ask how they are the outcomes of the concerted activity of specific people in concrete circumstances.

Beginning from a marginalized standpoint, one that integrates the perspectives of black feminists as academic outsiders and other black women, Patricia Hill Collins (1986, 1989, 1990)
developed a Black feminist epistemology that exposed the systematic and particular character of hegemonic sociology, and at the same time it offered an alternative. Collins (1990) identified four parameters of Black feminist epistemology. First, concrete experience and the wisdom developed out of everyday experience are valued in evaluating knowledge claims. Second, knowledge claims are not hierarchically imposed by elite, but rather worked out through dialogue with everyday social actors. Third, emotions such as empathy and attachment are incorporated into the notion of intellect. Finally, part of the methodology and analysis of research and theory is vis-à-vis what is known about the character and biography of the person advancing it (Collins, 1990, pp. 203-18). With these understandings of standpoint theory, and for the purpose of this research, the following is an assessment of mainstream research in sociology.

One of the first assessments by feminist standpoint theorists of mainstream sociological research is that it flows from the standpoint of privileged men. Some say that research practice has been distorted by its gender biases. Assessments point to the relative lack of women scholars, the choice of questions that address the problems of men and not of women, designs that exclude women, and interpretations of data from a masculine point of view (Keller, 1982). However, other critiques dispute the very notion of science and scholarship as a distinctive social enterprise; the claim is that science is as socially constructed as any other element of culture (Rosser, 1988). We see these critiques expressing five types of concerns: (1) objectivity as process and as outcome, (2) authority in the research relationship, (3) a hierarchical ordering of the social, (4) the predominance of problematic analytic categories, and (5) the role of sociology in broader relations of social domination.

The category that has drawn the most critiques from feminists and that is most relevant to my indigenous methodology, is the tendency for western mainstream research to make sense of
phenomena by opposing the researched to others in a construction that is represented as mutually exclusive and exhaustive (Jay, 1981). This pattern runs through the history of binary Western European social thought, such as: mind/body, capitalist/worker, nature/culture, nature/nurture, public/private, macro/micro, and structure/agency (Alway, 1995; hooks, 1994; Tuana, 1983). The artificiality of these dichotomies is exposed when one tries to identify the line that demarcates them empirically. The demarcating line between public and private is exposed as constructed when considering state-imposed policies such as those on sexuality, reproductive freedoms, and violence within marriage (Sprague, 1988). In fact, many of our most contentious political struggles can be seen as debates over where to draw the border between public and private in a particular domain of life (e.g., sexuality, parents’ rights, school prayer, assisted suicide).

Another analytic approach common to social theory that has come under the criticism of feminist thought, is what might be called abstract individuation. That is, individuals are seen in isolation from and unconnected with their interpersonal, historical, or physical contexts (Sprague, 1997). A prime instance of this abstract individuation is the tradition of representing people as instances of just one facet of the complex intersecting social relations through which they live their lives, for example, gender, or race, or class (Collins, 1989; hooks, 1981). In the process we tend to fall back to hegemonic categories: when we talk about class we see men, when we talk about race we see men, and when we talk about gender we see whites (King, 1988).

Consequently, seeing the social world through logical dichotomies and abstract individuation has generated conceptual distinctions that distort the lived experience of many people. The disciplinary division of work and family hides the work of caring for a family and the nurturing aspects of many jobs (Cancian, 1985; Cancian & Oliker, 1999; Oakley, 1974).
is clearly illustrated in the distinction between work and leisure as not being applicable to the vast majority of women who work both the double shift of paid work and unpaid domestic labor (Hartmann, 1981; Hochschild, 1989). In addition, the distinction between paid and domestic labor is not adequate to describe the lives of many women, particularly women of color, who have historically been blocked from any waged work other than paid domestic labor and child care (Collins, 1986).

So then, according to feminist standpoint theorists: What is the relationship between knowledge producers and the larger society in which they work? In ironic contrast to Marx and Weber, who were deeply engaged in the politics of their time, the intellectual projects of contemporary theorists has typically been to understand individual quests to maintain, develop, and extend the stream of ideas. The role of the researcher is one of detachment, only abstractly connected, if at all, to any sense of responsibility to their communities. Fortunately, mainstream sociological research has a better record of engagement and achievement in public policy debates. Still, some feminists charge that sociological research is constructed in ways that facilitate social domination. Harding (1987) observed that “there isn’t such a thing as a problem without a person, or groups of them, who have this problem: a problem is always a problem for someone or other” (p. 6). She, like Smith (1990), argued that social scientists tend to ask questions of those whose job it is to manage people, not questions of regular folks (Fine, 1994). To illustrate, in the research and study of sexual assault prevention, we are much more likely to ask who is likely to commit a sexual assault at UHM, rather than ask what we need to do to engage and empower students to work collaboratively within their UHM community to address and change the hegemonic attitudes and behaviors associated with the ‘culture of rape’ on campus. In summary, feminist critiques of western, mainstream research practices point to a detachment, both
intellectual and emotional, from the daily work of keeping life going, from the people whose lives we study, and from popular political discourse. The production of knowledge serves more to control people than to nurture them.

Fortunately, feminist standpoint theorists engaged in these concerns have developed some innovative and insightful strategies. Arguing that interviewing is a hierarchical form of social relationship, feminists have worked to make that relationship more egalitarian. They have given interviewees control over the topics to be discussed, incorporated self-disclosure on the part of the investigator, built an interviewing relationship over time, and asked interviewees for feedback on investigators’ interpretations of interviews (Acker, Barry, & Esseveld, 1991; Fine, 1994). Acker and her colleagues (1991) used these techniques of connection with research subjects, and reported that this approach leads to more nuanced understanding of respondents’ experience and particularly of how people change in response to social conditions.

In other words, the goal that hooks (1994) proposed for feminist pedagogy is not restricted only to the classroom, but is: to help people see the connections between their daily experience and the analytic frameworks offered. If we need some basis for judging among competing knowledge claims, if we know that scholars are limited by their experience and their particular interests, and if we cannot blindly trust the spontaneous consciousness of any particular group, what options are open to us? I believe that subsequent stronger, more nuanced reading of feminist standpoint epistemology suggests answers to the question.

Feminist standpoint theory transforms both the subject and the object in the epistemological relation. The subject is a collective one, strategically built on diverse experience. The object is a socially constructed one: the meaningful, coordinated activity of people in daily life is what is real. The relationship between the subject and object of knowing is historically
specific and dialectic. Throughout my research journey and study my, metaphor for feminist methodology, while grounded in Fine’s (1994) working the hyphens, was adapted to my particular standpoint while surfing the hyphens.

By surfing the hyphens I learned that an epistemological advantage of women is that a sexist society puts them in contradictory social locations, constructing them as both subject and object. We have an “outsider within” advantage and can play on the friction created by the hyphens between our experiences and the conceptual frameworks that are available to make sense of it (Collins, 1990; Harding, 1991; Smith, 1987, 1990). Nevertheless there is no single privileged standpoint. Because women exist in a wide diversity of social locations based on class, race, ethnicity, sexuality, disability; the subject of feminist knowledge is multiple and sometimes conflicting (Bar On, 1993; Haraway, 1988; Harding, 1991), and oftentimes connecting. Further, women cannot be the only generators of feminist knowledge; men in oppressed locations need to understand themselves and contribute to our understanding of their experience from a feminist perspective (Harding, 1991). If knowledge is grounded in experience, then we need to recognize and take into account the understandings generated by people in their daily life. However, we also need to recognize the authority that comes from the experience of having studied something, having reflected on it, and paid attention to the reflections of others. That is, those who are researchers have to take responsibility for the authority of our research. To do this, we must strategically structure our discourse, both listening to and learning from the perspectives of diverse subjects and diverse scholars. This is why Haraway’s (1993) notion of “splitting,” making a connection between two knowers in one self is important. We have to find the courage to disagree with so-called correct positions and/or persons; and the commitment to engage one
another to work toward a community consensus. We must be willing to disagree and use those disagreements as an access to stronger, more nuanced understanding.

Finally, feminist standpoint epistemology implies that academics are not individual producers of texts and courses. We are in a social relationship with the rest of the community. In the social division of labor, we are cultural workers; and our product is understandings. Because the community in which we live and work is organized in relations of social domination, the work we do, the questions we pursue, the strategies we use to gather and interpret evidence, and the forms and venues in which we communicate our findings, connects us with either the powerful or with the oppressed. For those reasons, I have purposefully chosen Native Hawaiian ways of knowing and learning to guide me on my journey of discovery and research. Indigenous methodologies were utilized to collect and analyze data, and feminist standpoint theory provided the landmarks needed to reach my research goals. To support the research goals of this study, the following includes the background for the sexual assault prevention movement; in general, and on college campuses.

**Background Sexual Assault Prevention Movement**

Members of the Women’s Liberation Movement started drawing attention to sexual assault and rape in the 1960s and 1970s. Feminists began a campaign of consciousness raising among women; and encouraged them to share personal experiences including those involving sexual assault (Koss, 1998). Feminist theory suggested that sexual assault was “both a symbolic and an actual means of keeping woman in her place: for every rape that does take place there are thousands of possible rapes in the back of a woman’s mind every time she walks down the street” (Lindsey, Newman, & Taylor, 2000, p. 195). This increased awareness of sexual assault began the feminist fight back by reducing the prevalence of sexual assault and increasing public
awareness about sexual assault. Mary Koss, a leading feminist researcher, wrote, “Rape awareness meant women learning where to kick and how hard” (Koss, 1998, p. 1). Women formed support groups, crisis hot lines and counseling centers while beginning to share their experiences aloud and in writing (Koss, 1998). New York Radical Feminists organized the first public speak out and conference about sexual assault in 1971, an event that marked a shift from sharing experiences in private meetings to voicing concerns in public forums (Pride, 1981). In response to these public meetings, activists began to receive funding for projects through private foundations and public grants. This funding allowed for hundreds of sexual assault and rape crisis centers to open around the country, providing counseling and advocacy services for victims of sexual assault and gender violence (Pride, 1981).

However, the funding organizers collected from foundations and government agencies to support sexual assault and rape crisis centers often required staff to be credentialed social workers (Pride, 1981). As a result, many of the feminists who were focused on social change left positions at centers, often resulting in less emphasis on the prevention of sexual assault (Pride, 1981). Consequently, much of the work surrounding sexual assault after the 1970s focused on direct service, counseling and advocacy, rather than prevention through social change. Increasingly, attempts to reduce the prevalence of sexual assault were geared mainly toward female participants and primarily included self-defense training (Pride, 1981). One member active in the early sexual assault and rape prevention movement explained: “Over the years our educational programs have taken a back seat to victim services. Education has centered on how to blow a whistle, rather than on a discussion of the causes of rape” (Pride, 1981, p. 116).

However, beginning in the late 1980s and early 1990s, there was a dramatic increase in men’s involvement in sexual assault prevention and education efforts (Katz, 2006). The first
high-profile campaign led by men was the 1991 White Ribbon Campaign, in which men wore white ribbons in response to violence against women. This project, which became an annual international effort, was a response to a shooting at the University of Montreal in 1989, known as the Montreal Massacre, which was allegedly sparked by a shooter’s hatred for women (Katz, 2006).

Since that time, several male sexual assault activists have formed prevention organizations, many of which examined aspects of American society referred to as “rape culture” (Katz, 2006, p. 254). The examination of the “rape culture” included elements of popular culture such as pornography and violent music videos as well as widespread ideologies about masculinity that promoted violence and sexism (Katz, 2006). Men involved in sexual assault prevention efforts, such as Jackson Katz (2006), a leading anti-sexist male activist and co-founder of The Mentors in Violence Program (MVP) in the United States, say rape culture and traditional masculinity norms, contribute to objectification of and violence against women. Katz’s and others’ leading prevention efforts encourage men to challenge rape culture, to consider their own views of women and sexual assault, and to intervene when they think other men will victimize women. Katz argued that this is necessary because men perpetrate “98 to 99 percent of sexual assaults” (Katz, 2006, p. 5).

This change in focus from female outreach service and education efforts to male outreach sexual assault prevention programs represented a paradigm shift (Katz, 2006). Though some feminists have voiced concerns about rape culture for decades, many claim men such as Katz can reach male audiences in ways women may not. Katz writes that many women have chosen to embrace male involvement (Katz, 2006).
Background Sexual Assault Prevention on College Campuses

Mirroring the educational and advocacy efforts of feminist led victim services organizations and feminist theorists in the 1970s (Brownmiller, 1975), sexual assault prevention has also evolved on college campuses. However, from the very early days of the sexual assault prevention movement, many misconceptions existed about sexual assault and rape on college campuses. One misconception was that sexual assault is perpetrated by strangers in isolated areas. Women on college campuses learned self-defense strategies to prevent attacks from suspicious looking men in public areas. The emphasis in these early programs was on self-defense tactics for women to reduce women’s vulnerability as a target, to train them in physical techniques, and to fight back if attacked (Fisher, 1995).

However, a groundbreaking survey of 6,100 undergraduates conducted by Koss (1982), sponsored by the National Institute for Mental Health, and published by Ms. Magazine in 1985, revealed that perpetrators known to their victims commit most rapes on college campuses. This report increased public awareness of what is now referred to as date rape or acquaintance rape. This study was also the first to examine the prevalence of sexual assault on college campuses, a crime usually underreported. Koss’s study, a subsequent book written by Robin Warshaw (1988) I Never Called it Rape based on Koss’s research, were aimed at raising awareness about campus sexual assault and rape, thus sparking new prevention and education efforts (Koss, 1998).

At about the same time, college campuses began to face increased legal pressure to do more to protect students from the threat of sexual assault and violence. Several prominent court cases established precedents demanding that universities “warn students about known risks” and “provide them with adequate security protection” (Fisher, 1995, p. 88). Sexual assault on college campuses was a serious part of those risks, and would also factor in to the need for adequate
security protection. In the 1979 case *Durate v. State*, a California appellate court held California State University liable for failing to provide a student with known crime data, including information about sexual assault (Fisher, 1995). In 1984, a California court ruled in the *Peterson v. San Francisco Community College District* that colleges were liable for not protecting students from “reasonable (sic) foreseeable assaults on campus” (Fisher, 1995, p. 89).

Pressure on college campuses increased throughout the 1980s and into the 1990s to be more proactive and active regarding sexual assault prevention and education. This was in part because of media attention to several high profile cases of sexual assault. One such case involved a male Lehigh University student who sexually assaulted, strangled and murdered fellow student Jeanne Clery (Fisher, 1995). Clery’s case and others like it drew pressure from parents for colleges to work harder to ensure student safety. Clery’s parents advocated for federal legislation that demanded colleges to focus more attention on sexual assault, gender violence, and campus crime (Fisher, 1995). The Student-Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act (1990) attempted to do just that. All colleges and universities receiving federal funding were required to distribute campus crime statistics, which included sexual assaults, each year and report crime policies and sexual assault prevention efforts to the Department of Education (Fisher, 1995).

These legal and legislative developments increased public awareness of the dangers of campus crime, which included sexual assault and sexual violence; which increased pressure on colleges to prevent it (Fisher, 1995). This has not been an easy task, as universities and colleges have been challenged on both accounts. A 2005 study sponsored by the U.S. Department of Justice found that only 37 percent of schools complied with the crime reporting mandated by the Campus Security Act (Karjane, Fisher, & Cullen, 2005).
In December 2010, the Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act (Campus SaVE Act) [H.R. 6461] was introduced by Congressmen Thomas Perriello of Virginia and John J. Duncan, Jr. of Tennessee. As of July 2011, this act has not passed. However, passage of the act will facilitate campus communities across the United States to better prevent sexual assault and other forms of violence, as well as provide an essential framework for institutions to use when an incident of sexual assault is reported. The Campus SAVE Act is a much needed update to current federal policy, and offers far more comprehensive guidelines. Some of the guidelines for the bill are:

- Expands the list of offenses that must be covered in a campus sexual assault policy to include sex offenses and other intimate partner violence, including sexual assault, stalking, and domestic violence offenses;
- Mandates primary prevention programming that includes defining consent and bystander intervention training and awareness education that includes instructions for how to report offenses that occur on or off campus;
- States that victims will be provided with full explanations of their options for health, mental health, and legal resources both on and off campus, as well as their right to involve local police or campus security and how they can obtain a restraining order, order of protection, no contact order;
- Requires all disciplinary proceedings be conducted by officials trained understand issues of sex offenses and other intimate partner violence (Security on Campus, Inc., 2010).
nonprofit organization dedicated to the prevention of sexual assault and all forms of violence at colleges and universities nationwide, stated:

The Campus SaVE Act targets this issue from the most crucial angles; prevention efforts, collaboration, motivating everyone to become involved in making sure that violence is not tolerated and that victims are supported, and most importantly protecting those who have been victimized. Time after time, victims of sexual assault drop out of school, leaving behind her dreams and goals. It is time that every victim is respected and informed of the rights she has in order to better protect her wellbeing and the integrity of her future. (Security on Campus, Inc., 2010, p. 1)

This legislation would update 18-year-old provisions in the Jeanne Clery Act to address a more inclusive range of intimate partner violence including sexual assault, stalking, dating violence, gender violence, and domestic violence. It would also expand campus educational programming already offered under the Clery Act to include primary prevention, male peer support education, and bystander intervention; empowering students to respond safely when they encounter sexual assault and gender violence on campus. “College campuses should be a safe and secure place of learning, not a place where anyone feels uncomfortable or unsafe,” said Congressman Perriello, “this legislation will improve our response to reported incidents, but the ultimate goal is to empower young people to end relationships and seek assistance before they become victims” (Security on Campus, Inc., 2010, p. 1).

Additionally, in May of 2011, Vice President Biden and Secretary of Education Arne Duncan introduced comprehensive guidance to help schools, colleges and universities better understand their obligations under federal civil rights laws to prevent and respond to the problem of campus sexual assault. The new guidance, announced at the University of New Hampshire in
Durham, New Hampshire, makes clear the legal obligations under Title IX of any school, college or university receiving federal funds to respond promptly and effectively to sexual violence. The guidance also provides practical examples to aid educators in ensuring the safety of their students (U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights, 2011, p. 1).

For over 20 years, Vice President Biden has waged a battle on sexual assault and violence against women. As the author of the landmark Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) of 1994, then-Senator Biden exposed high rates of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking experienced by women every day. As Vice President, he has continued the good fight, creating coordination and cooperation across the federal government to combat all forms of violence against women, including sexual assault on college campuses (U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights, 2011, p. 2).

As recently as May 2011, Vice President Biden continued to highlight the Administration’s commitment to raising awareness and promoting policies to prevent sexual violence against women of all ages when he stated: “Today we are strengthening our response to sexual assault in schools and on college campuses… Students across the country deserve the safest possible environment in which to learn. That’s why we’re taking new steps to help our nation’s schools, universities and colleges end the cycle of sexual violence on campus” (U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights, 2011, p. 2).

The goal to engage and empower all our students, both female and male, regarding sexual assault prevention and intervention on college campuses is a relatively new paradigm. Sexual assault prevention efforts on college campuses traditionally have targeted female students (Hong, 2000). Additionally, the field of sexual assault prevention has in general lacked scientific
research about the effectiveness of targeting only women (Lonsway, 1996). Some have argued that self-defense strategies in particular have been successful in preventing assaults (Schewe, 2002). However, others point out that women’s self-defense efforts only help individual women without addressing larger societal factors that encourage sexual assault and gender violence (Lonsway, 1996). Another critique is that dependence on self-defense strategies may inadvertently blame women who do not effectively protect themselves (Schewe, 2002). Still others point out that some sexual assault prevention strategies are ineffective because they address victim behavior while failing to address perpetrator behavior, focus on reacting to rather than preventing sexual assault, and are based on “rape myths” as opposed to an understanding of sexual assault and rape (Hong, 2000).

In response to the critiques of prevention programs for women, some campuses and organizations began designing sexual assault prevention programs targeting men in the 1980s and 1990s (Katz, 2006). Research and campus programs began to focus on the empowerment of male bystanders to intervene in and to prevent male violence through peer support and sense of community responsibility (Katz, 2006). Foubert (2000), DeKeseredy, Schwartz, & Alvi, 2000), and Berkowitz (2002) all looked at the role of bystanders in relation to sexual assault prevention and have focused on the effectiveness of the approach specifically for men. They concurred that programming that approaches all men as potential rapists overlook the statistics that indicated only five to 15 percent of college men acknowledge committing sexual assault, so just “don’t do it” messages (Rozee & Koss, 2001) may in fact, alienate 85 to 95 percent of men in college.

The idea of bystander behavior is well established in the field of social psychology and is utilized, largely to explore individual’s reactions to witnessing crimes and emergencies (Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007). More recently, the bystander approach has been extended
to the field of sexual assault education, intervention, and prevention on college campuses. The core principle of bystander approach to sexual assault prevention is the suggestion that training individuals to effectively intervene in situations involving sexual assault is critical for prevention. The incorporation of the bystander approach is increasing in popularity for college campus sexual assault prevention programs (Banyard et al., 2007; Berkowitz 2002, 2004a, 2004b; Foubert & Perry, 2007; Ward, 2001). In fact, the 2007 American College Health Association (ACHA) explicitly urged college health professionals to develop programs on bystander intervention techniques as a primary prevention strategy (ACHA, 2007).

Among one of the best known male outreach sexual assault prevention programs on college campuses is The Mentors in Violence Prevention Program (MVP), founded in 1993 at the Center for the Study of Sport in Society at Northeastern University. The MVP Program is a gender violence prevention and education program. The multi-racial, mixed gender MVP Program is the first large-scale attempt to enlist high school, collegiate and professional athletes in an effort to prevent all forms of men’s violence against women. By utilizing a bystander approach to the prevention of sexual assault, the MVP Program views male athletes and campus leaders not as potential perpetrators or victims, but as empowered bystanders who can confront abusive peers. Program participants develop leadership skills and learn to mentor and educate younger boys and girls regarding sexual assault and other forms gender violence (Kilmartin & Allison, 2007).

Additionally, MVP training is focused on a bystander model that engages and empowers each student to take an active role in promoting a positive school climate. The heart of the training consists of role-playing intended to allow students to construct and practice viable options in response to incidents of sexual assault, sexual harassment, abuse, or violence; before,
during, or after the fact. Students learn that there is not simply one way to confront sexual assault and violence, but that each individual can learn valuable skills to build their personal resolve and to act when faced with difficult or threatening life situations (Katz, 2006).

The MVP Program focuses on young men not as perpetrators or potential perpetrators, but as bystanders who can confront abusive peers, and offer support to victims of sexual assault and gender violence. It focuses on young women not as victims or potential targets of sexual assault and violence, but as empowered bystanders who can support abused peers, and confront abusive ones. In this model, a bystander is defined as a family member, friend, classmate, teammate, coworker, anyone who is imbedded in a family, school, social, or professional relationship with someone who might in some way is abusive or experiencing abuse (Katz, 2006).

The MVP Program has been studied qualitatively and quantitatively. A report available through the program’s website claimed that both evaluations showed positive changes in participants’ knowledge of sexual assault, attitudes about sexual violence, self-perceived ability to speak out against sexual assault, and intervene as a bystander (Ward, 2001). However, these studies only surveyed participants directly after they saw the program, so the reports do not show long-term attitude or behavior changes. To fill in these gaps, future research in the area of sexual assault prevention programming should include longitudinal studies regarding long-term attitude or behavior changes of program participants in order to adequately evaluate the MVP Program, as well as programs similar in content and type. This researcher suggests that any type of sexual assault prevention programming at UHM developed and implemented be evaluated with both cross-sectional and longitudinal studies.
Another well-known program geared toward college campuses is called Men Against Violence (MAV). MAV began as a peer education organization combating sexual assault and gender violence at Louisiana State University in 1995. Motivated by concern about campus violence, a group of 15 charter members representing a cross-section of students came together and formulated the idea for a service organization dedicated to fighting sexual assault, sexual harassment, gender violence, and domestic violence. While membership was open to both male and female students, MAV emphasized the unique responsibility that men have in identifying and eradicating all forms of violence on campuses and in surrounding communities. The program seeks to break the link between traditional masculinity norms (i.e., the ways men are taught to behave) and violence. It challenges young men to redefine male and female relationships in an equitable manner; to resolve conflicts effectively; to develop meaningful friendships with other men; and to appropriately manage anger and fear (Hong, 2000).

The primary purpose of MAV is to reduce the frequency and severity of sexual assault and violent acts among students, faculty, and staff at colleges and universities across the country. In keeping with that purpose, MAV is proactively engaged in four areas:

1. Promoting awareness through media campaigns about the prevalence and causes of sexual assault and violence on campus;
2. Engaging in community action to reduce sexual assault and violence on campus through policy revision and cultural change;
3. Conducting education on how to prevent sexual assault and violence on campus;
4. Providing information, support for survivors of sexual assault on campus (Hong, 2000).

Luoluo Hong, PhD, MPH and Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs at the University of Hawai‘i at Hilo (UH Hilo) is known for her innovative work with the MAV Program at
Louisiana State University (LSU) when she was worked there as the Director of Wellness Education & Outreach Services. Hong wrote that the MAV program challenges men to “approach male female relationships in an equitable manner, resolve conflicts effectively, overcome homophobia, develop meaningful friendships with other men, and express and manage anger or fear appropriately” (Hong, 2000, p. 270).

Moreover, as the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs at UH Hilo, Hong has been instrumental in the recent establishment of an organization at UH Hilo called MEN OF STRENGTH (MOS). MOS is designed to acknowledge, celebrate, encourage and honor the role and responsibility that men have to make a positive difference, to be agents of change in supporting sexual assault prevention and education. MOS is based on the educational principles developed by Men Can Stop Rape (MCSR) for their “Strength Campaign,” but is adapted to be culturally relevant and sensitive to UH Hilo and the island of Hawai‘i (UH Hilo, Men of Strength, Our Community, Our Kulena, 2010). MCSR is a national nonprofit organization based in Washington, D.C. that offers programs, trainings, and materials designed to engage men in the prevention of men’s violence against women. In contrast to traditional efforts that address men as the problem, the MCSR “Strength Campaign” embraces men as vital allies with the will and character to make healthy choices and foster safe, equitable relationships (UH Hilo, Men of Strength, Our Community, Our Kulena, 2010).

In its mission statement, UH Hilo recognizes and appreciates that it is a Hawaiian place of learning, that it is a college campus physically and conceptually grounded in Native Hawaiian knowledge and values. UH Hilo has incorporated within the MOS program Native Hawaiian values embedded in the concepts of kaiāulu (community) and kuleana (responsibility). This researcher firmly believes that as a university, we are a community of place and a community of
culture; a community that has the capacity to take seriously the responsibility to eliminate sexual assault at UHM, including UH Hilo and all our other campuses.

So although including men in sexual assault prevention has shown some positive outcomes from male outreach sexual assault prevention programming (Hong, 2000; Katz, 2006); there are a number of criticisms regarding men’s programs’ overall effectiveness. Kilmartin and Allison (2007) note that some of these male outreach programs lack in comprehensiveness. These authors argue that sexual assault prevention efforts on college campuses need to include fundamental components. The authors assert that a comprehensive sexual assault program should consist of a one time intervention effort, which includes both prevention and intervention sexual assault programming. Kilmartin and Allison (2007) stress that this initial endeavor should be followed by several other initiatives including the creation of a program geared toward a target audience (i.e., specific courses), development of a peer-education or support system intended to foster more wide spread awareness and change; and ultimately the “full integration of violence prevention into the institutional aspects of the community” (Kilmartin & Allison, 2007, p. 171). Applied to UHM, this last initiative would involve policy, social and system changes throughout the UH system, in order to facilitate successful and sustainable change.

To assist UHM to begin the process of integrating sexual assault and gender violence prevention into aspects of our community, research points us to the contributions to bystander literature by Vicki Banyard and her colleagues. They expanded previous conceptualizations of bystander intervention from an individual to a community-based model where individuals play an important role in “interrupting situations that could lead to assault before it happens or during an incident, speaking out against social norms that support rape, and having skills to be an effective and supportive ally to survivors” (Banyard et al., 2007, p. 464). Barnyard’s bystander
model covers a range of behaviors that fall on a continuum of violence with these behaviors defined by several tools that measure attitudes, behavioral intentions, actual behavior, self-efficacy, and decision-making (Banyard et al.). Her model has been developed rigorously and found to increase positive bystander attitudes and behaviors with both the general student population (Banyard et al.) and “high risk” students such as athletes and members of fraternities (Banyard et al.)

So then, built on the foundations of kaiāulu (community) and kuleana (responsibility), a theoretical framework for sexual assault prevention will provide essential guidance in developing the concepts and components for an effective sexual assault prevention program at UHM.

**Theoretical Framework Sexual Assault Prevention**

Generally, research on the causes of sexual assault have focused on two types of theories, those rooted in characteristics of the individual offender, and those that point to characteristics and the structures of the culture in which we live. Neither focus nor any single theory totally explains the prevalence of sexually violent behaviors on our college campuses, and in our society. Recent research in the field of sexual assault suggests an integrated theory may have the best ability for explaining the causes (Kilmartin & Allison, 2007; Renzetti, Curran, & Carr, 2003). Understanding the causes of sexual assault will enable us to develop more successful and sustainable prevention programs at UHM. As a feminist- criminologist, Routine Activities Theory offers a contextual foundation for an integrated theoretical framework for sexual assault prevention programming.

**Routine Activities Theory**

Some researchers have been using opportunity or lifestyle theories as an explanation for sexual assault and aggression (Rodgers & Roberts, 1995) and intimate violence (Mannon, 1997).
Routine activities theory, developed by Cohen and Felson (1979) suggests that people’s lifestyles or everyday behavior patterns increase their vulnerability to victimization, by increasing their contact with motivated offenders or by decreasing their exposure to guardians. Conversely, routine activities theory also argues that criminal opportunities increase with the presence of motivated offenders, presence of potential targets (i.e., victims) and lack of guardians. By being away from home and conducting more social activities outside the home, individuals’ possibly increase their chances of being victimized. “Moreover, those who participate in many outside activities in high risk situations increase their interaction with strangers thereby decreasing the possibility of guardianship and increasing the likelihood of personal victimization” (Rodgers & Roberts, 1995, p. 363). The structural environment and changes in individual’s routine activities can influence crime rates by three minimal elements of direct contact predatory violations: (1) motivated offender, (2) suitable targets (i.e., potential victims), and (3) the absence of a capable guardian, individuals, including police, witnesses, and even potential victims themselves, who can act to prevent the crime (Cohen & Felson, 1979).

Given the structural environment and the requirement of all three elements to be present in order to commit a crime, it may be possible for some types of crimes to be committed more often than others, such as sexual assault on college campuses. In 2005, the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) released this finding regarding sexual assault on college campuses: fewer than three percent of all college women become victims of a sexual assault, either completed or attempted, in a given nine month academic year. At first glance, the risk seems low, but the percentage translates into an alarming amount of: 35 sexual assaults for every 1,000 female students (Humphrey & Kahn, 2000). For a campus with 10,000 female students, the number of potential sexual assaults could reach as high as 350. If this percentage is projected to a full calendar year,
the proportion rises to nearly five percent of college female students. When projected over a now 
typical five year college career, tragically: one in four young women experience a sexual assault, 
either completed or attempted during their college career (Fisher, et al., 2000).

Additionally, in a study conducted by Humphrey and Kahn (2000), research revealed that 
women ages 16-24 experience sexual assault at rates four times higher than the assault rate of all 
women, making the college and high school years the most vulnerable for women. It is estimated 
that almost 25 percent, or one in four college women have been victims of sexual assault or an 
attempted sexual assault since the age of 14 (Fisher, et al., 2000).

In its original formulation, routine activities theory helps to begin the process in 
explaining the high rates of sexual assault on college campus. Tewksbury and Mustaine (2000) 
conducted surveys of college students in order to measure the likelihood of assault victimization, 
which included sexual assault, while using routine activities theory. Cass (2007) specifically 
conducted a study in which routine activities was utilized to explain sexual assault victimization 
on college campuses. Both studies found that in general, routine activities theory provides some 
valuable insight regarding sexual assault victimization. The three factors explained by Cohen and 
Felson (1979), (1) motivated offender, (2) suitable target, and (3) lack of guardianship are 
present on the college campus. The convergence of a motivated offender, suitable target, and 
lack of capable guardians in time and space, could also explain the variation in victimization.

For example, a college student who spends his or her day behind the safety of locked 
dormitory doors, alarm system, and in the presence of a vigilant resident assistant in the 
dormitory, as well as friends, dorm-mates, team-mates, fraternity brothers, and sorority sisters 
should have a much lower likelihood of being in contact with a motivated offender and falling 
victim to a sexual assault. On the reverse side, the student who spends most of their nights going
to parties on campus, or night clubs off campus; and hanging out with acquaintances should have a higher likelihood of sexual assault victimization. If one thinks of the student as a suitable target then the theoretical concept becomes clearer. The target is constantly moving into the public arena in the midst of motivated offenders who are looking for a suitable target. The target entering into a public arena, may attend a party in another student’s dorm room on campus, or a nightclub or bar off campus; which are populated by other students and people who are either casual acquaintances or complete strangers. The target who is frequenting these areas may also be consuming alcoholic beverages. The target may over consume alcohol, which as most individuals will attest to, impairs the judgment of an individual to reason and the ability to protect oneself. The individual then becomes a more “suitable target” for the “motivated offender,” leaving the individual more vulnerable to sexual assault. However, this situation could be mediated by the presence of capable guardians, such as, resident assistant in dormitory, friends, campus security, local police, and even a concerned citizen. This is a simple account of the reasoning behind routine activities theory and its ability to explain sexual assault on college campuses.

Nevertheless, routine activities theory fails to account for numerous facets of sexual assault. One is the presence of so many “likely offenders” in an environment that is usually viewed as containing particularly conventional individuals. Routine activities theory: “simply assumes that such persons (i.e. motivated offenders) exist and that they commit crimes in certain places and times at which the opportunities and potential victims are available” (Akers, 2000, p. 27).

Another major criticism of routine activities theory to explain high rates of sexual assault on college campuses has been its lack of what motivates offenders to approach any suitable
target. Simply put, routine activities theory fails to explain the individual motivations of offenders. Thus, with motivation presumed from the presence of offenders, researchers have made little attempt to discover what makes offenders different from other persons at the scene (Akers, 2000). Simply put, routine activities theory fails to explain the individual motivations of offenders.

Addressing those concerns, Schwartz and Pitts (1995) postulated a Feminist Routine Activities (FRA) theory as a model for explaining the prevalence of sexual assault on college campuses. FRA theory takes the criminology theory of routine activities theory and its concepts of the presence of likely offenders, the lack of effective guardians, and the presence of available targets (Cohen & Felson, 1979). However, the concept of effective guardians, when applied to sexual assault, is a complex one, given that with many crimes, an effective guardian is often an intimate partner. FRA theory adds a focus on what motivates men to commit sexual assault on college campuses. To test this theory, the authors suggest studying college men who refuse to support sexual assault prevention, thus helping to provide the effective guardian condition in FRA theory (Schwartz & Pitts, 1995).

Feminist Theory

The foundation for efforts in the prevention of sexual assault emanates from the feminist movement. Feminist theory understands sexual assault as a cultural phenomenon requiring interventions beyond the personal and interpersonal. Feminist theory is the foundation for the sexual assault prevention movement (Rozee & Koss, 2001). Feminist theory explains sexual assault and violence in the context of a rape culture, a complex system of beliefs that encourages male sexual aggression and supports violence against women (Buchwald, Fletcher & Roth, 1993). Interpreting sexual assault as a foreseeable consequence of rape culture has a profound effect on
prevention and programming strategies for college campuses. Sexual assault and violence is seen as a continuum of behaviors instead of as an isolated, deviant act. However, feminist models of sexual assault and gender violence maintain that sexual assault is not inevitable, and can be prevented by making changes to societal norms surrounding sexuality, violence, gender, and oppression (hooks, 1989).

Early feminist research in the 1970s contributed to feminist analyses of sexual assault as part of a larger pattern of male domination and control of women (Yllo, 1993). Research in the 1980s and 1990s expanded the theoretical understanding of men’s sexual violence against women through emphases on women’s agency and resistance to male control (Hart, 1988); the intersection of physical, structural, and emotional forces that sustain men’s control over females (Pence & Paymar, 1993); and the different constraints faced by women and men of diverse racial, ethnic identities, and sexualities who experience sexual assault and violence at the hands of intimate partners (Jang, Lee, & Morello-Frosch, 1998).

In addition, the performance of gender makes male power and privileges appear natural and normal rather than socially produced and structured. Butler (1990) argues that gender is part of a system of relations that sustains heterosexual male privilege through the denigration or erasure of alternative (feminine/lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgender/intersex) identities. West and Fernsternaker (1995) contend that cultural beliefs about underlying and essential differences between women and men, and social structures that are constituted by these beliefs are reproduced by the accomplishments of gender. Disturbingly, studies by feminist researchers have shown that sexual assault is an effective means by which men construct and reconstruct men as masculine and women as feminine (Yllo, 1993; Messner, 1988). By gendering sexual assault, perpetrators of sexual assault not only preformed masculinity, but they reproduced gender as
dominance. Thus, the perpetrators of sexual assault and violence against women naturalized a binary and hierarchal gender system.

As a result, FRA theory is strongest where mainstream routine activities theory is weakest: in explaining why motivated offenders are present on college campuses. To summarize, the strengths of FRA theory are its analysis of the dual importance and interactive effects of gender and class inequalities in shaping women’s and men’s offending and victimization experiences. FRA also has the empirical evidence and courage to challenge traditional criminological depictions of victims and offenders as distinct groups (Curran & Renzetti, 2001).

**Male Peer Support Theory**

Additionally, another promising approach to sexual assault prevention is a feminist approach to Male Peer Support (MPS) theory, which also addresses some gaps in routine activities theory. This approach emphasizes the presence of male peer groups that perpetuate and legitimate the sexual exploitation of women (Sanday, 1996; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 2000). Men who belong to these all male, patriarchal, homosocial networks are more likely than non-members to be motivated to abuse women sexually. For example, Sanday (1996) shows how campus organizations, such as fraternities and athletics, teach men to objectify women and to legitimate the use of techniques for “working a yes out” of a no (p. 230). “Working a yes out” of a no refers to coercing or forcing a woman to consent to a sexual act; either through talking her into it, or plying her with alcohol (Sanday, 1996, p. 230). Verbal coercion and the use of alcohol to get women to consent are common practices on college campuses. In a study of 3,187 women on 32 college campuses, it was reported that 44 percent of the women acknowledged that they had been verbally pressured to have sex; and 12 percent reported that the men had attempted sexual intercourse by giving them alcohol or drugs (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 2000). Thus, MPS
theory emphasizes that the presence of motivated offenders is assured by the continued presence in society of male peer groups that support such individual behavior.

Feminist perspectives on MPS theory address two different weaknesses of routine activities theory. First, male peer support can be seen as an important index of motivation. If a central thesis of routine activities theory is that motivated offenders must be present for crime to occur, the next step for a comprehensive theory of sexual assault is to address what motivates sexual assault offenders. The theoretical framework must be moved beyond the tautology where we know that offenders are motivated because there are people out there committing crimes, to a discussion of why such offenders exist. MPS theory sustained by a feminist lens provides this theoretical addition to routine activities theory by suggesting that motivated offenders exist because they have developed certain attitudes and behaviors as a result of encouragement and support by other males (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 2000).

The second weakness of routine activities theory that MPS theory addresses is the component of effective guardianship. When offenders receive either encouragement or no punishment from peers, administrators, faculty, and law enforcement officials, then effective guardianship is lacking (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 2000). On the other hand, if a man’s friends give no support for sexual assault and violence; this absence of support may lead to the beginning of effective guardianship.

Schwartz and DeKeseredy (2000) relate male peer support to the multidimensional attachments men form to male peers who themselves sexually assault women and, or provide resources that perpetuate and legitimate such assaults. There are a variety of sociological and social psychological processes by which peers influence men to sexually victimize women, but the key point here is that such all-male groups encourage, justify, and support the sexual abuse
and violence of women by their members. For example, such men provide informational support, which refers to the guidance and advice that influences men to sexually abuse their partners. MPS theory sees such support as a motivational factor, allowing men to develop pro-sexual assault attitudes and behaviors as a result of the encouragement and support of other males, if not of the broader culture at large (Schwartz, DeKeseredy, Tait, & Alvi, 2001).

Feminist theory and routine activities theory indicate that profound changes in the lives of men, the construction of masculinity, and gendered power relations are necessary if sexual assault and violence against women are to be eliminated. How this should be done remains uncertain; as the lack of effective educational and policy interventions to prevent sexual assault and violence against women is well documented (Berkowitz, 2002; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 2000; Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000; Lonsway, 1996; Fabiano, Perkins, Berkowitz, Linkenbach, & Stark, 2003).

Based on a preliminary review of current literature, preparing the groundwork for a successful sexual assault prevention program will include a discussion of the following themes: (1) irresponsible masculinity, (2) ethnicity and race in sexual assault prevention, and (3) systems approach to sexual assault prevention at UHM.

**Irresponsible Masculinity**

Despite growing recognition that male focused sexual assault prevention programs may be effective resources on college campuses to raise awareness of and prevent sexual assault, a majority of the research on sexual assault reflects the traditional view that sexual assault prevention is a woman’s issue and highlights what women should do to avoid being sexually assaulted (Sochting, Fairbrother, & Koch, 2004, Gidycz, Loh, & Rich, 2003). The vast majority of these studies on college sexual assault prevention programs only briefly mention men in the
discussion or within their suggestions for further research (Gidyecz, Rich, Orchowski, King, & Miller, 2006). However the emerging programs and research on sexual assault prevention demonstrate that men need to increase their understanding of and involvement in sexual assault prevention programs.

Therefore, the focus of sexual assault prevention on college campuses cannot remain on what women must do to avoid and/or protect against being sexual assaulted. As noted previously, without engaging and integrating men into the core of these programs, it puts the responsibility to end sexual assault completely on women, and women alone. Considering that researchers in the early 1980s and 1990s found that approximately one-third of college men said they would sexually assault a woman if they knew they would not get caught (Fisher & Sloane, 1995), it is prudent and judicious that the prevention of sexual assault go beyond self-defense classes for women. To be successful and sustainable, sexual assault prevention must be inclusive, comprehensive and campus-wide. An examination of the culture of rape on college campuses follows, in particular, if such a culture exists at UHM.

Culture of Rape

In a study of cultural myths and support for rape, Burt (1980) defines the culture of rape and rape myths as “prejudicial, stereotyped, or false beliefs about rape, rape victims, and rapists” (p. 217). Studies show that the attitudes of both men and women on college campuses reflect a widespread misunderstanding of the complexity involved in sexual assault and acquaintance rape:

Rape myths allow us to believe that a “real rape” is one in which a victim is raped by a stranger who jumps out of the bushes with a weapon, and in which she fought back, was beaten and bruised, reported the event to the police, and had medical evidence collected
immediately. In a “real rape,” the victim has never had sex with the assailant before, is preferably a virgin, was not intoxicated, was not wearing seductive clothing, and has a good reputation. (Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1997, p. 527)

These false ideas of a “real sexual assault or rape” perpetuate misperceptions in society, including ones held by the victim herself, that women are somehow responsible for being sexually assaulted or raped, particularly if the women know their assailants. Many rape myths revolve around the idea that a woman who did not physically resist was not really sexually assaulted, or that because a woman was drinking alcohol or dressed a particular way she was asking for sex.

A study by Johansson-Love and Geer (2003) investigated changes in rape attitudes among college males in a sexual assault prevention program. The results indicated that there was “no significant difference between the experimental and control groups prior to the intervention but that there was a significant difference after being exposed to the intervention” (Johansson-Love & Geer, 2003, p. 96). This finding suggested that being exposed to information dispelling rape myths and attitudes, statistics on campus sexual assault and rape, and reinforcing appropriate conduct of men in dating situations was successful in reducing rape myth attitudes (Johansson-Love & Geer, 2003).

Although there have been debates in the past regarding whether or not prevention efforts at the university level are effective in reducing the prevalence of sexual assault or in dispelling rape myths, the results of Johansson-Love and Geers’ (2003) study support the theory that attitude changes may be useful in the design of sexual assault prevention programs focusing on males on college campuses. However, the data also shows that attitude changes produced by the prevention program were sustained for only a short term, lasting two weeks. Limitations such as
short term attitudinal changes are consistent across many studies and indicate that more must be done to examine and ensure that sexual assault prevention programs succeed in producing long term attitudinal changes in populations with high rape myth agreement (Johansson-Love & Geer, 2003).

However, despite data collected regarding only short term attitudinal changes regarding sexual assault prevention, several studies have pointed to The Men’s Program used by the group One in Four as being a sexual assault prevention program shown to have a “clear, long-lasting effect on men’s attitudes” (Schewe, 2002; Foubert, 2005; Foubert & Perry, 2007). In a qualitative review of The Men’s Program Foubert and Perry (2007) reported that participants, specifically fraternity members and male student athletes, felt that they had an increased “understanding of what sexual assault would feel like” and “long-term compassion” for the victim of a sexual assault following the program (p. 70). This understanding, even if participants do not know a victim personally, may cause men to change their long-term attitude and behavior toward the sexual victimization of women on college campuses.

A similar study (O’Donohue, Yeater, & Fanetti, 2003) was designed to evaluate the effectiveness of a video-based intervention for undergraduate male students that focused on modifying rape myths, the culture of rape, increasing victim empathy, and identifying the possible negative outcomes of engaging in sexually coercive behavior. The video-based intervention resulted in significant changes in attraction to sexual aggression and adversarial sexual beliefs, indicating that programs providing information on the negative consequences and the harm caused by sexual assault can lead to attitude changes, and perhaps behavioral changes. Other research has found that providing information that alters men’s views of sexual assault as being less rewarding than consensual sex, potentially more costly, and more likely to lead to
negative consequences, could influence their risk perception and reduce sexually aggressive behavior (Schewe, 2002; O’Donohue, Yeater, & Fanetti, 2003), thus, discouraging irresponsible and troublesome masculinities.

*Troublesome Masculinity*

The literature examined support the argument that masculinity and aggression must not be ignored when discussing the design and implementation of sexual assault prevention programs on college campuses. Research conducted by Yescavage (1999) shows a relationship between college men’s level of sexual aggression and feelings of accountability toward sexual assault victims and perpetrators. “Sexually non-aggressive men made three times as many negative remarks toward the perpetrators than the victims, whereas the sexually aggressive men made approximately equal amounts of negative remarks toward both targets” (p. 805).

Therefore, the basic issue of what constitutes sexual assault on college campuses must be made completely clear to men. Exploring masculinity and college men provides an ideal environment to examine a place where both at-risk groups and male sexual aggression, or troublesome masculinities occur. Researchers in the past decade have examined sexual violence in the context of male socialization that teaches boys and men to link traditional male gender roles with violence, and have developed sexual assault prevention programs that support college men as they explore broader, nonviolent definitions of masculinity (Hong, 2000; Barnyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2005; Kilmartin & Allison, 2007).

One example is the Fraternity Violence Education Project, which began in 1989 as a research project and has evolved into a feminist social change peer education program that develops male leaders who challenge their peers to respond to social injustice and strive for egalitarian relationships (Mahlstedt & Corcoran, 1999). In addition to the above program,
Jackson Katz (1995) created the Mentors in Violence Prevention (MVP) program at Northeastern University. The MVP program taught student athletes to examine the messages they received about masculine and feminine roles; and to understand how those messages contributed to sexual assault and relationship violence. All these campus programs are rooted in the pro-feminist men’s movement that “has focused on the social and individual expressions of men’s power and privileges, including issues of men’s violence” (Kaufman, 1999, p.73). This model accepts and insists on men’s collaboration with women in the planning, implementation and evaluation of sexual assault prevention programs; and at the same time acknowledges the work women have done in the areas of sexual assault and gender violence prevention for more than three decades.

Pro-feminist men also focus on the impact of what Connell (2005) called hegemonic masculinity, the “culturally idealized form of masculine character” (p. 831), another form of troublesome masculinity. This ideal masculine character includes the attributes of domination, aggressiveness, competitiveness, suppression of emotion, and control of others. Kaufman (1999) and others in the pro-feminist men’s movement suggested that helping men recognize the negative impact of striving for this troublesome masculinity may encourage them to become involved in sexual assault and gender violence prevention programming on college campuses.

Consequently, the literature on sexual assault prevention supports the argument that the issues of troublesome masculinity and male aggression must not be ignored in sexual assault prevention programs on campus. Therefore, exploring masculinity with college men provides an ideal environment to examine sexual assault prevention and programming.

Moreover, when discussions of at-risk groups and male sexual aggression take place, especially within the context of sexual assault prevention programs on college campus, questions often emerge regarding the role that at-risk groups pose, such as, fraternities, athletic
organizations, and ROTC in facilitating and promoting rape culture attitudes and beliefs. Much of the research on sexual assault supportive environments explores the influence of membership in all-male groups and organizations on the members’ beliefs and attitudes about women, aggression, and sexuality (Barnyard, Moynihan, & Crossman, 2009). More specifically, researchers argue that some fraternities and athletic organizations may provide an environment in which troublesome masculinities and sexual assault supportive ideologies can thrive and be transmitted to others (Foubert & Newberry, 2006). Research has also shown that some fraternities create a rape culture where rape myth acceptance and sexually aggressive behavior is common. While pro-sexual violence attitudes are present in college environments in general, fraternities especially stress masculinity and exploitation of women to an increased degree, according to some researchers. These especially exploitative attitudes in fraternities include an emphasis on: competition, dominance, winning, conflict, excessive drinking, and sexual prowess (Foubert & Newberry, 2006).

Social acceptance of troublesome masculinities and sexually coercive behavior in the hyper-masculine environments of fraternities could also be applied to athletic teams on college campuses (Boeringer, 1999). Over recent years, attention to the role of college athletes and sexual assault and violence against women has been increasing. Within the literature that does exist on college athletes and sexual assault, the debate still exists as to whether college athletes are more likely to commit acts of sexual assault and violence, or whether they are simply more likely to be reported and publicized because of their celebrity status. There is however, a small body of empirical studies conducted that concluded that college athletes are over represented as perpetrators of sexual assault on college and university campuses; however, there are aspects of student athlete culture that are sexual assault and rape supportive (Crossett, 2000).
This research noted that available literature on college athletes and sexual assault provided an important starting point in addressing troublesome masculinities, but there is clearly a need for more extensive research. With the exception of Schacht’s (1996) study of rugby players and Curry’s (1991) analysis of locker room conversation, most of these studies used only quantitative measures of incidence and few have moved beyond this to explore the contributing factors. After reviewing the existing research on athletes and sexual assault, Crossett (2000) sums up the state of current research:

The conclusions we can draw from this quantitative research are limited. The research to date, driven by early theoretical understandings of men’s violence, is best regarded as incipient. The mixed results of the early empirical research push researchers to question some of the assumptions about the relation between sports, masculinity and violence against women. (p. 151)

Crossett’s (2000) critique provides an important directive for future research in the area of hyper-masculine groups such as fraternities, athletics and ROTC. It is essential to the success of an effective sexual assault prevention program on any college campus that more research be conducted with these at risk groups, so as to clarify the mixed results produced thus far by existing research. Therefore, social settings must be examined to determine what types of interactions and beliefs contribute to a rape culture and rape myth acceptance through peer support and education. In addition, increasing awareness of troublesome masculinities, harm caused to women, and consequences of gender stereotypes and sexually aggressive attitudes toward women (Boeringer, 1999) provides the opportunity to engage and empower young men to support and participate in sexual assault prevention at UHM.
Ethnicity and Race in Sexual Assault Prevention

The role of race and ethnicity as a risk factor for campus sexual assault has not been well studied, primarily because of the small number of minorities included in previous research. In Koss, Gidycz, and Wisniewski’s (1987) National College Women Survey, Native American college women reported the highest incidence of sexual assault, and white women had higher rates than African American, Hispanic, and Asian women. However, the role of race and ethnicity as a risk factor for sexual assault may differ depending on the type of assault. For example, the Harvard College Alcohol Study (2004) found that white undergraduate females were more likely to report experiencing sexual assault when intoxicated than women of other races (Wechsler & Nelson, 2008; Mohler-Kuo, Dowdall, Koss, & Wechsler, 2004), which is likely due to the pattern of heavy alcohol use being more common among white college students (Wechsler, Dowdall, Maenner, Gledhill-Hoyt, & Hang, 1998; Wechsler, Lee, Kuo, Seibring, Nelson, & Lee, 2002). In the same study, white women were less likely to report experiencing other types of sexual assault, which included physically forced rape and threats of force, than women of other races (Mohler-Kuo et al., 2004). Similarly, in a study conducted in a single Southeastern university, Gross, Winslett, Roberts and Gohm (2006) found significantly higher rates of physically forced sexual intercourse, and emotional coercion for African American women compared with white women.

My research included an analysis if quantitative data that included race and ethnicity in the findings as a reason for under reporting of sexual assault at UHM. The initial findings were that race and ethnicity affected the under reporting of sexual assault at UHM. Race and ethnicity was not a major theme resulting from the research, but rather, the culture of both place and
community were highlighted. The findings and conclusions regarding race and ethnicity and the problems of under reporting sexual assault at UHM will be discussed in detail in Chapter Four. Although race and ethnicity were a sub-theme in this particular study, my future research plan and journey will include a more extensive review and assessment of these areas in sexual assault prevention programming at UHM. However, a review of the literature clearly pointed to the need for a systems approach in sexual assault prevention programming.

**Systems Approach to Sexual Assault Prevention**

The literature review and evaluation of assessing the effectiveness of sexual assault prevention programming on college campuses suggested that a systems approach has a number of characteristics which contribute to the success and effectiveness of successful sexual assault prevention. In particular, effective sexual assault prevention programs are inclusive, comprehensive, and campus-wide. Additionally, these programs are grounded in *kaiāulu* (community) and *kuleana* (responsibility). The bystander model of sexual assault prevention encourages and thrives on a systems approach, taking steps towards a broader community approach to prevention. The bystander model gives all members in the community a specific role and responsibility in which they can identify and adopt in preventing the community problem of sexual assault.

*Bystander Model of Prevention*

Barnyard and Crossman (2009) noted that an innovative approach to sexual assault prevention on college campuses is the use of the bystander model of prevention. The bystander approach involves teaching students how to intervene in situations that involve sexual assault and sexual violence. While still involving programming that trains groups of individuals, the bystander model of sexual assault prevention takes the next step toward a more inclusive and
comprehensive community-based approach to sexual assault prevention. The bystander model gives all community members a specific role, the role of an engaged and empowered bystander. The role of the bystander includes interrupting situations that could lead to sexual assault before it happens or during an incident, speaking out against social norms that support sexual violence, and having skills to be an effective and supportive ally to survivors. The importance of bystander model is that it may also encourage wider community change. By presenting material about sexual assault in the context of discussions about the culture of place, sense of community and responsibility; individuals and groups may begin to take on greater challenges in creating positive social change. Bystander model of prevention of sexual assault is based on studies that point to the role of community norms as a significant cause of sexual assault; particularly in communities like college campuses (Barnyard, et al., 2009; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 2000).

Foubert (2005), DeKeseredy et al. (2000), and Berkowitz (2002, 2004a, 2004b) look at the role of bystanders in relation to sexual assault prevention and have focused on the effectiveness of the approach specifically for men. Katz (2005) evaluated the Mentors in Violence Prevention (MVP) program using a non-experimental pre-post test design. The program trained leaders among high school aged men and women. The heart of the model was interactive discussion, in single-sex and mixed-gender classes and workshops, using real-life scenarios that spoke to the experiences of young men and women in high school, college, and other areas of social life. The chief curricular innovation of MVP is a training tool called the Playbook, which consists of a series of realistic scenarios depicting abusive male and sometimes female behavior. The Playbook, with separate versions for boys/men and girls/women transports participants into scenarios as witnesses to actual or potential sexual assault and challenges them
to consider a number of concrete options for intervention before, during, or after an incident (Katz, 2005).

According to Katz (2005), the MVP model seeks to provide bystanders with numerous options, most of which carry no risk of personal injury. With more options to choose from, people are more likely to respond and not be passive and silent, and hence complicit, in sexual assault or violence by others. Many young men and women have been socialized to be passive bystanders in the face of sexist abuse and violence. MVP sessions can only begin to explore this and some of the other deeply rooted cultural characteristics that contribute to bystander apathy.

So, unlike other sexual assault prevention efforts that target young men as perpetrators or potential perpetrators, MVP has the potential to expand dramatically the number of young men willing to confront the issue of men’s violence against women. This is a result of the MVP philosophy of working with men as empowered bystanders; not against them as potential perpetrators. This positive approach has the effect of reducing men’s defensiveness around the discussion of sexual assault, which provides the basis for the emergence of more proactive and preventive responses (Katz, 2005).

Furthermore, the bystander model of prevention, in the centrality of notions of community responsibility, may encourage participants to contribute in creating community levels of change since the responsibility for action rests not only with potential perpetrators or victims but with all members of the community. Indeed, a bystander perspective provides all community members with a positive role to play in ending sexual assault and sexual violence. Strong messages that challenge the culture of rape and troublesome masculinities make community members more aware of sexual assault, its prevalence, and consequences; but more importantly, places the responsibility to prevent and intervene in sexual assault on all members of the UHM
community (Barnyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2004). By engaging students at UHM as responsible bystanders and community members, providing them with the necessary knowledge and skills to prevent sexual assault; students will be better equipped to ho’omana (empower) themselves and each other to intervene in, but more importantly, to prevent sexual assault on campus.

**Peer Education as Ho’omana**

Peer education, instruction by individuals who have some similarity to those they are teaching (Foubert, 2005) has been used on college campuses to promote public health since 1957, and is highly valued as agents for change (Foubert, 2005; Foubert 2004a). Foubert (2005) has even argued that peer educators are much more effective than professionals in educating students about campus sexual assault. The effectiveness of peer education stems from the fact that the peer educators convey information and communicate with their contemporaries in ways that professionals cannot. Additionally, peer educators live among their constituents, have access to students, and are active members of their university community. The American College Health Association (ACHA) annual survey consistently indicates that students are comfortable receiving health related information from other students (ACHA, 2007).

Therefore, if students are being educated by their peers and are empowered with the necessary knowledge and skills to act as responsible community members, this can be an extremely potent and positive force for change. Many college campuses around the country have established groups to raise awareness about campus sexual assault, with an increasing focus on prevention. Increasingly, the members of these groups are exclusively men. These campus based groups seek to prevent sexual assault by starting with men, by looking at it as a man’s issue, rather than taking a traditional approach and focusing on women (Foubert, 2005; Katz, 2000).
Fabiano (2003) has been instrumental in promoting a broader concept of the peer health educator role to include sexual assault and violence prevention education, acknowledging that sexual assault is a source of physical and emotional injury. Her vision of student peer educators as agents of change has been embraced by professional health educators on college campuses across the country and is reflected in the proliferation of peer education groups dealing with sexual assault, gender violence, alcohol and drug use, and eating disorders beyond the early peer health education focus on first aid and disease prevention education.

Hong (2000) has acknowledged utilizing Fabiano’s (1994) community action model of peer education in the development of the Men Against Violence (MAV) student organization at Louisiana State University, and the MEN OF STRENGTH (MOS) program at UH Hilo. Hong (2000) has incorporated a feminist advocacy approach to her work with the students in both the MAV and MOS programs and her discussion of the intersection of race, ethnicity and gender issues within the group provides a rich example of how peer educators can be “agents of cultural change” (Fabiano, 1994, p. 3).

UHM prides itself on being a community of diverse cultures, a community that strives to be an inclusive campus environment for all students regardless of their cultural identity, race, ethnicity, gender identity, or sexual orientation. Although not discussed in this study, further research is recommended regarding the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and intersex (LGBTI) population at UHM regarding sexual assault prevention programming. Based on the literature review, it seems that the sexual assault and gender violence experiences of LGBTI are not addressed by mainstream public health resources, nor are they adequately addressed at UHM. This lack of inclusion creates a significant gap in existing research and prevention and may create a barrier for gay and bisexual men to participate in sexual assault prevention at UHM.
Future research needs to include the experiences and voices of LGBTI students to aid in the design of effective sexual assault prevention programs on all college campuses, including UHM.

*Kaiāulu* and *Kuleana*

The Native Hawaiian values embedded in the concepts of *kaiāulu* and *kuleana* serve to remind us of our responsibilities to our UHM community, and the greater community around us. A community happens when people practice shared values, making them visible to all. For UHM to be perceived as truly a Hawaiian place of learning, core values must be manifest in all areas of endeavor to establish a foundation for the teaching and learning community. Essential to providing a transformative educational experience for students is engaging them as participants in this learning. As researchers and educators we share in this responsibility, to engage our students in sexual assault prevention programming. All our students will then be empowered to actively contribute solutions to sexual assault at UHM, and to assist in the development of a culturally responsive and sensitive sexual assault prevention program. As a community we have the opportunity to make a promise to one another to assist in the creation of an environment that promotes respect, equality, civility, healthy relationships, and healthy sexuality; and ultimately, a campus setting where all students are safe and learning successful.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

_E lauhoe mai nā wa’a; i ke kā, i ka hoe; i ke kā; pae aku i ka ‘āina._

Everybody paddle together; bail and paddle; paddle and bail; and the shore is reached.

(Pukui, 1983, p. 40)

Setting the Course: Wayfinding

In the course of working on the preliminary stages of my thesis and study of personal stories of students and key stakeholders at UHM regarding sexual assault prevention programming, I determined that my methodological path would primarily be qualitative, feminist, indigenous, and reflexive. All were shaped by and constructed by not only my Native Hawaiian identity, and approach to knowledge and epistemology; but also my Native Hawaiian way of learning and being in the world, ontology. This section begins with a discussion of the Native Hawaiian navigational skill of setting the course, or wayfinding. Included is a discussion on feminist epistemologies, indigenous methodologies, and researcher reflexivity, as a means of maintaining the course. This chapter on methodology concludes with an in-depth description of the quantitative and qualitative mixed-methods that I utilized, as a means of reaching the goals of this study. The journey of discovery and research continues.

I begin this chapter as I have every chapter previous, grounded in the wisdom of _Nā ‘Ōlelo No‘eau_ to guide the way. The poetic proverb that introduced my chapter on methodology accurately depicts ancient Native Hawaiians as skilled navigators, and expert explorers that worked together to reach their destination. To reach their common goal, ancient Native Hawaiian explorers utilized a navigational technique deeply rooted in their culture, called wayfinding.
Wayfinding was the method of navigating a canoe across long distances using only natural signs: the sun, moon, stars, and ocean swells. Three distinctive strategies comprised wayfinding:

1. Setting a course for reaching the destination;
2. Maintaining the course during the voyage;
3. Finding land after reaching the destination (Polynesian Voyaging Society, 2010).

Chapters Four and Five of this research study include quantitative and qualitative data analyses that incorporated similar strategies of wayfinding. Research strategies included:

1. Quantitative secondary data analyses of the 2003 UMH Student Survey on Violence (SSVP) for the Program Against Violence to Women (PAVW), and 2003-2004 UHM Campus Security Log (Chapter Four);
2. Qualitative analysis of five focus groups with students at UHM (Chapter Five);
3. Qualitative analysis of five individual interviews with key stakeholders at UHM (Chapter Five).

**Maintaining the Course**

With the development, growth, and transformations in feminist epistemologies, feminist researchers have drawn on a wide range of research methods to conduct their work. From narrative analyses, to in-depth interviews, ethnographies, surveys, oral histories, and secondary data analyses feminists apply a particular methodology when conducting their research that reflects their woman-centered vision. They view research holistically, and as a process; and thus pay close attention to the synergy between the context of discovery and the context of justification. Feminists have changed conceptions of what is truth, who can be the knower, and what can be known (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998; Harding, 1993; Collins, 1999). By creating situated and partial knowledge, by attending to the intersection of gender and other categories of
difference such as race, class, and sexual preference in its analysis of social reality, feminist research and methodology is open to new knowledge, asking new questions. As a result, feminist methodology aims at creating knowledge that is beneficial to women and members of other minority groups (DeVault, 1990).

Feminist Epistemology

Many feminists are activists seeking to use their research to better the social position of women. While feminist scholarship varies in epistemological position and research; a feminist approach to research helps give voice to the experiences, concerns, attitudes, and needs of women (Collins, 1999; Hesse-Biber 2002), which aligns perfectly with the specific goals of this research study,

Given these feminist foundations, feminist researchers seek to make visible the lived experiences of women. The experiences of oppression due to sexism, to which both researcher and researched are subject, can create a unique type of insight and ability to interpret explanations and grasp gender relations and their mechanisms (Fonow & Cook, 1991). These insights teach us not only about gender relations, but also about society as a whole. According Patricia Hill Collins (2004), bringing groups of marginal intellectuals, such as Black feminist sociologists, as well as others who share an outsider-within status vis-à-vis sociology, into the center of the analysis, may reveal views of reality obscured by more mainstream approaches (Collins, 2004).

While many feminists conduct qualitative research, Sandra Harding (1987) claims it is not the method that makes feminist research different from what she terms “malestream” (p. 188) research, but that feminist research is a series of alternative research decisions including:
…the origin of the problems under examination, which concern women rather than men; the alternative hypotheses and evidence used; the purpose of the inquiry, which is to understand a woman’s view of the world and assist in the emancipation of women; and the nature of the relationship between the researcher and the so-called subjects of her inquiry (Harding, 1987, p. 188).

As a self-proclaimed feminist, I see research and methods as a means to develop a conceptual framework and theories that explain the world from the position of women. A primary function of a conceptual framework is to map the conceptual terrain surrounding an area of interest. Each identified element can represent a specific area about which data are needed and collected. Additionally, such a framework defines the scope of enquiry, delineates important concepts and organizes them into a logical structure, showing the key relationships, processes or flows that exist between elements. Successful conceptual frameworks are logical in structure, comprehensive but concise, dynamic and flexible to allow for change, and cognizant of other frameworks, classifications and standards.

Because I am not only a feminist, but also an indigenous researcher, I use the analogy of Fine’s (1994) “working the hyphens” (p. 135), by surfing the hyphens and giving voice to my many identities. Thus, my research will include methodologies and analyses from an indigenous-feminist perspective. Surfing the hyphens means creating opportunities for this researcher and the participants to discuss what is, and is not, happening between, and within the negotiated relations of whose story is being told, why, to whom, with what interpretation, and whose story is not being told, why, for whom, and with what consequence (Fine, 1994).
Indigenous Methodology

Simply defined, methodology is about how research does or should proceed. Thus, methodology is a body of approaches and methods, rules and postulates employed by research. Indigenous methodology is a body of rules and postulates employed by indigenous researchers in the study of indigenous peoples. The main aim of indigenous methodologies is to ensure that research on indigenous issues can be carried out in a respectful, ethical, sympathetic, useful and beneficial fashion, seen from the point of view of indigenous peoples (Smith, 2006; Meyer, 2003; Osorio, 2004; Maaka 2004, McMullin, Bone, Pang, Pang, & McEligot, 2010). Western academic research, which has usually been aimed at solving indigenous problems or searching for answers to a series of questions about indigenous peoples, has given power and control over research to non-indigenous groups or individuals. Over the past few centuries’ research on and about indigenous populations has been affiliated with the interests of a particular group, or individuals, who have been almost exclusively non-indigenous (Mihesuah, 1998; Maaka, 2004). This being the case, it must be noted that indigenous methodologies do not reject non-indigenous researchers, nor do they reject Western canons of academic work. Rather, indigenous methodologies articulate that indigenous scholars cannot be privileged just because of their indigenous background, because there are a great variety of insider views (Smith, 2006).

Therefore, insider research has to take seriously the notion of accountability, which is an obligation or willingness to accept kuleana (responsibility), as well as the notion of respect (Meyer, 2003). Indigenous methodologies permitted this researcher to think critically about my research processes and outcomes, bearing in mind that indigenous peoples’ interests, experiences and knowledge must be at the center of research methodologies and the construction of knowledge concerning indigenous peoples (Kawai‘ae‘a, 2002).
A direct result of accepting *kuleana* for my research was the recognition that a detailed discussion of the methods was not merely a requirement; it was central to the study. To remain on course, the researcher must describe the methodology in detail to make the process as transparent as possible. My committee chair stressed the importance of outlining the conceptual framework of the study. It is important, as well, to provide a theoretical rationale for the selection of central concepts and to define these concepts in operational terms. Details should also include the population of interest, the research subjects and how they were recruited or selected for the study, and the means of analysis. It is especially important to provide the landmarks, or details of the data collection methods and instruments as well as the data analyses techniques and procedures.

I purposely chose a mixed-methods approach, quantitative and qualitative, to my study, with the primary methodological modes being qualitative. The purpose of a mixed-methods research design was ultimately to strengthen the validity of the results. Specifically, studies that use only quantitative, survey-type methods can be limiting in being able to explore the participants’ own perspectives and definitions of situations. Using qualitative methods, such as the focus groups and individual interviews, allowed the researcher to gain in-depth information and clarification that is not possible with a survey alone (Sprague, 2005; Charmaz, 2006; Glaser, 2003). Also, reflecting on my positionality vis-à-vis the way others constructed my identity helped me in becoming engaged in researcher reflexivity; which enabled me to be immersed in the research process in a more meaningful way (Falconer, Al-Hindi, & Kawabata, 2002).

*Researcher Reflexivity*

Many feminist methodologies emphasize non-hierarchical interactions, understanding, and mutual learning, where close attention is paid to how the research questions and methods of
data collection may be embedded in unequal power relations between the researcher and research participants (Moss, 2002; Bondi, 2003). Reflexivity in research involves reflection on self, research processes, and representation, and critically examining power relations and politics in the research process, and researcher accountability in data collection and interpretation (Falconer, & Kawabata, 2002). Going beyond the purpose of research in and of itself, feminists have encouraged women to engage and become active through research and education. Reinharz (1992) emphasizes the importance of reflexivity in the research process, stating that reflexivity on the part of feminist ethnographers and participant observation research suggests that the researcher will not always be able to control her experience and relationships in the field (Kobayashi, 2003). This idea of integrated learning and dialectical knowledge production contradicts the mainstream assumption that the researcher can control her stance or be placed outside the circumstances of the situation she is observing. Furthermore, as Nancy Naples (2003) argues, the practice of self-reflexivity has been greatly informed by third world and post colonialist feminist theorists who “argue for self reflexive understandings of the epistemological investments that shape the politics of method” (p. 41). In other words, coming from a feminist perspective requires the acknowledgment of power dynamics and an assessment of gains and losses for those individuals participating throughout the research process.

Specifically within the context of my research on sexual assault prevention at UHM, it was an integral part of my research process to identify and work though power differentials between participants and researcher as well as participants amongst themselves. Power differentials are in fact, always part of the dynamics of research. Coming from a feminist perspective requires the acknowledgment of power dynamics and the rethinking of the validity of research as process and knowledge creator (Naples, 2003). For example, although I conducted
the focus groups, I worked diligently to create an environment for the students that would encourage them to feel safe and included in the research process. I chose not enter into the focus groups as the *kumu* (teacher), but rather, we were all *nā haumāna* (students), all gathered in a focus group community, learning and living with one another.

Additionally, I learned that engaging in self-reflexivity also requires researchers to acknowledge that there may be variation in their levels of commitment and participation to a research project for a variety of reasons. We must ask ourselves how we can measure the consistency and level of commitment a researcher has on a day to day basis over the course of the research. Is it useful, or should it be expected, to take into account what is going on in the life of the researcher, emotionally, personally, and financially; and reflect on how these elements may affect the research project design, implementation, and the extent to which these issues are relevant within a framework of self-reflexivity in research.

Cope (2002, p. 55) proposed that self-reflexivity include all forms and intersections of oppression occurring in the subject and circumstance of our research that are socially and spatially constructed. This encouraged me to ask questions differently, reevaluate my data collection process, rethink the ways in which I interpreted data and produced results, and demanded that I represent the research in ways that were sensitive to all the varied forms of oppression that influenced the processes, people, and events we I studied (Cope, 2002).

I found great comfort in this idea. I found that Cope’s argument resonated with my own sense of *kuleana* (responsibility) in that moment and historically to the people, situations, and events that contextualized the research experience. Cope’s argument encapsulated the ways in which I had reformed my own notions and presumptions of sexual assault prevention programming throughout the research process. By asking myself key questions such as, what
counted as worthy of academic inquiry, in what ways did I have authority to assess the situations I engaged with during research, and who gained from this research project; I felt that I was able to hold myself more accountable to a feminist research agenda of contributing to social change and thus minimized the reinforcement of exploitative research practices. The following will be a detailed description of the quantitative methodologies utilized; maintaining the course of the research study.

**Maintaining the Course: Quantitative Methodologies**

The qualitative methodologies were secondary data analyses of existing data. The secondary data analyses provided this researcher with readily available resources to examine sexual assault and relationship violence experienced by undergraduate students at UHM. A secondary data analysis was conducted on the 2003 UHM Student Survey on Violence (SSVP).

**2003 UHM Student Survey on Violence**

In 2001 the UHM Women’s Center and Gender Equity Office secured a grant from the U.S. Department of Justice Violence Against Women Office to address issues of sexual assault and relationship violence on campus. This grant included the implementation of a needs assessment survey. The survey was conducted in 2003, UMH SSVP, and looked at sexual assault and relationship violence experienced by undergraduates since starting school at UHM (Bopp, 2005).

The survey instrument administered was an eight page anonymous survey titled *UHM Student Survey on Violence*, consisting of 57 closed ended questions. This survey collected demographic data, attitudinal information related to gender roles and rape myths, information on the participants’ experiences with sexual assault, stalking, rape, and relationship violence while at UHM; and their willingness to report these incidents (Bopp, 2005). After receiving approval
from the Human Subjects Committee, an invitation to participate was extended to instructors teaching randomly selected undergraduate lecture courses with 50 or more students. Of the 10 instructors asked to participate, seven agreed. Instructors allowed class time for the survey and encouraged their students to participate resulting in a very high participation rate (Bopp, 2005).

Data for this report were collected from UHM students in undergraduate lecture courses in the fall of 2003. A total of 794 surveys were collected, with 724 usable for analysis. It was not stated in the survey final report why 724 surveys out of the 794 collected were usable. Additionally, while both male and female students were surveyed, only responses from female students were examined in the research report. The sample of female undergraduate respondents examined were (N=435), with a total of 7,284 female undergraduates attending UHM in the fall of 2003 (Bopp, 2005).

Of the 712 survey respondents 55.5 percent were freshmen, 26.6 percent sophomores, 14.9 percent juniors, and 4.1 percent seniors. Primary and secondary ethnicities were collected with the following breakdown: 54.6 percent Asian, 23.1 percent Caucasian, 12.4 percent Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, 4.5 percent Mixed, and 5.4 percent Other. Male survey respondents were 38.8 percent, while female respondents were 61.2 percent. (Bopp, 2005). Table 1, on the following page, describes the characteristics of the 2003 UHM fall undergraduate survey participants.
Table 1. Characteristics of 2003 UHM Fall Undergraduate Survey Participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of 2003 UHM Fall Undergraduate Survey Participants</th>
<th>2003 UHM Fall Undergraduates %</th>
<th>2003 UHM Fall Undergraduates Survey Sample %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 13,292</td>
<td>N= 712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHNICITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guamanian or Chamorro</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronesian</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Ethnic Background</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the 2003 UHM SSVP, this researcher was able to review the records of the UHM Campus Security Daily logs for the 12-month period, from September 2003 up to, and including August 2004. The Jeanne Clery act requires colleges and universities to publish and distribute their annual campus security report to students and employees. They must also maintain a crime log and collect the three most recent year’s crime statistics. Each entry in the log must contain the nature, date, time and general location of each crime and disposition of the complaint. Lastly, they must provide timely warnings of crimes that represent a threat to the safety of students or employees; hence the UHM alert system. All institutions are monitored by the U.S. Board of Education to ensure compliance (UHM Campus Security Daily Logs, 2003-2004).

A quantitative secondary data analysis of the 2003-2004 UHM Campus Security Daily Logs corroborated the data collected from the 2003 UHM SSVP. This researcher counted the number of reported incidents that could be considered as sexual assault, sexual harassment, or gender violence against women at UHM. A total 63 incidents were counted, and were described as either sexual assaults, indecent exposure (considered fourth degree sexual assault under Hawai’i state law), sexual harassment of a female by a male, and reported cases of gender compliance (UHM Campus Security Daily Logs, 2003-2004).

**Reaching the Goals: Qualitative Methodologies**

Qualitative researchers use what we as “investigators bring to the research process in order to reach the goal of increasing our sensitivity to what our participants are telling us. This requires that a researcher put him or herself into the research” (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, p. 32). Qualitative researchers do not attempt to separate their own backgrounds or experiences from
their interpretation of the data they gather, but throughout the research process they focus on understanding the meaning the participants place on the subject matter rather than their own meaning (Creswell, 2007). Striving for sensitivity helps researchers accomplish this because as stated by Corbin and Strauss (2008) it “means having insight, being tuned in to, being able to pick up on relevant issues, events, and happenings in data” (p. 32).

The goals of qualitative feminist research are to establish collaborative relationships with research participants, to place the researcher within the study rather than taking an isolated stance, and to conduct research that is transformative (Creswell, 2007). The work of feminist scholars has been to “correct the invisibility and distortion of female experience in ways relevant to ending women’s unequal social position” and to challenge the male-oriented framework of the research process (Lather, 1991, p. 71).

One aspect of the research process Lather (1991) explored for almost two decades is alternative concepts of validity as a method of establishing data credibility. Lather suggested that a feminist researcher’s goal to conduct transformative research could include “catalytic validity” defined as a measure of how the research process “re-orient, focuses and energizes participants toward knowing reality in order to transform it.” The researcher “consciously channel(s) this impact so respondents gain self-understanding and, ultimately, self-determination through the research process” (p. 68).

Although most feminist research topics focus on social justice for women and oppressive situations for women (Oleson, 2005), Mahlstedt and Corcoran (1999) applied a feminist social change approach to the issue of male involvement in sexual assault and violence prevention. “A feminist social change approach to violence prevention is based upon the belief that power
relations within a patriarchal system of male dominance stand at the center of the problem” (Mahlstedt & Corcoran, 1999, p. 312).

Research that “re-orient, focuses and energizes” (Lather, 1991, p. 68) male participants requires the feminist researcher to create collaborative relationships and “authentic, basic caring must accompany the challenge to confront sexism” (Mahlstedt, 1999). Describing feminist prevention education, Mahlstedt and Corcoran (1999) asserted that “support from other men and feminist role models” will provide the “structure within which men can examine their own behavior” leading to social and personal change (p. 313).

Mahlstedt and Corcoran (1999) and Lather (1991) encouraged this researcher to acknowledge the inequities of power between the researcher and the participant; and to do research that empowered the participant. I approached the participant as a conversation partner, using methods like Rubin and Rubin’s (2005) “responsive interviewing,” so that “both interviewer and interviewee work together to achieve a shared understanding” of the participant’s “uniqueness and his or her distinct knowledge” (p. 14). I also encouraged participants’ to share their suggestions in how to best prepare the groundwork for a successful sexual assault program for UHM. The qualitative methodologies included in this study were five focus groups with students enrolled at UHM, and five one-on-one interviews with key stakeholders at UHM.

Five Focus Groups with Students at UHM

A focus group at is, at its simplest, “an informal discussion among selected individuals about specific topics” (Beck, Trombetta, & Share, 1986, p. 73). Researchers using focus groups typically organize and run a series of small, focused, group discussions and analyze the resulting data using a range of qualitative techniques (DeVault, 1990; Kvale, 1996). A focus group
participant is not an individual acting in isolation. Rather, participants are member of a social
group, a community, all of whom interact with each other. In other words, the focus groups are
itself a social context. As David Morgan (1988), a leading focus group researcher emphasized:
“The hallmark of focus groups is the explicit use of group interaction to produce data and
insights that would be less accessible without the interaction found in a group” (p. 12).

The particular advantages of focus groups for feminist research are that they are
relatively naturalistic, that they offer a social context for meaning-making; and that they shift the
balance of power away from the researcher toward the research participants. In this manner,
focus groups meet the concerns of feminist researchers to avoid the problems of artificiality,
decontextualization, and exploitive power relations. I chose focus group methodology because at
the na‘au (center) of this particular method is a genuine appreciation for action research, and the
role that each member had in raising awareness about sexual assault prevention programming at
UHM.

Additionally, and key to the research methodology was the relevance of two key aspects
of Native Hawaiian culture to focus group methodology: kaiāulu and kuleana. First, the process of
working together in a group has special meaning for Native Hawaiian, reflected in kaiāulu,
which means community and kuleana, meaning taking responsibility, or being responsible
(Kawai‘ae‘a, 2002). These values were translated into group behaviors through a cultural ritual
of introduction. Kaiāulu (community) was manifested when focus group participants were
introduced to one another, and then helped each other by setting up the community environment
with chairs, tables, and equipment. The introductory ritual created a sense of solidarity for the
group and for the discussions that would be taking place. The spirit of kuleana translated into
action by being responsible for what happened to one another as well as for their own behavior
during the group process. This metaphor played out in the circular movements of participants as they introduced themselves and engaged in conversations that stimulated meaningful dialogue for the purpose of making connections. Thus, the focus groups became a cohesive unit, a responsible community, through the Native Hawaiian cultural values of *kaiāulu* and *kuleana*, before sharing their intimate talking-story sessions.

**Talking-story.** In Native Hawaiian culture, talking-story is a common term used to describe the process of allowing people the opportunity to discuss what is on their mind; thus, creating the space for them to share the power of their own knowledge. As Sing, Hunter and Meyer (1999) have noted “talking-story…is how we as Hawaiians best approach an issue” (p. 4). It includes all our voices and the nuance of group energy, or group *mana*. It is often how most Pacific Islander conversations begin before the conversation is constrained by what others, such as researchers, might want to know. The focus groups were specifically designed to include a mix of modified standardized questions that were scientifically valid, questions that represented the possible daily life experiences of participants, and a “talking-story” session for the participants. Through the conversation about sexual assault prevention programming at UHM the focus group participants had an opportunity to better understand the concerns of the researcher and the UHM community. Talking-story, as a feature of the focus groups, provided the environment to practice *kaiāulu* (community), *kuleana* (responsibility), ‘*ike* (ways of knowing), and *na‘au* (ways of learning); and the sharing of knowledge. The respect and caring for each other in our efforts emerged in our data collection phases, as we engaged one another in the conversation of talking-story. The following section is a detailed description of the focus groups. All focus group participants were encouraged by this researcher, and sole moderator, to engage in the art of talking-story, the oral tradition that imbues the Native Hawaiian culture. Based on a
characteristic of Native Hawaiian communities, talking-story promotes joint turn taking during conversation (Kawai‘ae‘a, 2002; Meyer, 2003). Talking-story is respected for its value of behaviors that resemble ground rules in focus group methodology. Respected and required behaviors include attentive listening while another is telling his or her story, not disputing the content of another’s story, and rallying in support of one who shares their personal narratives and emotions (Andrade, Hishinuma, McDermott, Johnson, Goebert, & Makini, 2006; Affonso, Mayberry, Inaba, Matsuno, & Robinson, 1996). The smooth flow of responses allowed for the depth and meaning of one’s story and encouraged others to follow in expressing their thoughts and feelings. This expressive tone in all five focus group was observed by the researcher among all participants. Notably, expressions were powerfully articulated by the males who openly shared their concerns about sexual assault and gender violence at UHM and the need for prevention and education. The emotional behaviors that accompany talking-story engender a sense of community among the participants, in which their co-narratives build and reinforce their shared responsibility towards building a campus environment that is free from sexual assault.

I conducted and analyzed five focus groups; each consisted of six participants, for a total of 30 members. All thirty participants were, at the time of the focus groups, enrolled at UHM. The focus group study began as a project for a graduate course in qualitative methodology, and blossomed into my master’s thesis. I implemented my first focus group in the beginning of March 2009 and completed all six focus groups by the ending of spring semester, in May 2009. I posted a printed invitation for volunteers to participate in focus groups. Invitations were placed at key locations, close to my office on campus, which had high levels of student traffic and visibility. Additionally, because of having worked in the academic services department as a mentor and a tutor of various subjects, such as, sociology, women’s studies, Hawaiian studies,
and courses from the PACE department; I received numerous responses to participate from student-athletes. In my work with student-athletes, I have found that the majority of them are hard-working, healthy and responsible young adults who manage a challenging schedule and a variety of responsibilities. When there are problems on teams, it is often the minority who create a negative stereotype for the majority.

However, one of the factors recognized by feminist researchers as contributing to the occurrence of sexual assault on college campuses is the role of all-male settings or sub-cultures, such as fraternities and men’s athletic teams (Schacht, 1996). A small body of empirical studies has concluded that college athletes are over-represented as perpetrators of sexual assault on college campuses and that there are aspects of student-athlete culture that are rape supportive (Boerignier, 1999; Crosset, Bendict, & McDonald, 1995; Crosset, Ptacek, McDonald, & Benedict, 1996; Curry, 1991; Schacht, 1996). Being that focus groups were mostly comprised of student-athletes, with a few international students and non-student-athlete undergraduates; I was able to collect and analyze data from a population known to be at high risk for sexual assault.

The composition of the first and second focus groups were all-male. The third focus group was all-female, and the fourth and fifth focus groups were an equal mix of both genders. The gender distribution of the focus groups was 40% female and 60% male. I purposely chose 40% female participants and 60% male participants because I wanted to include male voices in finding solutions to the problem of sexual assault: a crime perpetrated mostly by men.

One of the main tenants of this research was to engage and empower all our students, male and female in preparing the groundwork for an inclusive, comprehensive campus-wide sexual assault prevention program at UHM. Focus group questions asked specifically what men could do in the prevention of sexual assault, and what men are, in fact, already doing in the
prevention of sexual assault at UHM. To answer those questions, I needed to engage the men’s voices, inviting them to join in the dialogue with women, thus creating an opportunity for a positive role for men in sexual assault prevention at UHM. Table 2 lists the demographic details of each five focus groups, based on gender, age, ethnicity, marital status and years at UHM.

Table 2: Demographic Details of Five Focus Groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2003 UHM FOCUS GROUP DEMOGRAPHICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years at UHM</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All five focus groups were audio-taped, with the permission of the students and then transcribed. I used a digital recorder for all focus groups. To maintain the participants’ anonymity they were assigned a pseudonym. I took notes during the focus groups, and after each session recorded in a journal my observations of each participant and new questions or areas of inquiry that were suggested. I also used the journal to reflect on what I was learning about my research questions and about myself as a researcher, and to examine my responses for evidence of bias.

Members of focus groups were asked the following questions:

1. If you could design and implement a sexual assault prevention program at UHM, what elements would you include? Follow up questions: Do you feel that UHM is doing enough to educate students about the harmful consequences of sexual assault on campus?

2. How do we engage and empower students to become agents of change in sexual assault prevention programming at UHM? Follow up questions: How aware do you think male students are about the issue of sexual assault at UHM? What solutions to ending sexual assault against women do all students, female and male, offer? How do we begin the dialogue between women and men regarding sexual assault prevention at UHM?

3. How do we create a kaiāulu (community) of kuleana (responsibility), between and with students, administrators, and educators in the design and development of an effective sexual assault prevention program at UHM?

Five Interviews with Key Stakeholders at UHM

Qualitative research such as mine, which included in-depth interviews within a specific community at UHM, utilized purposeful sampling as opposed to random sampling. Because the emphasis is on quality rather than quantity of data of interviewees, I selected key stakeholders at
UHM based on their individual and/or departmental involvement in sexual assault prevention policy and programming on campus. Those that I initially contacted also eagerly provided me referrals to other individuals and groups on campus that had a personal and community commitment to sexual assault prevention programming at UHM.

Between September and October of 2010, I conducted five one-on-one interviews with key stakeholders at UHM. Potential interviewees were contacted by email in order to invite them to participate. I contacted 18 potential interviewees by email inviting them to participate in the study. Out of the 18, a total of 12 responded to my email invitation. Of the 12, a total of nine responded positively to the invitation. The other three responded that they would not be able to participate because of time and scheduling. For the purpose of this study, and due to time constraints, the first five invitees to respond positively were chosen by this researcher to participate in the study. The three that were not able to participate were contacted by this researcher, and most appreciatively thanked for their kind response. As this was my first time conducting interviews, I was pleasantly surprised that most of the potential interviewees, when asked to participate in the study, readily responded and very positively. In fact, they seemed eager to share their perceptions and experiences regarding sexual assault prevention and education programming. To protect their identity, anonymity, and privacy of those who participated in the individual interviews, I gave each interviewee a pseudonym.

Amy, an Asian-American female, and student resource manager, emailed response is a great example of the positive replies:

Dear Penny-Bee,

Thank you for the invitation to participate in your study regarding sexual assault prevention programming at the university. I would be pleased to participate, as I am a
strong advocate on campus for sexual assault, rape prevention and education. I am actively involved in a number of events on campus, and would love to be able to share my experiences. I appreciate your attaching the abstract to your study, and IRB approval. I am eager to schedule a date and time for our interview.

Table 3 lists the demographic details of the five individual interviews based on gender, age, ethnicity, marital status, and role and number of years at UHM.

**Table 3: Demographic Details of Five Individual Interviews.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEW DEMOGRAPHICS</th>
<th>Pseudonyms</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Role and Years at UHM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Member of Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Campus Security Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Student Resource Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Extra-Curricular Program Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Female(3) (60%) Male(2) (40%)</td>
<td>Average Age: 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The five key stakeholders, who agreed to participate, including members of the focus groups, were given a copy of consent form and asked to sign it (Appendix A for sample of consent form). Interviews lasted from forty-five minutes to an hour and fifteen minutes, with
most taking an hour. With their approval, I used a digital recorder. Notes were taken during the
interviews. The recordings were transcribed using pseudonyms for the participants in place of
their names. One interview was not recorded. The participant was not available to meet with me
but asked to participate in the interview via email. I emailed a copy of the consent form and the
interview questions, and received the answers by return email.

**Responsible interviewing.** A semi-structured interview approach was utilized with the
wording and sequence of questions set in advance. In some cases elements of an interview guide
approach was used so that the sequence of questions could be modified when the course of the
conversation anticipated upcoming questions. On occasion clarifying questions were used to
learn more from participants when it was evident that they had a deeper understanding of a
specific aspect of sexual assault prevention programming. This project attempts, as Eisner (1998)
proposed, “to see what is subtle but significant” (1998, p. 21) in the participants’ views of sexual
assault work at UHM. Their experiences, perspectives, and stories formed the central text of the
data analysis.

The interview guide for this study (Appendix B) was developed through use of the
iterative research design described by Rubin and Rubin (2005), so after each interview I reflected
on the interview process and incorporated new questions or areas of inquiry suggested by that
discussion collaborator into future interviews.

Additionally, following a feminist approach to the interview process, I paid close
attention to the standpoints from which the interviewees spoke throughout the discussion
exchange; noting, as Holstein and Gubrium (2003) suggest, that the standpoint from which
information is offered is continually developed in the interview interaction. The interviewees
engaged in this process of changing and specifying standpoints from which they spoke
throughout the interviews as the topics shifted. During the course of the interview discussion, I attempted to allow the interviewees to speak from their multiple standpoints without my influence. For example, I opened every interview by asking the interviewee to engage in talking-story and sharing with me a little about how their department was working to promote the prevention of sexual assault at UHM. Each interviewee chose from which standpoint they would respond; some spoke as legal experts highlighting the benefits of federal and state laws regarding sexual assault prevention at UHM and college campuses across the nation; and some spoke as policy and program coordinators of sexual assault prevention programming at UHM. Each interview was guided by, but not restricted to these main questions with the potential for follow-up questions:

1. How is your department working to promote the prevention of sexual assault? What types of programming, and how successful?

2. If you could design and implement a sexual assault prevention program at UHM, what elements would you include? Follow up questions: Do you feel that UHM is doing enough to educate students about the harmful consequences of sexual assault on campus? How is violence against women defined and perceived by members of the student community at this university? In what situations within the student culture are abusive behaviors towards women perceived as acceptable? In what situations are they tolerated?

3. How do we engage and empower students to become agents of change in sexual assault prevention programming at UHM? Follow up questions: How aware do you think male students are about the issue of sexual assault at UHM? What solutions to ending sexual assault against women do all students, female and male, offer? How do we begin the dialogue between women and men regarding sexual assault prevention at UHM?
4. How do we create a *kaiāulu* (community) of *kuleana* (responsibility), between and with students, administrators, and educators in the design and development of an effective sexual assault prevention program at UHM?

The first question asked to the interviewees: “How is your department working to promote the prevention of sexual assault? What types of programming, and how successful?” opened up a floodgate of responses. Participants were eager to discuss their engagement with sexual assault prevention programming. This resulted in numerous pages, in fact, over twenty pages of material on this question alone, which indicated that the interviewees' welcomed the opportunity to reflect on and talk about sexual assault prevention at UHM.

The goal of this research and responsible interviewing was to gain a deeper understanding of the research topic, which was accomplished by developing a relationship between this researcher and the interviewee, or as described by Rubin and Rubin (2005), the conversation partner. Developing this relationship was a central concept in my research methodology, based on feminist research theory, which provided the framework within which the responsible and responsive interview guide for this study was developed. The use of the term “conversation partner” in place of “interviewee” emphasizes the empowerment of the person being interviewed to guide the conversation and give voice to their experiences, ideas, and stories. The responsible and responsive interview design remained flexible, allowing this researcher and interviewer to ask follow-up questions in response to ideas, themes and concepts offered by all the conversation partners.

Early in the research process I became keenly aware of the importance of providing checks and balances to maintain acceptable standards of scientific inquiry. In effect, the need for
rigorous data collection and analytic methods had to be addressed. Padgett (1998) enumerates and elaborates on six strategies for enhancing the rigor of the research:

1. Prolonged engagement;
2. Triangulation;
3. Peer debriefing and support;
4. Member checking;
5. Negative case analysis;
6. Auditing.

In my research, I employed no fewer than four of those strategies. However, I put emphasis on triangulation; employing various methods and tapping various sources for data. Both indigenous and feminist researchers frame their studies in an interpretive paradigm, and think in terms of trustworthiness as opposed to the conventional, positivistic criteria of internal and external validity, reliability, and objectivity (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Padget, 1990). Denzin and Lincoln (1994) suggest that four factors be considered in establishing the trustworthiness of findings from qualitative research: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. My three methods of choice were triangulation, peer debriefing and support; and member checking. With regard to triangulation, I researched data from multiple sources through multiple methods, in particular, focus groups, interviews, and secondary data analyses.

Focus groups and interviews were time-consuming, but were my main data gathering methods. What went through my mind was that I simply could not afford to rush through the focus groups and interviews or skirt around the issues. And when the time came for me to draw upon the focus groups and interviews for my research thesis, I was at pains to ensure that I was not offering a cure for insomnia. I did that by constructing a compelling narrative and including
lengthy and descriptive quotes in Chapter Four and Chapter Five. The parts of the narrative that illustrated emerging themes found their way into these two chapters, which I knew had to be more than a good story well told.

Additionally, after each focus group and interview, I conducted a peer debriefing and support system, in part, due to the highly sensitive nature of the discussions, sexual assault prevention. Member checking, which involved contacting focus group participants and interview participants to check the accuracy of their narratives, took place as data collection segued into data analysis. Crosschecking helped me maintain reflexivity by encouraging self-awareness and self-correction. This process provided participant validation of the findings.
CHAPTER FOUR

‘IKE: WAYS OF KNOWING

*I ka nana no a ‘ike.*

By observing, one learns (Pukui, 1983, p. 129)

Quantitative Secondary Data Analyses: ‘Ike

As expressed in the wise saying of our kūpuna (ancestors) above, there is much knowledge that we as Native Hawaiian researchers journey to discover. ‘Ike (knowledge) and deep understanding is highly valued and essential for the community. As our understandings of our own cultures and our training in western mainstream approaches to research come together, the opportunities for synergies are many and exciting. At their naʻau (center), these synergies are about valuing and respecting the voices of indigenous peoples and ensuring that research speaks to those who are most involved, our communities. Tied to this, is the recognition that our worldviews, our ways of knowing, and our knowledge are fundamentally valid and legitimate as are western ways of knowing. Therefore, culturally relevant and sensitive western systems of knowledge gathering working collaboratively and combined with indigenous ways of knowing teach us the value of observing one another, acting responsibly, celebrating the journey, and coming together to learn as a community.

I set out on my quantitative secondary data analyses with the goal of creating sensitive and critically informed analyses that combined a feminist approach (Sprague and Zimmerman, 1993). Researchers, like me, who use a feminist approach in their analyses, have one very important commonality, and that is a commitment to responsible social change. This research and my long-term research agenda fit within such a framework. Both my quantitative and qualitative data analyses were grounded in working for positive social change and my goal was
to understand how all our students, women and men could collaborate with administrators and faculty at UHM in the design and implementation of an inclusive, comprehensive, and campus-wide sexual assault prevention program. The following, is a secondary data analysis of the 2003 UMH Student Survey on Violence (SSVP), along with a review of the 2003-2004 UHM Campus Security Logs, which spoke to a number of the research questions, including: Do the statistics support the design and implementation of an inclusive, comprehensive, and campus-wide sexual assault program at UHM?

2003 UHM Student Survey on Violence

The 2003 UMH SSVP looked at sexual and relationship violence experienced by undergraduates since starting school at UHM. This study found that nearly 10% of female undergraduates experienced sexual assault since starting school at UHM (Bopp, 2005). When asked specifically about sexual assault, 9.7% (N=41) of female undergraduate students said they had experienced sexual assault since starting school at UHM. If we extrapolate this given the total number of 2003 undergraduate women, it translated to 707 UHM female undergraduates.

Of the female undergraduate students reporting sexual assault since starting school at UHM:

- 51.4% reported the sexual assault happening on campus;
- 38.5% said the sexual assault happened 1 time;
- 33.3% said the sexual assault happened 2-4 times;
- 7.7% said the sexual assault happened 5 or more times;
- 17.1% told no one about the sexual assault;
- 2.4% reported the sexual assault to campus security;
- 2.4% told UHM staff/person about the sexual assault (counseling center, instructor);
- 0% reported the sexual assault to Honolulu Police Department (Bopp, 2005).
2003-2004 UHM Campus Security Daily Logs

In addition to the 2003 UHM SSVP, this researcher was able to review the records of the UHM Campus Security Daily logs for the 12-month period, from September 2003 up to and including August 2004. A quantitative review by this researcher of the 2003-2004 UHM Campus Security daily corroborated the data collected from the 2003 SSVP. This researcher counted the number of reported incidents that could be considered as sexual assault, sexual harassment, or gender violence of women. A total 63 incidents were counted, with the following breakdown of incidents by type:

- 8 reports of sexual assault;
- 11 reports of indecent exposure, considered fourth degree sexual assault under state law;
- 12 reports of assault/harassment of a female by a male/males;

Painting a face to the statistics. Based on the statistics, two main themes emerged from the quantitative secondary analysis of the 2003 UMH SSVP and review of UHM Campus Security Logs (2003-2004). The first theme was: painting a face to the statistics. Many of the participants stated that an effective strategy to raise awareness about sexual assault at UHM was to paint a face to the statistics. Meaning that unless someone we know, or we ourselves have been sexually assaulted, it is difficult to fully understand the severity of the statistics.

Focus group participants’ were shocked to learn one in four college age women have either survived a sexual assault or an attempted sexual assault (Gidycz, Rich, Orchowski, King, & Miller, 2006; Karjane, Fisher & Cullen, 2005; Johansson-Love & Geer, 2003). These startling statistics compelled focus group members to ask the following: What if the one was your sister? What if the one was your girlfriend? What if the one was your classmate? What if the one were
your teammate? What if the one were your colleague? What if the one was you? The numerical evidence paints a face to the statistics and to the prevalence of sexual assault at UHM. This researcher has been inspired by the strong and sensitive voices of the students, which included both female and male students, collaborating with administrators and faculty in advocating for an inclusive, comprehensive and campus-wide sexual assault prevention program at UHM.

*Under reporting of sexual assault.* The second theme revealed the prevalence of under reporting sexual assault at UHM (Bopp, 2005; UHM Campus Security Logs, 2003-2004). Secondary data analysis of the 2003 UMH SSVP asked “If you experience partner violence, stalking, rape or sexual assault in the future, do you think you will report it?” 52% of all respondents said “Yes”, 9.2% said “No”, and 35.5% said “Not sure/Depends.” Additionally, the secondary data analysis noted that none of the students that reported rape went to the police or campus security, and only three students that reported other types of sexual violence told the police or campus security (Bopp, 2005).

Therefore, taking into account UHM’s cultural and ethnic diversity is instrumental when addressing the concerns of under reporting of sexual assault, but more importantly, for designing successful strategies to improve under reporting. According to the National Violence Against Women Survey (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000) Asian and Pacific Islander women are the least likely to formally report any kind of physical victimization. Research finds that while most Asian communities consider sexual assault and gender violence unacceptable, many women of Asian descent do not believe in reporting sexual assault or gender violence to anyone outside of their family (Yoshioka & Dang, 2000).

Research in Hawai‘i has also found that women of Asian ancestry to be significantly less apt to report a sexual assault (Ruch, Coyne, & Perrone, 2000). Ruch et al. (2000) examined data
from a sample of 709 women accessing services from the Sex Abuse Treatment Center in Hawai‘i. They found that reporting rates for Caucasian, Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian, Filipina and women of “Other” ethnicities were between 71% and 76% compared to 56% for women of Asian ancestry (Ruch et al., 2000). The FBI estimates that nationally approximately one in 10 sexual assaults are reported to the police; however, in Hawai‘i, the number is about one in 16 (Bopp, 2005). UHM statistics indicate that five cases of forcible sexual offenses were reported in 2001, seven in 2002 and seven in 2003 (Campus Security Crime Statistics Report, 2002-2004), approximately one in 16. Although under reporting of sexual assaults is well recognized, the gap between reported and actual prevalence at UHM may possibly be higher than many other college campuses on the continent since 17.1% are Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and over 49% of the student body are of Asian ancestry (UH Institutional Research Office, 2010).

In addition, the literature from the American College Health Association Campus Violence White Paper (Carr, 2005) notes that under reporting by campus victims of sexual assault and gender violence “stems from a combination of individual, institutional, and socio-cultural factors” (p. 2). The report goes on to say that many institutions of higher education may “unintentionally condone victim blaming when they circulate materials that focus primarily on the individual victim’s responsibility to avoid sexual assault without prevention education that stresses the perpetrator’s responsibility for committing the crime” (p. 2).

Stressing the individual’s personal responsibility to avoid sexual assault, the December 2010 Ka Leo O Hawai‘i, a newspaper independently produced by students at and for the UHM community, featured an article entitled: *UH Mānoa takes steps to reduce sexual violence,*
increase resources to victims. The article included a list of techniques suggested by UHM Campus Security to protect against sexual assault:

- Learn some self-defense from an instructor;
- Know your limits. Don’t be embarrassed to say no or ask to stop;
- Trust your instincts. Guard your personal space;
- Educate yourself on warning signs and techniques (Ka Leo O Hawai‘i, December, 2010).

Although the article was an important and timely one, citing current statistics regarding sexual assault on campus at UHM, some of the techniques suggested by the article may unintentionally condone victim blaming by directing the responsibility for avoiding sexual assault towards the victim. So, even though the suggestion to learn self defense techniques was a practical one, successful sexual assault prevention at UHM must also take into account the cultural backgrounds of our students and strive to make improvements in under reporting of sexual assault. We must remove the focus on the victim’s responsibility to avoid sexual assault, thereby, redirecting sexual assault prevention on perpetrator accountability and UHM becoming a responsible, caring, and compassionate community.

Emerging from the two main themes, were two sub-themes from the secondary data analysis that support the literature review. They were: (1) attitudes about sexual assault at UHM; and (2) sexual assault prevention at UHM. A brief discussion of the findings follows.

Attitudes about sexual assault. In the 2003 UHM SSVP, students were asked to agree or disagree with a series of common misconceptions about sexual assault and relationship violence such as, “Men rape because they cannot control their sex drive” or “If women listened to men more men would not abuse them as much.” Men were significantly more likely to accept these misconceptions in 12 of 14 measures used (Table 4). About one-fourth of men agreed that “If a
woman gets drunk it is partly her fault if she is sexually assaulted” (24.7%) and that “Women often claim ‘rape’ to protect their reputation” (23.9%). Women agreed with these two statements 14.8% and 8.8% of the time respectively. Almost 39.6% of men felt that “If a couple really loves each other they should do anything for each other” compared to 18.2% of women. Items that both genders similarly agreed with were “If women are cautious enough they can nearly eliminate being raped” (35.4% for men, 29.8% for women) and “Men rape because they cannot control their sex drive” (20.4% for men, 18.4% for women). Significantly, Asians and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders were more likely to accept these misconceptions than Caucasians in eight of 14 measures (Table 5).

Clearly the research shows that a considerable number of UHM students endorse some of the stereotypes and myths that support sexual assault and sexual violence against women. As found in previous studies, men at UHM were significantly more likely to accept these misconceptions than women. Furthermore, Asians and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders were significantly more likely than Caucasians to accept these misconceptions. Previous studies have found that rape myth acceptance is not only associated with subsequent sexual coercion by men, it also contributed to the lack of reporting sexual assault to law enforcement officials by women. The endorsement of these conceptions by UHM Asian and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students may likely be linked to the low reporting rates. While programs addressing misconceptions about sexual assault against women may not prevent all men from committing sexual assault, they remain an important correlate with increased reporting and should be a part of any sexual assault prevention program at UHM (Bopp, 2005).

Highlighted in Table 4 are responses to myths about sexual assault and gender violence by gender from the secondary data analysis of the 2003 UHM SSVP. In addition, Table 5 takes
those same myths and highlights the responses to myths about sexual assault and gender violence by ethnicity at UHM.

**Table 4. Responses to Myths about Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence by Gender.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MYTH</th>
<th>Male (N= 275)</th>
<th>Female (N=435)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent Agree</td>
<td>Percent Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 If women did not act so bad men would not be so violent towards them</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 If women are cautious enough they can nearly eliminate being raped</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 It is okay to have sex with someone when they are really drunk</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Men rape because they cannot control their sex drive</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Women in sexy clothes are partly to blame if they are sexually assaulted</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Women often say NO to sex when they really mean YES</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 If a woman gets drunk it is partly her fault if she is sexually assaulted</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Women often claim “rape” to protect their reputation</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 A wife cannot be “raped” by her husband</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Most people are raped by strangers (someone they have never met)</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 If a couple really love each other they should do anything for each other</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from: Bopp, 2005)
Table 5. Responses to Myths about Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence by Ethnicity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Myth</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Other∞</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent Agree</td>
<td>Percent Disagree</td>
<td>Percent Agree</td>
<td>Percent Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. It is okay for a man to keep his wife from seeing people he does not like</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If women are cautious enough they can nearly eliminate being raped</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is okay to have sex with someone when they are really drunk</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Men rape because they cannot control their sex drive</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Women in sexy clothes are partly to blame if they are sexually assaulted</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If women listened men more, men would not abuse them as much</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Women often say NO to sex when they really mean YES</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>89.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from: Bopp, 2005: ∞Includes Mixed, Black, Hispanic, Native American, and Unknown)
Sexual assault prevention programming. Feminist Theory, Male-Peer Support Theory, and the Bystander Model of Prevention all indicate that profound changes in the lives of men, the construction of masculinity, and gendered power relations are necessary if sexual assault and violence against women is to be eliminated. How this should be done remains uncertain as the lack of effective educational and policy interventions to prevent sexual assault is well documented (Berkowitz, 2002; Schewe, 2002; Schwartz & DeKerseredy, 1997; Hong, 2000; Kilmartin, 2000; Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000; Lonsway, 1996; Gidycz, Dowdall, & Marioni, 2002; Breitenbecher, 2001; Fabiano, Perkins, Berkowitz, Linkenbach, & Stark, 2003). However, it is clear that if sexual assault is to be abolished men must take part. Research does indicate that peer based programs; men intervening with other men around their problematic attitudes and behaviors can reduce harm to women (Fabiano et al., 2003). The 2003 UHM SSVP survey found that significant numbers of male students endorse attitudes that support violence against women and that Asians and Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders were more likely to endorse these attitudes than Caucasians. To date no primary prevention interventions targeting men have been done at UHM; nor has research been done on the effectiveness of current or past campus sexual assault and violence prevention programs. More importantly, there needs to be more research conducted on effective sexual assault prevention models for Native Hawaiians, Pacific Islanders and Asians.

Kaiāulu and Kuleana

Fortunately, at UHM we have inspirational leaders in the area of indigenous research and sexual violence prevention and intervention. Dr. Valli Kalei Kanuha is well-respected and admired for her outstanding work in domestic violence prevention and intervention within our Native Hawaiian population. Her research has involved the design and evaluation of Native Hawaiian cultural interventions for Native Hawaiian and Pacific Island men who are court
ordered to batterer intervention programs in Hilo and Honolulu. The project, *Ke Ala Lōkahi* Native Hawaiian cultural domestic violence project was funded by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention from 2000-2005. The goal of the project was to design, implement and evaluate a culturally-based intimate partner violence and sexual violence intervention for Native Hawaiian batterers and battered women using Native Hawaiian cultural values, beliefs and practices. The intervention incorporated Western best practices regarding power and control, sex and gender roles, and family responsibility as they relate to intimate partner and sexual violence, and included teachings on ancient Hawaiian traditions and customs, visits to cultural sites, and classroom lessons (Kanuha, 2007). Sexual assault prevention at UHM would benefit from studies such as Dr. Kanuha’s in the implementation of culturally relevant and sensitive sexual assault prevention program, honoring the culture of place.

When the data was collected and analyzed from the 2003 UHM SSVP, the author of the survey made the recommendation for an institutional commitment to the prevention and education of sexual assault. This would include institutionalized funding of staff and programming, developing relevant policies, procedures and protocols, updating existing policies, and full compliance with all federal laws (Bopp, 2005). Although UHM did undertake a number of the recommendations listed above; eight years after the 2003 UHM SSVP was completed, UHM has yet to develop and implement an institutionalized, inclusive, comprehensive, and campus-wide sexual assault prevention program. Initial findings from the secondary analyses revealed that there has been and there is still a need for such a program at UHM.

Additionally, based on the statistical evidence of under reporting of sexual assault by Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and Asian women, this researcher recommends that such a program be culturally relevant and sensitive, thus benefitting from being grounded in the Native
Hawaiian concepts of *kaiāulu* (community) and *kuleana* (responsibility). The program should also be modeled on evidence-based practices with proven effectiveness. Finally, sexual assault prevention programming must engage and include the voices of all students at UHM, so that they are empowered to become active agents for change. The following chapter is an analysis of data collected from the five focus groups with students and five individual interviews at UHM. Three key themes that emerged were: (1) creating a responsible community, (2) honoring the culture of place, and (3) transforming the systems approach at UHM. These three themes will be discussed in detail in the subsequent chapter.
CHAPTER FIVE

NA‘AU: WAYS OF LEARNING

Nānā ka maka; ho‘olohe ka pepeiao; pa‘a ka waha.

Observe with the eyes; listen with the ears; shut the mouth. Thus one learns.

(Pukui, 1983, p. 248)

Qualitative Data Analyses: Na‘au

I cannot recall how many times I heard my Papa tell me: “Pa‘a ka waha.” In my family, I was known to be quite the kolohe (mischievous) keiki (child). I was constantly asking my Papa questions about the why is that, what is that, and where is that? As an inquisitive kolohe keiki, I was not shy about sharing my thoughts and opinions. The “shut the mouth” part of this traditional Native Hawaiian saying is at odds with much of today’s Western learning and teaching practices, in which students are encouraged to speak up and ask questions early in the learning process. On the other hand, this saying acknowledges an innate ability, deep in our na‘au (center of being leading to ways of learning and acting), and combined with our ‘ike (ways of knowing), that indigenous people have in understanding the subtleties of who, what, where, when, and how we research. How one knows, what one prioritizes with regard to this knowing, is the truth that links us together as a responsible learning and teaching community. It is the essence of who we are as explorers of the vast ocean of knowledge. It is the discussion of the culture of place and the culture of community. It is a way to navigate the shores of what is worth knowing and it is particularly important as we journey towards our destinations of discovery.

My qualitative data analyses began with ‘ike and proceeded to build on na‘au. Qualitative approaches emphasize interpretation and nuance; researchers address non-numeric sources, such as in-depth interviews, texts, and observation with an intensive focus, seeking a detailed
portrayal of the process and meanings in a context, what Clifford Geertz (1973) described as thick description (Sprague, 2005). I utilized both focus groups with undergraduate students, and individual interviewers with key stakeholders to achieve thick descriptions about sexual assault prevention programming at UHM (Geertz, 1973). The following offers my analyses of the voices and insights shared by students in the five focus groups and by individual university staff during interviews. The three themes that emerged: (1) creating a responsible community, (2) honoring the culture of place, and (3) transforming the systems approach at UHM.

**Creating a Responsible Community at UHM**

There is no denying that sexual assault and sexual violence is a widespread problem across communities (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000; Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987). Increasing recognition of this problem has generated a growing literature on prevention efforts (Lonsway, 1996). The result is a call for more empirical evaluation of sexual assault prevention programs and the continued development of sexual assault prevention program innovations that are grounded in theories of social change (Lonsway, 1996; Yeater & O’Donohue, 1999).

In my research, I used recent reviews of the sexual assault prevention literature as an important starting point for the discussion of next steps in the development of sexual assault prevention programs. Specifically, my literature review highlighted the importance of a bystander approach that involves all members of a community acting responsibly in the prevention of sexual assault (Berkowitz, 2002; Foubert, 2000; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997, 2007).

A responsible community, based on the Native Hawaiian values of kaiāulu and kuleana, shifts the onus of responsibility for ending sexual assault from individuals to the community. A primary step towards creating a responsible community at UHM is educating the members about
sexual assault. Once armed with knowledge and skills to address sexual assault, engagement and mobilization can begin. This is a participatory process that is focused on changing community norms, basic patterns of social interaction, attitudes, behaviors, and institutions in ways that will significantly improve the quality of life at UHM. Effective implementation of any community engagement requires promoting positive roles, which includes leadership within the community. Committed community members involved in sexual assault prevention are just as important as are the strategies and solutions. “When people have an opportunity to participate in decisions and shape strategies that vitally affect them, they will develop a sense of ownership in what they have determined, and commitment to seeing that the decisions are sound and that the strategies are useful, effective and carried out” (Lofquist, 1996, p. 4).

All my participants expressed a vision of creating a responsible community at UHM. That vision included preparing the groundwork for sexual assault prevention at UHM by: educating students about sexual assault and prevention strategies, engaging one another to collaborate in sexual assault prevention, and empowering all students, in particular, male students to act as agents for change. Thus, participants agreed that the benefits of striving to be a responsible community and then becoming a thriving community are significant. All agreed, that when members of a community, such as UHM, feel engaged in a process, know their voices are heard, and that their ideas are being incorporated into the planning of strategies, that they will have a greater commitment to the process and will be more invested in the success of the strategies.

Additionally, all five focus groups began the process as a community. We helped to set up the chairs, rearranged the tables, and even shared in snacks and drinks. The setting up of the focus group community, and encouraging the story-talking mode of discussions, provided a
particular backdrop for dialogue, one in which participants challenged UHM to become more involved and committed to sexual assault prevention programming.

Leah, Native Hawaiian, and a member of Focus Group #3, summed up the common sentiment across all five focus groups, a sentiment that was shared by approximately 90% of all focus group members, that at the na’au (center) of sexual assault prevention programming is education: “I would really like to see the administration make it a practice in a positive way, that you know, this type of prevention message [sexual assault prevention] is core to our community. The message should be that we [UHM] support this education. We need to be educated about sexual assault. This is our responsibility to one another. I really believe in that message, education is so important to being able to understand the [sexual assault] problem.”

Focused on campus-wide initiatives, Amy, an Asian-American female, and student resource manager offered the following insights:

Given the high rate of misunderstanding surrounding sexual assault, it is essential that UHM provide community-based, campus-wide programs to educate our students not only on the realities of sexual assault, but also on the resources on-campus and within their communities. Providing education about sexual assault is the first step towards becoming a responsible community. Next, we have to work together, and programs like the purple and white ribbon campaigns, Walk a Mile in Her Shoes, and Sexual Assault Awareness Week help raise awareness about sexual assault, and create opportunities for the students, faculty members, and administrators to actively participate together in these programs.

Another common aspect of participants’ descriptions of an ideal sexual assault prevention program was the importance of acknowledging the need for leadership within the UHM community. Elizabeth, an Asian-American female, and member of the Law School, has worked
at UHM for the past 15 years in the area of sexual assault education. According to her, community leadership means more involvement and support from faculty, staff, and administrators. She described her vision of more responsible leadership roles:

Successful prevention of sexual assault and violence requires recognition of the problem at the highest levels of campus leadership. Further, it is the responsibility of faculty, staff, and administrators to serve as leaders, mentors, and role models for students. Community development sets a framework that involves participation at every level, which fosters leadership and sustains prevention strategies for the long term. We need to encourage the students to become involved as leaders in peer education. Emerging research of different types of sexual assault prevention has revealed that programs conducted by peer educators achieved the most positive changes in students’ attitudes about sexual assault.

Along with leadership, another important aspect of participants’ descriptions for a successful sexual assault prevention program was empowering men with positive roles within the community at UHM. Diane, a white female, with fifteen years of experience as a faculty member, has always encouraged male students in her classes to voice their concerns and insights regarding sexual assault and prevention strategies. She stated from first-hand knowledge: “Men must assume responsibility for preventing men’s violence against women. Men need to be approached as partners in solving the problem rather than as only perpetrators.”

Although most participants may not have used the Native Hawaiian words of kaiāulu and kuleana, their shared responses resonated with the values associated with these expressions. All participants agreed that an ideal sexual assault prevention program at UHM should mirror the values of a responsible community.
Participants talked about the various specific components that should be included in a sexual assault prevention program at UHM, these included: (1) educating community members regarding sexual assault and prevention strategies, (2) empowering men with positive roles, and (3) engaging community members to work collaboratively, including encouraging opportunities for leadership roles at UHM. The following is a discussion of the participants’ overall definitions of educating community members at UHM regarding sexual assault prevention.

**Educating Community Members at UHM**

Discussions with participants disclosed points of view that stressed education awareness as a vital component of an effective sexual assault prevention program. In the literature review, scholars focus on what is called “citizen inoculation” and “environmental action” as tools to that change power structures for women and increase community resources for survivors (Koss & Harvey, 1991, pp. 260-61). Although these are terms from the literature, members of my study discussed education in terms of providing the necessary knowledge and skills to address sexual assault on campus. Grounded in an understanding of sexual assault, UHM can begin to strive to become a responsible community, where we all will thrive and grow. For participants, community involvement will be the boost needed to engage and empower all members of the UHM community to become agents for change.

Although most student members of the focus groups felt that UHM was providing some education regarding the risks of sexual assault, the majority of the focus group participants voiced serious concerns. The most frequently offered concern from all five focus groups was that there is not an inclusive and comprehensive sexual assault prevention education initiative provided at UHM, and that the types of education now being offered, did not encourage
campus-wide involvement. Travis, an African-American student-athlete, and a member of Focus Group #1 shared his comments and concerns:

There is very little of it [sexual assault education], I don’t know of any general classes…freshmen students have to do an alcohol awareness thing, but there’s really not too much sexual assault education. We really need to have a program that addresses everything, alcohol awareness, sexual assault, what resources are available on campus, how we can help. I’ve always thought that the April [Sexual Assault Awareness Month] events should be a requirement. Not sure how we would do that, but it’s something that we could have a part in, get the entire campus involved, from students to professors, to the administration.

Providing a unique perspective and voice to their specific concerns, were a number of junior college transfer students, who felt that as a group of students, they were not being included in any of the sexual assault education programs at UHM. Ian, a white male junior college transfer student, originally from the southwest, and a member of Focus Group #4 spoke eloquently about his experience:

I transferred from a JC [junior college]. We did not have any kind of…hmm… [sexual assault] education at my JC. When I got here [UHM], I had to attend a mandatory orientation, but there was nothing in it about sexual assault. We know it’s out there [sexual assault], we hear stories about it, but where is the education? Because of who we are on campus [student-athletes], you hear a lot of stories about us being accused of sex assault, seems like the news just loves to write stuff about us, some good, but some really bad stuff. I heard that the freshmen had a workshop about sexual assault, but we didn’t. It’s like they expect us to already know about this stuff. We could be role models, in fact,
we are kind of expected to be roles models, but how can we do that if we don’t have the basic information. I have a girlfriend, if something happened to her, not sure where to go, what to do. Probably would talk to one of my brothers [teammate], and then maybe the coach.

The five interviewees offered valuable insights regarding the various educational resources at UHM concerned with sexual assault prevention. In fact, based on information shared by interviewees, I gathered over 30 pages of material on the topic of education resources alone, indicating that all the interviewees wanted an opportunity to reflect on and talk about this aspect of their work. Moreover, interviewees’ extensive discussions demonstrated their commitment to providing community-based education on sexual assault. Although each interviewee worked for different UHM departments, and utilized various strategies for education, all five agreed that UHM, as a community, would benefit from an inclusive, comprehensive and campus-wide sexual assault education programming. All five participants eagerly discussed their engagement and insight regarding sexual assault education strategies at UHM. This resulted in over 30 pages of material, indicating that all the interviewees wanted an opportunity to reflect on and talk about their commitment to providing students at UHM with the education and resources needed to address sexual assault on campus. Although each interviewee worked for different departments at UHM, and utilized various strategies and programs for sexual assault education, all five agreed that UHM needed to incorporate sexual assault education that was transformative. Some of the most promising educational approaches that were discussed by interviewees’ were:

- Free on-campus trainings and educational presentations on partner violence, sexual assault, and stalking on campus for campus administrators; campus law enforcement; health and counseling services staff; faculty; staff; and student leaders;
- Including education about sexual assault in new student orientation;
- Social marketing events, such as “Walk a Mile in Her Shoes,” and “Denim Day” focusing on educational strategies to raise awareness about sexual assault on campus;
- Incorporating education about sexual assault in classroom curriculum and discussions.

Despite the animated discussions regarding the types of educational initiatives utilized by each of the interviewees, most interviewees were candid in pointing out some of the gaps in education regarding sexual assault at UHM. Elizabeth, an Asian-American, and member of the Law School, indicated that: “They [students] really lack basic information. They do not know the legal definitions of sexual assault, nor the consequences. They do not know what resources are available on campus, where they can go, and who they can talk to. They need to know the ABC’s about sexual assault, and then we can move on to discussing prevention strategies and community responsibility.”

Adding to the discussion, Diane, a white female, and faculty member, appreciated the need for basic education regarding sexual assault, but also wanted to make sure that education be on-going and comprehensive:

It is somewhat naïve to think that only a few hours of education and awareness will transform deeply embedded cultural norms and practices about sexual assault and gender relationships. Don’t get me wrong, we need to lay the groundwork with basic education about sexual assault, but then we need to build the bridges, and bring in prevention education and research on young people’s sexuality, and sexual violence to move beyond the limitations of existing sexual assault prevention education. This type of comprehensive education, knowledge, and skills needed to learn cooperation and
collaboration in intimate relationships is sadly absent from most sexual assault education and prevention programs on college campuses, including here at UH.

Another common concern among interviewees was the fact that education programs should, but did not, offer the same types of education to male and female students. The major criticism was that male students’ received education strategies, while female students’ received risk management approaches on how to avoid sexual assault at UHM. Some of the interviewees felt that gender segregated education programs may not offer all students a comprehensive foundation regarding sexual assault.

Kevin, a white male, has worked at UHM for the past six years as an extra-curricular program leader. He spoke directly to the concern of gender based sexual assault education:

We’re educating them all the time. [Athletics, ROTC] do get [sexual assault education] but, I feel that our female students do not receive as much. Athletics and ROTC have national offices that do a lot of education. I get to see the reports of the actual types of programs that these groups support and implement, and it seems like they highlight education for the male students and risk management for the female students. Our department tends to follow those same types of programming. Unfortunately, this may lead to not enough education for one group of students, or not enough prevention for another group of students. A comprehensive program would address areas that are lacking, and really provide students with the education and prevention skills they need regarding sexual assault and sexual violence at UH.

Joseph, a white male, born and raised in Hawai‘i, has been a dedicated campus safety consultant for over 20 years at UHM. He shared how his department offers support and practical
suggestions for sexual assault education, but notes that these practical strategies are lacking in overall comprehensiveness:

Our suggestions listed on the UH website basically gives [females] suggestions in risk assessment, assault prevention, and awareness about situations in order to decrease their chances of being victimized. You do all you can do to try to prevent it. If you can’t prevent it then you have to pull in all the physical techniques which are options. We do realize that we are providing risk management to the female students. Perhaps a more complete sexual assault prevention and education program is needed, to involve both the female and male students, in both areas of education and prevention.

In summary, all five interviewees agreed education about sexual assault that was comprehensive, intensive, and relevant was a vital component to the success of sexual assault prevention at UHM. Another central component of a responsible community, was empowering young men to have a positive role in sexual assault prevention programming at UHM.

Empowering Men: “Manning Up”

Researchers and practitioners commonly highlighted the idea that men have, in partnership with women, a significant role in ending sexual assault and violence against women (Foubert & Perry, 2007; Berkowitz, 2004a, 2004b; Katz, 1995). The argument presented by many, is that men should take responsibility for preventing violence against women because of the untold harm it causes to women in men’s lives and the ways in which it directly hurts men (Berkowitz, 2004a; Katz, 1995).

In my study, participants also discussed the idea that men can play an important role in changing campus culture. The general agreement among participants was that while only a minority of men was violent; all men could have an influence on the culture and environment
that allows other men to be perpetrators. For example, many of the participants stated that men could have positive roles in sexual assault prevention at UHM by refusing to be bystanders to other men’s violent behavior. In addition, men can be empowered by being positive role models, and choosing to intervene against the violence of other men. Focus group members noted many ways for men to make meaningfully contributions to sexual assault prevention.

Diane, a faculty member and long time advocate for victims of domestic violence in Hawaiʻi noted:

Violence against women hurts men when it results in women being afraid of or suspicious of men due to fear of potential victimization and when it perpetuates negative stereotypes of men based on the actions of a few. Men must accept and examine their own potential for violence and take a stand against the violence committed by other men.

A common concern for students was that men on campus need to be seen as “good guys” and as valuable resources. Anthony, a Native Hawaiian, born and raised in Hawaiʻi, and a member of Focus Group #1, summed up sentiments shared during all five focus group storytelling sessions:

Instead of always hearing about how we [men] do all this bad stuff, like sexual [assault]. We need to figure out a way to work together, be more positive. My professor was talking about sexual assault prevention in class just the other day. One thing that I really appreciated is that she said; there are more good guys than there are bad guys, but we need to hear your voices. We talked about how we could get our voices to be heard. We talked about the positive roles that we could have.

Some focus group members were specific about what it meant to be a “good guy.” Brent,
a Native Hawaiian student-athlete, and a member of Focus Group #2, described men’s intervention in male-on-female assaults as “manning up.” He said:

If my brother, friend, classmate, or teammate was hurting their girlfriend, being disrespectful to her, or even to girls, hey, I don’t look the other way. I can tell you that a friend of mine really hurt this girl, he messed up bad. She ended up pressing charges against him. I didn’t know her, but a few of us [men] got together and we told him that what he did was wrong. We told him that he needed to man up, and take responsibility for what he did. If he did this, then we would help him get some help. If he didn’t man up, he was no friend of mine. Being a man means you don’t look the other way. We also made sure that the girl was getting some help, too.

While students tended to focus on the need to identify men as “good guys”, interviewees offered specific definitions regarding positive male roles. Amy, a student resource manager, defined what she called a positive message approach:

Positive roles should build on men’s values and predisposition to act in a positive manner. Men are more receptive to positive messages that outline positive roles and what can be done than to negative messages that promote fear or blame. To design a program that incorporates these elements may seem like a daunting task. We need to focus on quality and process rather than quantity.

Elizabeth, who has a background in sexual assault education and prevention, offered a detailed image of a male and peer-based participation in sexual assault prevention:

Workshops and other activities are more effective when conducted by peers in small, all-male groups because of the immense influence that men have on each other and because of the safety all-male groups can provide. Discussions should be interactive and
encourage honest sharing of feelings, ideas, and beliefs. Positive opportunities and roles should be created to discuss and critique prevailing understandings of masculinity and men’s discomfort with them, as well as men’s misperceptions of other men’s attitudes and behavior. Positive anti-sexual assault values and healthy aspects of men’s experience should be strengthened, including teaching men to intervene in other men’s behavior. To create positive roles for men in sexual assault prevention and education we need to work with men in collaboration with and accountable to women working as advocates, educators, and prevention specialists. Thus, men are empowered by and through their participation [in sexual assault prevention].

Kevin, an extra-curricular program leader, shared his experiences with the young men he encounters at UHM. He noted:

We are always encouraging our young men to be positive role models. They actively participate in community service activities. They visit local high schools and talk to kids about not being involved in any types of violence; gang or sexual violence. Our [male] student-athletes have also participated in public service announcements about date-rape and domestic violence. One of the public service announcements even featured one of our coaches, his wife, and his son, all talking about what it means to be a real “man.” That a real man does not resort to violence, and that a real man acts responsibly in his family and in his community. I always thought that was one of the most powerful messages, and most effective. It showed that the university supported this type of education [sexual assault], and recognized our young men [student-athletes] as positive role models, instead of the stereotypical “dumb-jock” or “trouble-maker tough guy.” Our young men have also participated in the “Walk a Mile in Her Shoes” event. These same young men
encouraged some of us older guys to get involved, too. I really believe that they [student-athletes] have a unique opportunity to be positive role models. We just need to encourage them, and provide them with the opportunities.

Four of the five interviewees agreed that men can have a positive role in sexual assault prevention at UHM. Interviewees suggested several ways that men can have a positive role in sexual assault prevention, including: men can prevent sexual assault against women by not personally engaging in violence, men can intervene against the violence of other men, and men can address the root causes of male violence. Amy, faculty member, summed up interviewees’ suggestions:

Men can and should have positive roles in sexual assault prevention. Those roles include taking responsibility and creating a safe environment for men to discuss and challenge each other with respect to information and attitudes about men’s violence. These discussions should include and encourage men to intervene against the behavior of other men. Positive roles for men should also encourage them to take on more leadership responsibilities in this issue [sexual assault]. The best way to accomplish this is to encourage men to be partners in solving the problem rather than by criticizing or blaming men. Most men are not coercive or opportunistic, do not want to victimize others, but, in fact, are willing to be part of the solution to ending sexual assault.

Interviewees’ also noted that male based programs can work at two levels: one focusing on men who have been violent, and another on men who may become violent. Elizabeth, member of the Law School, described these two male-based approaches:

We know that most perpetrators of sexual assault are men. So, to address sexual violence prevention in a truly comprehensive manner, strategies to prevent its initial perpetration
and victimization [primary prevention] must reach the same level of efficacy and adoption as programs that respond to its consequences, such as intervention [secondary prevention]. All levels of prevention are necessary to stop the occurrence of sexual violence. By incorporating all levels of prevention, advocates will be able to help in identifying and popularizing healthy sexuality that respects gender, sexual orientation, and gender identity.

Finally, interviewees acknowledged the challenges and barriers for men that take on positive roles in sexual assault prevention. Amy, student resource manager, shared her view of what some of those challenges are:

Men who work to end violence against women are challenging the dominant culture and the understandings of masculinity that maintain it. Thus, male activists are often met with suspicion, homophobia and other questions about their masculinity. Men and women who feel threatened by this work often discredit male activists’ efforts [in line with literature by Flood, 2003]. At the same time many men are grateful for the example set by male activists and for modeling a different, more positive way of being male.

While Amy noted some of the challenges men confronted, research also tells us that men, at the same time, have a privileged place in sexual assault prevention. The literature informs us that men who do this work are also frequently and unfairly given more credit for their efforts than women who do similar work (Flood, 2001). Furthermore, men engaged in sexual assault prevention need to personally be aware of the challenges that Amy noted, as well as the challenges in the literature.
Community Collaboration

Most members of the focus groups talked about the importance for administration, various departments, and faculty on campus engaged in the work of sexual assault education and prevention to collaborate and cooperate with students at UHM in the development and implementation of an effective sexual assault prevention program. Most of the students also mentioned that they would personally consider being involved in some type of sexual assault prevention. The discussions in the focus groups naturally gravitated to the many reasons why students felt that not enough was being done to make a connection with them. Most of the participants expressed a strong desire to work collaboratively, as a community at UHM, in sexual assault prevention. Interestingly, the main reason mentioned by the students for the lack of a connection, was that the students felt their voices, both collectively and individually, were not being heard. If heard, students felt that their voices were not being valued as a part of the UHM community. Most members of the focus groups talked about the importance for administration, various departments, and faculty on campus engaged in the work of sexual assault education and prevention to collaborate and cooperate with students at UHM in the development and implementation of an effective sexual assault prevention program. Most of the students also mentioned that they would personally consider being involved in some type of sexual assault prevention. Olivia, a white female international student-athlete from Eastern Europe, and a member of Focus Group #5 said:

I really wish that we [students] had more say. Just seems like we are supposed to go to classes, and not get involved. I really think that we have a lot to offer, and that we have some really good suggestions, like making [sexual assault] education a required course for all freshmen, maybe a one credit course that we could take as a credit/no credit class.
As freshmen [student-athletes] we have to take this class called CAS. We learn about community, and working together, but we never even talked about sex, or drugs and alcohol. We should have had a section about sexual health in that class. I don’t even know if there is somewhere that I could go to share these suggestions. Isn’t that part of being a community, working together?

On this same theme, Molly, an Asian-American, born and raised in Hawai‘i, and member of Focus Group #4 shared this idea and summarized the narratives of all the focus group members:

We need to be able to work with the faculty more closely. I took this one class where the instructor included a section on sexual assault and domestic violence; it was a woman’s studies class. He encouraged us to get involved. We also had a guest speaker come to class; she was really knowledgeable about sexual assault, and super easy to talk to. I remember she mentioned the statistic one in four [one in four college aged women will be victims of an attempted and/or completed sexual assault], and how that one could be someone we know, or even ourselves, wow, that really hit home. Why don’t we talk it about this in our other classes? We have a lot to say and share, but I just don’t think that most of the professors here want to listen. You know, I think that more students would get involved in [sexual assault] prevention if they felt like they were a part of the solution. Our voices need to be heard.

The individual interviewees also expressed the need to engage all members in collaborative learning and cooperative activism in sexual assault prevention. Elizabeth, who has tangential responsibility for sexual assault prevention and education at UHM, pointed out her department’s desire to work together with students in the area of sexual assault prevention. This
commitment to partnership and support is typical of all five key stakeholders interviewed. She summarized what she meant by commitment: “Our department understands the importance of collaboration and cooperation. We work well with other departments on campus, and also encourage and support student involvement. We all have a personal stake in preventing sexual violence and all members have a valuable role to play.”

Summarizing the interviewees’ discussions, Kevin, extra-curricular program leader, offered the concept of teamwork to emphasize his commitment to group effort:

Teamwork, that’s what it’s all about. I have a quote by coach Butterfield [pseudonym] on the wall in my office, and live by it everyday: “Make sure that team members know they are working with you, not for you.” The student-athletes see that quote every time they come into my office, and they know that I really strive to live up to it. This is not just for coaching, but this is really a life skill. We need to be able to work as a team to achieve our goals. We need to get everybody involved, from the coaches, to the students, to the administration, and learn to work together.

Along with creating a responsible community through education, empowerment of men, and collaboration and cooperation within the UHM community, both students and interviewees talked about honoring the culture of place. The next subsection highlights the importance of sexual assault prevention programming at UHM being culturally relevant and sensitive, and truly honoring the culture of place.

**Honoring the Culture of Place at UHM**

As Shawn Kana‘iaupuni (2006) writes, culture refers to shared ways of being, knowing, and doing. In this study honoring the culture of place was clearly present in many of the talking-story sessions. In fact, students described a way of being, knowing, and doing that was tied to
Hawai‘i as a place. In this way, students offered an image of Hawai‘i as a context and a culture; a culture of place in their eyes. In the discussions, after participants shared their meanings and definitions of honoring the culture of place, I was also able to share what that meant within my own family.

I shared my stories with all the members of the focus groups, as well. One story that I shared, was how my Papa taught me that respecting this place, the ‘aina (land) was one of the most important aspects of Native Hawaiian life. Not only does it speak to our genealogy, but often to our destiny. The birthplace of our nā kūpuna, (elders), commonly marked the resting place of their elders. Generations of families, like my Papa, would become so intimate with their environment that they could call the winds and the rains by name. Whether a family lived near the ocean as fishermen, as our family, or upland as farmers, they were inextricably tied to their surroundings. For many Native Hawaiians, our pu‘uhonua, (place of peace and safety) entails a connection with the land. Each time a fragrant breeze enfolds us or a gentle wave cleanses us, we are renewed and made whole again. In return, we walk gently upon this land, for we understand that we are no more than temporary stewards. And when our īwi (bones) are laid to rest beside those of our nā kūpuna, another generation will call the winds and the rains by name. Therefore honoring this place helps to define the relationships we have as families, as hosts and guests, as well as how we treat one another and our surroundings, within our community.

The University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa also takes great pride in stating that one of its main goals is facilitating excellence. UHM is dedicated to serving with aloha, “the local, national, and international communities that surround us... Taking as its historic trust the Native Hawaiian values embedded in the concepts of kuleana, ‘ohana, and ahupua’a that serve to remind us of
our responsibilities to family, community, and the environment” (University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa Strategic Plan, 2011-15, p. 3).

Most of the participants in the study also spoke about honoring the culture of place. For some of the participants, it meant learning about some aspect of the culture, such as honoring the culture of place. For the focus group participants, honoring the culture of place meant learning about the Native Hawaiian values of ‘ohana (family), kuleana (responsibility), and respect for the ‘aina (land), and then actually inculcating those ideals into their everyday living. For other participants, honoring the culture of place was more conceptual, and placed emphasis on adapting culturally sensitive and relevant sexual assault prevention strategies into any existing or developing programs at UHM.

The focus groups contained students from diverse cultures; who identified with a variety races and ethnicities. In fact, all focus group members discussed the richness of diversity at UHM, and voiced their appreciation for the host culture. Students’ appreciation for diversity of UHM and students’ respect for the host culture of Hawai‘i came to the forefront in different ways. Mainland students, for example, tended to express loneliness and isolation when they first arrived at UHM. Interactions with students from Hawai‘i, and especially with local students’ families, inspired a gratefulness and heartfelt appreciation for local customs in Hawai‘i, especially those customs favoring ‘ohana (family) and kuleana (responsibility) for the ‘aina (land). Whitney, an African American student originally from the southeast, and a member of Focus Group #3 expressed a common sentiment voiced during the focus groups, and said:

When I came to here, I was all alone. I knew nobody, but in no time I met my roommate who grew up here. She and her family have embraced me as part of their family. I go over to her house on the weekends, and we have dinner, we watch TV together. They
treat me just like a daughter. They are really good people. I know that a lot of it has to do with their culture. I’ve learned a lot about their culture, how accepting they are, how important family is, how they love and respect the land. Cultural values like this would be important to include in sexual assault prevention.

As Whitney noted, focus group participants recognized that connection to the land and respect for family were key components of the culture of place in Hawai‘i. Garret, a white, junior college transfer student-athlete from the west coast, and a member of Focus Group #2 related his heart-warming experiences with his roommate. His roommate was from a local family, and was raised by a single-mother. Based on his first-hand experiences, Garret believed that a sexual assault prevention program at UHM would benefit greatly from the qualities he so keenly observed whenever he went to visit his hānai (extended) family. He said:

I am from a close-knit family, but the kindness and generosity shown to me has been unbelievable. They are my family, and I know I am a part of their family. I learned from my brother’s [roommate and teammate] mother how inspiring a woman can be to a man. Mom, I call her Mom, but her name is Lani [pseudonym], is a single-mom, and she has raised three daughters and one son all on her own. She is strong, independent, and she is loving and compassionate. She scolds me when I need to be scolded, and she hugs me whenever I need a hug. The first Hawaiian word I learned was ‘ohana. I have learned to respect the ocean and the land, to be an honorable man. Sexual assault prevention at our school needs to include family, and the cultural values of the people that live here.

Interestingly, the all-male participants from Focus Group #1 and Focus Group #2 talked about their real-life opportunity and experience in honoring the culture of place through active involvement in the Native Hawaiian Ha’ a Koa (Dance of the Warrior). The Ha’ a Koa is
performed by student-athletes, in particular, the UHM football team prior to the start of each game. The student-athletes perform the dance as a way to bring honor to their team, UHM, and to Hawai‘i.

*Ha‘a* is the Native Hawaiian word referring to the ancient (pre-hula) “bent-knee dance” that was performed by *kāne* (men) while *koa* is the Native Hawaiian word for “warrior.” The *Ha‘a Koa* is a protocol that is clearly and uniquely Native Hawaiian; in language, movement, ‘ike (ways of knowing), na‘au (ways of learning and acting). In essence, the *Ha‘a Koa* celebrates the spirit of the ancient *koa* (bravery and courage), the virtues of *aloha* (love and compassion), *lōkahi* (unity and peace), *kupa‘a* (committed and loyal), and *mana* (spiritual power).

Students’ comments echoed some of these cultural values when they discussed the *Ha‘a Koa*. One theme among the students’ was the idea that the dance reflected compassion and loyalty, especially mutual respect among the team members.

James, part-Native Hawaiian student-athlete, and a participant from Focus Group #1, made the point that although the *Ha‘a Koa* is a Native Hawaiian practice; participation was inclusive and non-participation was non-judgmental about students’ taking part in this pre-game dance. James made these enlightening comments:

Dancing the *ha‘a* is not whether you’re Hawaiian, Polynesian, or even from Hawai‘i; it doesn’t matter where you’re from, that’s not what’s important. What’s important is that this [*Ha‘a Koa*] is part of our culture. We represent our culture, and respect our culture; this is just one way that we can express that respect. Also, we don’t force anyone to do the *ha‘a*. Although the *ha‘a* is Native Hawaiian, the words are spoken in Hawaiian and the dance is Hawaiian, the decision to participate is up to the individual. Showing respect for all our team members is an important way to honor our culture. Our team represents
all our players; [those that participate in Ha‘a Koa] and respects [those that choose not to participate in Ha‘a Koa] all our players.

Shane, a white student-athlete, originally from the east coast, and member of Focus Group #1, had these comments to make regarding the Ha‘a Koa; and how the meaning behind the dance brings honor to the culture of place at UHM:

I am originally from the east coast. When I got to UHM, I did not know that much about Hawai‘i and the culture. But, in no time, my brothers [teammates], especially the ones from Hawai‘i made me feel comfortable and a part of a family. They taught me how to do the Ha‘a, not only did I learn the dance, but I learned the language and the meaning behind the dance. I was really impressed, but, more importantly, it has taught me to be more open to people from different backgrounds and cultures. When we talk about sexual assault prevention at UHM, we really need to include elements of this culture, like aloha, and family, and respect.

However, not all student-athletes, that had the opportunity to participate in the Ha‘a Koa, chose to do so; some based on their strong religious beliefs, others on their cultural backgrounds. Samuel, a white southern-Baptist student-athlete, and member of Focus Group #1 provided his reflections on the Ha‘a Koa:

I am not a local boy, but I do appreciate the culture of Hawai‘i. I just love it here; the people are so friendly and giving. When we were asked to participate in the Ha‘a, I had to respectfully decline. I am from a very religious family, and I am also very religious. I am a Christian, and based on my beliefs, I could not participate. I explained my reasons for choosing not to participate. Got to be honest with ya’ll…at first, I was a little worried, I did not want to offend any of my boys [teammates], but I should have known better.
Everybody [on the team] understood and supported my decision not to participate. No one judged me, no one looked down on me, no one disrespected me; they all accepted me. When my boys do the ha’a, I stand respectfully, a little ways in the back, to show that I support my team and that they support me. That is why I love it here, and will really miss Hawai‘i. Most of all, I will miss the people. That’s the culture here, accepting and respectful. That is what we need when you teach about sexual assault, acceptance and respect for who you are, and where you come from.

Interestingly, interviewees’ discussions didn’t seem to be focused on a culture of place. Rather interviewees wanted to address a cross-section of cultures; from indigenous to those on the mainland. Additionally, their story-talking sessions were vague and not as detailed as the students in the focus groups. For example, none of the interviewees described having any personal experiences with or exposure to the culture of place; for instance having interactions with local families. Instead, in the eyes of the interviewees, sexual assault prevention program at UHM should be “culturally relevant” and “sensitive,” to use two terms common in the one-on-one interviews. To interviewees, UHM community would be honoring the many cultures included at UHM. However, it should be noted that the notions of culturally sensitivity or relevance reviewed by the interviewees was very broad.

Kevin, extra-curricular program leader, made this observation specific to the development of a culturally relevant sexual assault prevention program at UHM: “Because our [student-athletes] come from different geographical areas, such as Polynesia, Asia, South America, and most of the 50 states, they come here with different cultural values and belief systems, they all have different experiences. Relevant programming must address the cultural
context for sex assault prevention within all these communities. We value the students, we value their communities."

Elizabeth, a member of the Law School, brought up the idea of “culturally appropriate” programming, and said: “Culturally appropriate sexual assault prevention is not just a basic human right, it is also good practice. The best way to contextualize sexual assault education is to relate what students are learning to their cultures, communities, lives and land.”

Most of the interviewees’ responses echoed these same suggestions. Several studies have found that race-or-culturally-neutral sexual assault prevention programs are ineffective with men of color (Heppner, et al., 1999). Interviewees, while not mentioning these studies, seemed aware of the idea that culture matters in sexual assault prevention programming. For example, their responses strongly supported the critical importance of developing programs that are either tailored to the needs of a particular group, or conducted in a way that is inclusive and welcoming of all backgrounds.

Joseph, who has worked in the criminal justice system, summarized the suggestions of the majority of interviewees regarding the need for a culturally relevant and sensitive sexual assault prevention program for UHM: “Men from different cultural groups have different experiences with the educational and criminal justice systems that may influence receptivity to sexual assault and violence prevention. Violence against women prevention efforts that are community based sensitive to ethnic and class issues, and accountable to the larger community have been developed in many communities and show promise.”

All of the data analyzed emphasize the idea that students and UHM staff in this study desired a sexual assault program that is culturally relevant and sensitive. The voices of the students clearly defined that in honoring the culture of place in Hawai‘i; we need to recognize
the richness of diversity and respect the host culture. Students eagerly provided personal experiences; focusing their discussions on the positive aspects of local customs and cultural values of 'ohana (family), and kuleana (responsibility) for the 'aina (land) and for the kaiāulu (community). On the other hand, interviewees discussed the need to address the cultural, ethnic, and class backgrounds of all students at UHM. Because of the rich diversity making up the student body population at UHM, interviewees believed that sexual assault prevention must speak to students from Hawai‘i, the mainland, and international students. To participants, a sexual assault program that is culturally relevant and sensitive is truly honoring the culture of place. Along with honoring the culture of place, the following discussion of transforming the systems approach at UHM illustrates another vital component of a responsible community, highlighted by study participants.

**Transforming the Systems Approach at UHM**

The final theme that emerged in both the focus groups and the individual interviews was transforming systems at UHM. There was recognition on the part of the individual interviewees that the system or UHM as an institution was isolated, fragmented, and lacked a genuine sense of collaboration. Additionally, data revealed that most of the departments at UHM that work in the area of sexual assault prevention were merely surviving and not thriving. And lastly, to transform the systems at UHM, focus group participants and interviewees pointed to the idea that programs at UHM need to bridge the gap between the work of a few committed individuals to the work of an engaged, enthusiastic and committed community.

*From Isolation to Collaboration*

Focus group members and interviewees discussed the fact that many individuals and departments are isolated from one another at UHM. Moreover, participants longed for
collaboration and cooperation on sexual assault prevention and programming. Most participants noted the need for this shift and transformation of current practices and policies at UHM.

While both the focus group participants and interviewees agreed that UHM is rich in faculty, staff and students, they also agreed that these resources are not being wisely and/or widely utilized. For example, many of the focus group participants expressed a genuine sense of being isolated, and even excluded from being able to actively participate in policy making decisions and planning processes at UHM. From the students’ standpoint, this was not self-imposed isolation, but the by-product of current practices and policies at UHM, which imposed the isolation on them. Narratives specifically focused on the need for commitment from students, faculty, and the administration to work together as team and as a responsible community. Additionally, focus group participants stated that successful collaboration also required effective leadership. Mitchell, an African-American, and a member of Focus Group #2, pointed out the importance of leadership within sexual assault prevention and within the UHM community:

You know its like the team, we got coaches, assistant coaches, players, we got guys that work in the locker room, we even got doctors to help us rehab. We got leadership. I think you gotta have good leadership in a community, and you have to have good teamwork from everyone. I guess leadership comes from the coaches, the guys that are in charge at UHM, you know [administrators], yeah them, and even the coaches, and professors. You know even students can be leaders. We just need to work together as a team.

Gabrielle, white, student-athlete, and a member of Focus Group #5 spoke directly to the need for a change to how UHM was currently approaching sexual assault prevention. She did not enjoy the sexual assault prevention workshop that she attended during her freshman year at
UHM. She explained that her lack of enthusiasm for the workshop was because she felt that the workshop separated female and male students from having any type of constructive or cooperative dialogue. She also noted the lack of engagement of the students in attendance and the UHM workshop moderator. She said:

Coach always tells us, “Play not your 5 best, but your best 5.” In other words, a team plays both halves of the game. You don’t just play one half, and then sit out the other half. But, that’s what the workshop [sexual assault] felt like, like the first part was for the guys and the second half was for us [females]. The first half of the workshop was about how guys need to stop being so aggressive; learn to control themselves on the field and off the field. The second half was about how we [females] can avoid sexual assault. Some of the information was okay, but we [students] didn’t even get a chance talk about our experiences, or even if we had any suggestions about how we could stop this [sexual assault] from happening. The way they run the workshop is not very good, they are not “playing our best 5.” To play your best 5, you need to talk about it [sexual assault], listen to each other, and then work together for a solution.

For the interviewees, transforming the systems approach at UHM meant addressing the problem of departmental isolation, so as to encourage teamwork across all departments. Interviewees honestly shared their struggles to work on sexual assault prevention as a collaborative community rather than as individual departments. Elizabeth, member of the Law School and long-time advocate for an institutionalized systems approach to sexual assault education and prevention, voiced her frustrations and concerns:

I know that other departments are working just as hard as we are, and are just as dedicated in their work regarding sexual assault education and prevention. Unfortunately,
we are part of the problem. There is a real lack of collaboration across departments to work together on this problem. We are isolated from each, and this creates programs or events that are fragmented, that are not connected. With this fragmentation comes a lack of consistency. We have these great one day campaigns, two day training sessions, but this is not enough. It’s like we have growth spurts, and then we just stop growing, or worse, go backwards. We need consistency in our education and prevention policies and programs, and to achieve this, we have to be able to work together. We need the administrations support. What we need, and what I have continued to fight for is a sexual assault prevention program that is institutionalized. A prevention program that is comprehensive, intensive and relevant.

In addition to moving from isolation to collaboration, interviewees also pointed out that for most of them and their departments, survival was the name of the institutional game, which left little to thrive. The following will be a discussion of the importance of moving from merely surviving to actual thriving in sexual assault prevention programming at UHM.

From Surviving to Thriving

In addition to isolation, interviewees also added that there was a natural progression into what was described as the “survival mode.” The interviewees defined “survival mode” as a response to numerous challenges that they and their departments have had to overcome. Once locked into survival mode, most interviewees conceded that it became very difficult for their departments to thrive or grow in developing a comprehensive and campus-wide sexual assault prevention program at UHM. Surviving became a full-time struggle and battle, one that each of these interviewees felt a responsibility to fight: for their departments, for their workmates, and for the University. The specific fights for survival mentioned by interviewees were tied to
several system-wide challenges including: leadership turnover, fiscal limitations, facilities problems, and an academic support infrastructure that has suffered years of budget cuts. Diane, who has worked at UHM for the past fifteen years, has experienced all of the challenges discussed by the interviewees’ and shared these comments:

I have to be honest with you; our department has seen its share of cutbacks, both in funding and employees. Due to financial constraints, our department has eliminated class sections and courses. Class sizes have also changed from around 30 students to 60 or 100 students. Larger class sizes will mean less time for interaction between students and professors. I am fighting for the survival of my department; I am fighting for my existing programs [sexual assault prevention]. We are surviving, not thriving.

The focus group participants also saw the University to be in a “survival mode.” For the focus group members, “survival mode” meant that inadequate student housing, and poor facilities for students. For some of the students in the focus groups, “survival mode” also meant that the University viewed them only as valuable commodities (i.e., bodies that pay tuition); and not as precious resources and members of the UHM community. In fact students noted that many of UHM resources were severely neglected. Courtney, an Asian-American, born and raised in Hawai’i, and a member of Focus Group #5 said:

Some of the buildings on campus really need to be repaired. I don’t know how many times the elevators at Saunders Hall have been broken and repaired this year, too many times. Our locker room is awful, toilets not working, showers broken. On top of that parking is expensive, prices of textbooks are outrageous, and our tuition keeps increasing. I know that they [UHM] have to make a profit to survive, but they also have a responsibility to fix our classrooms, locker room, and the dorms. I just feel that we
[students] are not getting what we pay for, better classrooms and more resources on campus. What are we? Reminds me of the movie, *Jerry McGuire*, “show me the money.” That’s what we are to UH, the money.

Adding to the discussion, Bianca, a white female from the all-female Focus Group #3, made a link between the neglect of campus facilities and her personal safety. “Sometimes it just feels like we are here to make the University money. We pay a lot for our education, to live here; but, when I fear for my basic safety, something has to be done. Sure, we have campus security, whenever you can find them, and security keys and locks for our dorm rooms; but why do we still have strangers getting into the dorms?” Bianca was not alone in her concerns about the lack of basic safety at UHM; when sharing her experience about being unable to even lock her own dorm room. She shared many of focus group participants’ views that UHM regarded the students as financial capital; but failed to provide students with basic resources, such as adequate and safe housing.

As discussed above, focus group participants and interviewees noted that in the struggle to survive, UHM has failed to thrive. However, they also agreed that UHM has the opportunity to review their systems approaches and foundations; with the potential to move from committed individuals who have been working hard to survive to a thriving responsible community.

*From Committed Individuals to Responsible Community*

Many of the voices from the focus groups and individual interviews resonated with a commitment to sexual assault prevention at UHM. During the interviews it became apparent that many offices that engage in sexual assault work at UHM do not have an official responsibility to do so, but do so unofficially based on their individual department members’ interests. For the majority of participants, moving from being committed individuals to a responsible community
required that all community members have a specific role, with which they can identify and adopt in preventing the community problem of sexual assault. Participants specifically noted that the role of prevention can include interrupting situations that could lead to sexual assault before it happens or during an incident, speaking out against social norms that support sexual assault, and having skills to be an effective and supportive ally to survivors. Additionally important to the participants’ perspectives was presenting material about sexual assault in the context of discussions about sense of community and the interconnections between members of the community. Diane, a faculty member, stated:

I consider all my courses as collaborative learning. For example, I learned from the students that there is a culture on campus that validates a certain amount of sexual assault without reporting it…peers telling peers just not to worry about it, that kind of thing. Through this collaborative learning experience, students discussed why they thought such a culture exists at our university. I place great value on the collaborative learning experience, and encourage other faculty to do the same. Let’s build a community of learning.

Amy, a student resource manager who works extensively on sexual assault education and prevention, felt that “there has been a little bit more cooperation with the faculty, like being able to get education [and] prevention messages to the academic side. But, it’s still not nearly as strong an effort as I would like it to be. I would like to see more involvement, and more community action.” Kevin, an extra-curricular program leader, however, more pointedly referred to “clueless faculty” as a roadblock to better interaction, collaboration, and growth towards a committed community at UHM.
Joseph, a campus safety consultant, best summed up the general consensus among the individual interviewees, that to move from committed individuals to a committed community, these steps must be taken: “The connections must be made and strengthened to create a genuine campus safety network in each of our campus communities. There must be a collaborative effort to support survivors and assure raised awareness of this crucial campus safety issue impacting our students.”

Perhaps though, the vibrant voices of focus group members’ best encapsulated the findings from the data, and the need to transform UHM into a community that engages and empowers their members to be responsible. Keith, a Native Hawaiian, and a member from Focus Group #4 shared his story:

The truth is we are a commuter school. A lot of us have to work to attend school. We don’t have a lot of time to get involved with campus causes, but I believe that if the University engages us [students] in the dialogue about sexual assault prevention, we would get more involved. It starts with the administration, and then the professors. Talk to us about the problem [sexual assault], teach us ways to address it, how we can help. Just because we are a commuter school doesn’t necessarily mean that we can’t get involved, and really start to be more of a community.

Lastly, Kristina, an African-American junior college transfer student-athlete, and a member of Focus Group #5, discussed her vision of a concerned and compassionate community:

President Obama has encouraged all of us to become involved in our communities. This is my first year here, and I want to feel a part of the university. I look for ways to get involved. A lot of the students I know feel the same way, but we don’t know where to go, who to talk to. We need to start somewhere, let’s start with getting information [about
sexual assault] to us [students]. Good place to start is in our classrooms. Let’s start the process of building a community there, and then we can share what we’ve learned with other students. Before you know it, we are a community that cares about each other.

**Kaiāulu and Kuleana**

The data analyses revealed that essential to providing an inclusive, comprehensive, and campus-wide sexual assault prevention program at UHM are three key elements: (1) creating a responsible community, (2) honoring the culture of place, and (3) transforming the systems approach at UHM.

In addition, the narratives in this study seemed to coalesce around a recognition of and appreciation for the Native Hawaiian values of *kaiāulu* and *kuleana*. Participants may not have used these exact terms, but their explanations and experiences evoked the same concepts. Some of students’ experiences, for example, included recognition of the richness of diversity of UHM, and respect the host culture here in Hawai‘i. Student members of the focus groups provided personal stories; focusing their discussions on the positive aspects of local customs and the cultural values of ‘ohana (family), and *kuleana* (responsibility) for the ‘aina (land) and for the *kaiāulu* (community). Interviewees, on the other hand, discussed the need to address and respect the cultural, ethnic, and class backgrounds of all students at UHM. The recommendation by interviewees’ was that sexual assault prevention speak to students from Hawai‘i, the mainland, as well as international students. Thus, the majority of the participants’ interviews advocated for a sexual assault prevention program that is culturally relevant and sensitive, and one that honors honoring the culture of place at UHM, and respects the Native Hawaiian values of *kaiāulu* and *kuleana*. 
The first element in the design of an effective sexual assault prevention program at UHM was creating a responsible community. Therefore, based on the data analyses, kaiāulu (community) and kuleana (responsibility) formed the foundation for three components comprised in creating a responsible community at UHM. Those three key components were: (1) educating the community members at UHM, (2) empowering the men with positive roles at UHM, and (3) engaging the community members in collaboration at UHM.

The data analyses also revealed the second element in the design of comprehensive sexual assault prevention program at UHM, and that was honoring the culture of place. This highlights the need that a sexual assault prevention program at UHM be culturally relevant and sensitive. Lastly, transforming the systems approach called for UHM to move from isolation to collaboration, move from surviving to thriving, and move from individual commitment to community responsibility.

To do this, participants agreed that it would entail forging new and strengthening existing partnerships with all stakeholders and students at UHM, so they can play a more active role in determining the goals and components for an effective sexual assault prevention program. The majority of the student members from the focus groups stated that UHM must be willing to engage and empower students by making them more integral to policies, practices and decision-making. Such active positioning of students will help to develop a caring and compassionate community.

All participants recommended that UHM draw on the strengths afforded by our location. For example, the Native Hawaiian values of kaiāulu and kuleana should be the guiding principles in the creation of a responsible community. Thus, a positive transformation can
emerge from discussions about sexual assault prevention that occur in class to collaborative research and community events.

UHM prides itself in being welcoming and responsive to students, staff, and faculty. However, current actions to effectively address sexual assault prevention do not meet perceived needs. While there were many positive responses from the participants on specific efforts, particularly regarding the content of programs and training, data analyses reflected a need for an inclusive, comprehensive, and campus-wide sexual assault program. Additionally, there was a need to collaborate with one another in the design and implementation of a sexual assault prevention program at UHM.

We are at a crucial point in our approach to sexual assault policy and education. Significant improvements are necessary and the timing is right. *Kaiāulu* and *kuleana* appear to be valued in addressing numerous systems and procedures across campus. The interviewees involved in sexual assault prevention work, as well as the majority of the student members of the focus groups are eager to embrace new ideas. If *kaiāulu* and *kuleana* are to be meaningful, it must be clear that education and policy are intertwined and mutually reinforcing branches. They must be addressed as a totality in order to create meaningful growth and change. Elements of comprehensive campus-wide sexual assault prevention program have worked well at other institutions and provide useful lessons as we contemplate restructuring our own work. The urgency of *kaiāulu* and *kuleana* are evidenced by the voices of the participants in this study and the data that indicates the low reporting rates of our students who experience sexual assault. In order to provide state of the art responses to the persistent problem of sexual assault we must, as Fullan (2001) suggests, “disturb the future” (p. 137). The benefits to our UHM community, and in particular the students, now and as they grow and thrive with the lessons they have learned to
become agents of change in their communities, is the way to achieve our destination. My journey continues with a discussion of the findings, implications for future research, and researcher’s reflections. Journey with me to the destination: ha‘ina mai ka puana (and now the story is told).
CHAPTER SIX

HA‘INA MAI KA PUANA

And now the story is told.

Telling the Story

Just as I began my thesis honoring my kūpuna (elders) with a Native Hawaiian proverb, I now conclude my research with the wisdom of my kūpuna. Ha‘ina mai ka puana (and now the story is told) signals the final verse of a song, and the final chapter in my thesis. In Native Hawaiian tradition the conclusion of a mele (song) contains the most important parts; the words, stories, and meanings. The following saying of my Papa also reminded me that: “Whenever you and I sit in serenity, and tune into the endless knowledge of our ancestors, it is beautiful enlightenment beyond comparison.” My Papa’s proverbial words directed me, and his peaceful presence grounded me throughout the research process. Listening and reflection guided the purpose, process, and product of my research.

The purpose of this study was stated in the research title: Ho‘omana o Mānoa: Engaging and Empowering Students, Preparing the Groundwork for a Sexual Assault Prevention Program at the University of Hawai‘i Mānoa. Preparing the groundwork began with identifying current gaps in knowledge about sexual assault prevention programming on college campuses, in particular at UHM. More importantly, data analyses endeavored to bridge those gaps by recommending three components needed for an inclusive, comprehensive, and campus-wide sexual assault prevention program at UHM: (1) creating a responsible community, (2) honoring the culture of place, and (3) transforming the systems approach.

Embedded in the first component, creating a responsible community, participants narratives connected with the Native Hawaiian core values of kaiāulu and kuleana. These core
values served to remind us of our responsibilities to UHM as a community. When speaking about sexual assault prevention, participants agreed that UHM’s declaration of being a truly Hawaiian place of learning required all members of UHM to be actively involved in the following:

1. Educating community members regarding sexual assault and prevention strategies;
2. Empowering men by having them “manning up, and taking positive roles;
3. Engaging community members to work collaboratively, including encouraging opportunities for leadership roles at UHM.

When discussing honoring the culture of place, participants offered diverse standpoints. For focus group members, their perspectives were based on personal experiences, while learning and living a particular aspect of the Hawaiian culture. For interviewees, honoring the culture of place was more conceptual, and placed emphasis on adapting culturally sensitive and relevant sexual assault prevention strategies into any existing or developing programs at UHM.

The final component, which was highlighted in both the focus groups and the individual interviews, was transforming systems at UHM. There was recognition on the part of the interviewees that the system or UHM as an institution was isolated, fragmented, and lacked a genuine sense of collaboration. Additionally, data revealed that most of the departments at UHM that work in the area of sexual assault prevention were merely surviving and not thriving. And lastly, to transform the systems at UHM, focus group members and interviewees advocated for development going beyond being merely a collection of committed individuals to becoming a caring, compassionate, and committed community.

As I stated in Chapter 1, the prevalence rate for sexual assault of college women has stayed around 13% from 1982 to 2007 (Krebs et al., 2007), despite the efforts colleges have made to create effective sexual assault prevention programs (Lonsway, 1996). As I learned from
the interviewees, UHM is populated with knowledgeable faculty and staff in multiple disciplines who care about college students and their college community. In addition, interviewees shared information about their personal and departmental resources offered at UHM regarding sexual assault prevention. Finally, student focus group members acknowledged that they were at a developmental stage in their lives where they wanted to have an impact on the world around them, and live as agents for change.

So then, despite the interviewees’ assessment of their departmental resources, and the willingness of the students to participate in sexual assault prevention: why haven’t we utilized our resources to engage the students, challenging them to be empowered agents for change in sexual assault prevention at UHM? Perhaps, we first must ask the question: How do we prepare the groundwork for engaging and empowering the students in sexual assault prevention programming at UHM?

To answer that question: we can begin by surrounding students with our community of place; we give them meaningful experiences that highlight their ability to be responsible, intelligent, and compassionate. We watch for their gifts, and we value their voices. We laugh more, look at the stars more, and journey together. We help each other, we listen more, we trust in one another. We discover our ‘ike (ways of knowing) and na‘au (ways of learning and acting) reflected in both process and product of our efforts. That is the groundwork and our kumupa‘a (foundation) for a sexual assault prevention program at UHM that engages and empowers the students to strive and thrive as agents for change. So, let the story be told: I have returned to the ocean and to the endless knowledge of our ancestors. I have only begun a journey of discovery and enlightenment that is beyond comparison. We have what we need, and we are who we need. Based on the findings of my research, the following is a discussion on how best to utilize our
valuable resources in sexual assault prevention, the students, faculty, and administrators, all members of the UHM community.

**Preparing the Groundwork**

All the voices of the study participants strongly advocated for community collaboration between students, faculty, and administrators in the design and implementation of a sexual assault prevention program at UHM. Participants defined community collaboration as: “mirroring the values of a conscientious and caring community.” Participants also recognized that some gaps in preparing the groundwork for a sexual assault prevention program at UHM were: (1) the lack of effective education for all members of the UHM community regarding sexual assault and prevention strategies; (2) the need to create positive roles for male members at UHM to empower them to “man up” and (3) including actively support opportunities for collaboration, cooperation, and leadership roles at UHM. The study participants had a genuine desire to link activities that were normally separate and disconnected so as create positive synergy, with the result in activities that are more effective in combination than alone.

For UHM to grow as a responsible community, we must begin to view the target population as the whole community and emphasize the construction of meaningful connections with colleagues. The findings supported community collaboration at UHM, which foster awareness of what others are doing, develop a common sexual assault prevention framework, and provide information and messages that are mutually reinforcing, integrated and synergistic. Within the sexual assault prevention movement, collaboration and comprehensiveness has been encouraged through the development of responsible, coordinated community responses to men’s violence and its prevention (Pence, 1999).
Insights from the Literature

To respond to sexual assault prevention, Sanday’s (1996) research called for more investigation into the characteristics of sexual assault-prone and sexual assault-free college campus communities and highlighted the development of coordinated community responses to sexual assault. According to Sanday (1996) sexual assault-free campuses are characterized by a broad sense of community connection and responsibility. Sanday (1996) stated, “On this campus, everyone – administrators, faculty, and students – is on a first name basis, which makes the atmosphere more egalitarian than most campuses. Decision making is by consensus, and interpersonal interaction is guided by an ethic of respect for the individual. Those who are disrespectful of others are ostracized as campus life is motivated by a strong sense of community and the common good (p. 203).” This again fits well with participants’ views of community collaboration that highlighted moving from individual commitment to community commitment in sexual assault prevention.

Koss and Harvey (1991) also described how the sexual assault movement has developed prevention programs with a responsible community approach. They described programs that take either a “community education” or “rape [sexual assault] avoidance” approach (p. 114).” Community education focuses on such things as diminishing the acceptance of sexual assault myths by community members while sexual assault avoidance focuses on teaching skills to at-risk groups (primarily women) so that they can protect themselves from becoming victims. Koss and Harvey (1991) also categorize the specific strategies used including forms of “citizen inoculation” that work with individuals to change views about sexual assault and increase knowledge, and “environmental action” that works to change power structures for women and increase community resources for survivors (pp. 260-61). In addition, studies conducted by
Schwartz and DeKeseredy (1997) and DeKeseredy, Schwartz, and Alvi (2000), also address “citizen inoculation” and “environmental action” (Koss & Harvey, 1991, p. 261). They describe how pro-feminist men can act responsibly, and become involved in changing norms for other men around sexual assault on college campuses.

So, despite the fact that some examples highlight the fact that important sexual assault prevention efforts informed by a community perspective have begun, the broader literature on sexual assault prevention reviewed suggests that work and innovation in this area must be ongoing. For example, studies continue to show that negative stereotypes about sexual assault victims continue along with endorsement of sexual assault myths (Payne, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999). The prevalence and persistence of such beliefs suggests the need for more community members to play a role in making change. Future developments must focus on efforts to have all community members take responsibility in ending sexual assault on campus. Again, using the specific case of college communities, Potter, Stapleton and Moynihan (2008) state, “The mere existence of such [sexual assault prevention] programs is not enough, however. The intent of the programs and their content must be conveyed to all members of the university community in a clear and consistent manner…to further spread the campus community expectation that such behavior is not acceptable (p. 39)”. Therefore, characteristics of a responsible community include environments where individuals have an impact on one another and share a strong sense of community including, “the perception of similarity to others, an acknowledged interdependence with others, a willingness to maintain this interdependence by giving to or doing for others what one expects from them (Dalton, Elias & Wandersman, 2001, p. 193).”

In addition, a review of the literature suggested that sexual assault prevention programs for college students tend to be more effective when they have a number of characteristics. These
characteristics include being longer in duration of months, presented by professionals, content addressing risk reduction, gender-role socialization, and discussion of myths and facts about sexual assault. Moreover, there is support for the idea that both mixed- and single-sex programming are effective in preventing sexual assault (Anderson & Whiston, 2005; Burgess, 2007; Hayes-Smith & Hayes-Smith, 2009; Karjane, Fisher, & Cullen, 2005). As a result, advocates and practitioners at UHM may wish to consider both single- and mixed-sex groups, depending upon the goals and topics of the program. Therefore, extended educational programming that provides longer exposure to material addressing multiple content areas may be a more effective way to educate all the students about sexual assault.

Another critical characteristic of successful sexual assault prevention is recognition that both men and women are involved. Encouraging the commitment of men to serve as positive role models for other men to be intolerant of sexual assault is as fundamental to prevention of sexual assault as are programs that provide continuous opportunities that empower women to develop self-respect, self-esteem, and assertiveness. Further, student groups that research has identified as high-risk for actions of sexual assault and populations at-risk for victimization should be addressed with specific outreach efforts. To address sexual assault prevention and intervention in the college community in a truly comprehensive manner; strategies to prevent its initial perpetration and victimization must reach the same level of efficacy and adoption as programs that respond to its consequences.

**Insights from Quantitative Data: ‘Ike**

Surveys of sexual assault at UHM note race and ethnic disparities in experiences of sexual assault and likelihood of reporting it. The student body at UHM is a complex and diverse mix of race and ethnic groups, thus one would think that race and ethnicity would naturally come
up as themes in who experiences, how to prevent sexual assault among interviewees and even focus group members. However, the story about sex assault prevention in participants’ narratives, however, did not emerge along parallel lines with the story about race and ethnicity in the quantitative data.

In the quantitative data, research in Hawai‘i has found that women of Asian ancestry to be significantly less apt to report a sexual assault (Ruch, Coyne, and Perrone, 2000). Ruch et al. (2000) found that reporting rates of sexual assault for Caucasian, Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian, Filipina and women of “Other” ethnicities were between 71% and 76% compared to 56% for women of Asian ancestry (Ruch et al., 2000). Addition data from FBI estimated that nationally approximately one in 10 sexual assaults are reported to the police; however, in Hawai‘i, the number is about one in 16 (Ruch et al., 2000). UHM statistics indicate that five cases of forcible sexual offenses were reported in 2001, seven in 2002 and seven in 2003 (Campus Security Crime Statistics Report, 2002-2004), approximately one in 16. Although under reporting of sexual assaults is well recognized, the gap between reported and actual prevalence at UHM may possibly be higher than many other college campuses on the continent since 17.1% are Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and over 49% of the student body are of Asian ancestry (UH Institutional Research Office, 2010).

In contrast, focus groups students’ narratives about culture of place pointed to the idea that Hawai‘i is a place offering key values that, if embraced throughout UHM, have the potential for sexual assault prevention. The focus groups contained students from diverse cultures; and identified with a variety races and ethnicities. In fact, all focus group members discussed talked the richness of diversity at UHM, and voiced their appreciation for the host culture. Students’ appreciation for diversity of UHM and students’ respect for the host culture of Hawai‘i came to
the forefront in different ways. As stated previously, many members of the focus groups were student-athletes. Participants reflected the diversity at UHM, and were composed of a variety of races and ethnicities. However, as a member of the student-athlete culture, and to succeed at UHM in their sport, and academically, they must work collaboratively as a team. Teamwork is a vital component of the student-athlete population, and the issues of race and ethnicity are put aside for the betterment of their team community. This researcher posits that this might be an explanation why race and ethnicity regarding sexual assault was not discussed during focus group talking story sessions.

Interviewees also did not focus on UHM and its racial and ethnic diversity or the race and ethnic disparities in sexual violence victimization and reporting. Instead, interviewees employed a language of “culturally-based” or “culturally-sensitive” sexual assault prevention programming. To interviewees the culture of place was not focused on the host culture of UHM nor did interviewees mention that the University was embedded in a particular political-history within Hawai‘i and the traditions of the indigenous culture. Instead, interviewees felt that UHM was the “cultural place” that needed to be acknowledged and honored. UHM as a place, in interviewees’ eyes, is a diverse institution with a collection of local, mainland, and international students whose experiences should be collectively included in a sexual assault prevention program.

Thus, this study calls attention to the need for future research at UHM that addresses racial and ethnic diversity or the race and ethnic disparities in sexual assault victimization and reporting.

*Insights from Focus Groups and Interviews*

Additionally, and very important to the success and effectiveness of a sexual assault prevention program will be to identify the unique resources that exist, the ways in which students
themselves discuss their desire to be involved in sexual assault prevention. Noteworthy to the study, were the gaps in the needs and services for sexual assault prevention programming at UHM by the study participants. Ultimately, the goal for all the participants’ regarding sexual assault prevention was the creation of a living and learning environment free of sexual violence. Interviewees described their vision as requiring a cultural shift that moves beyond the mere prevention of sexual assault towards a community that responsibly adopts healthy and caring sexual attitudes and practices. Focus group participants advocated for the opportunity to play key roles, in cooperation with faculty, staff, and administrators, in the creation of a campus culture that reflects and promotes respect, equality, civility, healthy relationships, and healthy sexuality. The study participants revealed that efforts to prevent sexual assault should be multifaceted and include but not be limited to such strategies as: classroom discussions, health promotion programs, media campaigns, peer education, and discussions during student health and counseling services visits. Both focus group members and interviewees expressed urgency in introducing educational messages about healthy sexuality and sexual assault prevention into the curriculum at all levels. Faculty in sociology, women’s studies, Hawaiian studies, biology, health sciences, religious studies, psychology, and other areas can be mobilized to share research and establish critical thinking skills to assist students in making healthy decisions that will aid in the prevention and intervention of sexual assault on campus.

So, in preparing the groundwork for sexual assault prevention program at UHM, we must focus on accomplishment and achievement, we must be tolerant of each other’s differences, and we must learn to share our stories from all of our different standpoints. When we do, we will discover that we all have inside of us ‘ike (ways of knowing), na‘au (ways of learning and acting), and mana (spiritual power), that can guide us to help engage the students’ and our own
passion for learning and living in a community free from sexual assault. This is hard work. There are no shortcuts. But, by engaging in this work, we will enhance our students’ connections to themselves, their families, their communities, and their world. We must learn that talking story with each other in ways that tap into that part of us, that energy and excitement that looks for the best in us and each other, and then build our community from that wisdom, will in fact be, preparing the groundwork for a successful sexual assault prevention program at UHM.

**Reflecting on Research**

Native Hawaiians continue to research and recite our genealogies. We sing *mele* (songs) and dance *hula*. We talk story. Some of us compose new *moʻolelo* (stories), *oli* (chant), and *mele*, and choreograph new *hula*. And we still do all these things with thought and meaning. Identity is central to the concept of value in Native Hawaiian communities (Porima, 2005). Maaka (2004) described the essential connectedness of individuals to their land, their family and ancestors, and their language. Identity is built on perspectives that value proper relationships with spiritual power inherent in every location, ancestral lineage, living family members, and obligations to the collective good of the community (Kawakami, 1999; Kawakami & Aton, 1999; Meyer, 1998, 2003; Osorio, 2004). Value is viewed in terms of practical and respectful impact on the lives of the people and communities involved (Mead, 2003). Value is situated with specific communities and people in a specific time and place and will endure in these communities; long after the completion of the final chapter in this master’s thesis.

Therefore to tap into data that breaks through and below the surface of rigor as defined by Western epistemology, this research study utilized Native Hawaiian values and concepts of ‘ike (ways of knowing) and *naʻau* (ways of learning and ways of action) by means of quantitative and qualitative analyses. This researcher encouraged participants to engage in the Native Hawaiian
methodology of talking-story. By tapping into the participants’ standpoints, their narratives revealed to this researcher the value of considering new and expansive paradigms when addressing the design and implementation of a sexual assault prevention program at UHM.

Researcher reflection required that I responsibly and accurately express and analyze the participants’ visions for a sexual assault prevention program at UHM. These visions included: promoting a sense of belonging and connection to one’s peers and community, modeling the values of responsibility and leadership, engaging all members of the community to participate in education, skill development, and intervention, and incorporating sexual assault prevention into every layer of the curriculum at UHM.

As a researcher and as a woman with multiple locations (Native Hawaiian scholar, feminist, UHM member, researcher), I have gathered many types of knowledge along my journey. Based on my many locations I have come to a particular stance regarding what is needed in terms of sexual assault prevention at UHM. In the following, I articulate my vision, keeping in mind that it is grounded in my study and in multiple ways of that that I have employed. These include: (1) more support from administration, both in policy and practice, which includes more funding, (2) expanded awareness efforts, (3) more services for LGBTI and international students, and (4) a statewide coordinator to monitor and coordinate sexual assault prevention efforts on campus.

First, as noted by the interviewees’ there is serious need for more support from the administration, both in policy and practice and in funding to address sexual assault prevention efforts on campus. A few of the interviewees also linked their being in “survival mode” to the national economic downturn that has defined the past few years. Declining state revenues to support sexual assault education are a recurring concern to interviewees, with impacts related to
finding new ways of raising revenues and budgeting as well as potentially limiting new initiatives. Interviewees viewed the changed economy as both a threat to Mānoa’s future; but also an opportunity to review our systems and potential.

In regards to funding, since the early 1990s, U.S. Department of Justice, Violence Against Women’s Office has provided funding to assist colleges and universities in developing sexual assault prevention efforts (Bopp, 2005). In October 2001 and October 2003 the UHM Gender Equity Office and Women’s Center was awarded two-year Campus Violence Prevention grants from the U.S. Department of Justice, to fund a project known as the Program Against Violence to Women (PAVW). In October 2006 PAVW was awarded a third grant by the U.S. Department of Justice Violence Against for an additional two years until October 2008 for $199,999 (Bopp, 2005). The re-awarding of the PAVW grant provided much needed additional funding for education and training at UHM about sexual assault. However, this funding is limited and awarded on a competitive basis; therefore, expanded funding should be provided by state and local governments to support sexual assault prevention programming efforts at UHM.

Second, efforts to increase awareness about sexual assault at UHM must be expanded. Studies have shown that students, especially females, pay attention to programs on sexual assault provided by the school (Janosik, 2001). Examples of this are workshops on sexual assault awareness (Briskin & Gary, 1986) as opposed to more mundane forms of education on the subject, like reviewing handbooks or statistics. Moreover, a few researchers have suggested that the social marketing approach, using posters and other forms of information media, is effective in providing information on sexual assault prevention and services (Konradi & DeBruin, 2003). The messages on the poster ads in one study undermined sexual assault myths, emphasized the fault of the offenders, and encouraged decision-making in the aftermath of the assault (Konradi
& DeBruin, 2003). These strategies effectively provided information for students that increased their awareness of sexual assault prevention and services. A project that some campuses participate in, “The Clothesline Project,” features a rather unique way for students to spread messages about sexual assault and prevention: this project provides students with t-shirts to paint brief messages about sexual assault for later display on campus (Payne & Fogerty, 2007).

At this time, UHM does not participate in this project. Research conducted with focus groups was completed in 2009 after the National Sexual Assault Awareness Month in April. The focus group student members will be pleased to know that in April of 2011, the PAU Violence Program and the Women’s Center at UHM sponsored a project to raise awareness on campus regarding sexual assault. On April 5th through the 6th, a total of 2,820 teal colored flags were placed around Varney Circle to represent, or to paint a face to the statistic: one in four. (PAU Violence UHM Women’s Center, Manoa Campus, 2011). The sponsor of the event, PAU Violence Program explained that the 2,820 teal colored flags represented the number of female students at UHM that would report surviving a sexual assault or an attempted sexual assault. UHM currently has 11,200 female students enrolled, and the shocking statistic, one in four, revealed that 2,820 of these students will be or have been sexually assaulted. Additionally, the PAU Violence Program and the Women’s Center set up an information table on the Queen Lili‘uokalani Center for Student Services lanai on both days. Staff and volunteers provided information that explained the purpose of the flags and information about sexual assault, which included resources for getting help both on and off campus. Many of the volunteers were current students at UHM (PAU Violence, UHM Women’s Center, Manoa Campus, 2011). So, whatever medium is chosen, the information on prevention and availability of services should be more
prominent, and policies and protocols at UHM should be distributed across the university-wide information systems (Mikhailovich & Colbrana, 1999).

Along a related line, more recently, there has been evidence of increased efforts to target the attitudes of the male student population to redefine sexual assault as a shared concern of both women and men (Armstrong, Hamilton, & Sweeney, 2006; Fabiano, Perkins, Berkowitz, Linkenbach, & Stark, 2003; Kilmartin, 2001). Different universities have targeted male students at large, and specific male student populations, like athletes (Katz, 2005) and fraternities (Foubert, 2000; Foubert et al., 2006) using programs that educate males on the risks and consequences associated with sexual assault and that encourage empathy toward victims among the men on campus. Examples of the programs include “Men against Violence” (Fabiano et al., 2003), “Man-to-Man”, and “Men-of-Strength” (Foubert et al., 2006) suggest that to raise awareness of sexual assault among males, programs must consider the culture of the men they seek to educate. Overall, these efforts aim to alter the attitudes of students that traditionally supported sexual assault myths and victim blaming (Foubert et al., 2006).

I also, as a researcher, want to highlight additional needs that are not being met. The need exists to better serve international and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Intersex (LGBTI) students through sexual assault prevention and intervention efforts. Research has shown that campus advocates identified additional problems with their prevention and intervention efforts at colleges. For example, one study noted that universities must investigate international students’ needs for sexual assault services more fully (Mikhailovich & Colbrana, 1999). It is likely that international students come to us with differing cultural views concerning violence against women and systems of redress. Being in a new culture may also increase the risk of victimization for international students.
In addition, as a responsible community, we need to strive to maintain a safe and inclusive campus environment for all students regardless of their gender identity or sexual orientation. To that end, we need to address issues regarding sexual assault that are unique to the LGBTI community. Just to name a few: fear of prejudice and victim-blaming because of societal homophobia and bias, fear of being forced to reveal their sexual orientation, fear of betraying the LGBTI community if the perpetrator is also LGBTI, and fear of having the experience minimized or sensationalized (Waldner-Haugrud & Vaden Gratch, 1997; Sloan, & Edmond, 1996; Renzetti, 2001).

Finally, the need for statewide coordinators to oversee sexual assault prevention efforts on college campuses exists. As it is, participants’ voiced concerns that sexual assault prevention efforts are localized on campus; with advocates being forced to compete with one another (Payne, 2008) for funding and resources. Moreover, through a statewide coordinated effort, advocates can be aware of “best practices” at other campuses. Perhaps most importantly, such a position would send a message to students, university professionals, and the community that sexual assault prevention will be taken seriously at UHM.

**Looking Towards the Future**

This study introduces new and expansive questions to consider. It would be beneficial and relevant to examine how the characteristics of race, ethnicity, and class influence existing and any future sexual assault prevention programming at UHM. Similarly, researchers may want to explore more fully the effectiveness of culturally sensitive and relevant sexual assault prevention strategies. Future studies must compare cultural groups to determine for whom the program is effective and for whom it is not effective. Finally, research must provide answers to
the question of how our campus can address the specific needs of international students and LGBTI in sexual assault prevention at UHM.

In looking towards the future in sexual assault prevention at UHM, we need examine what Hall (2004) concluded: that our society has embraced risk management as a panacea in many facets of life, which includes sexual assault prevention on most college campuses. She found that risk avoidance education for women simply reinforces fear of sexual assault while not addressing the root cause: male behavior. Some study participants agreed with Hall’s findings, and feel that UHM is focused on risk avoidance and has lost sight of the advantages of prevention education. This argument is a reflection of the sophistication of some participants’ knowledge and echoes a national discussion about what type of education is most valuable to reduce sexual assaults on college campuses.

Therefore, an expanded sexual assault prevention program requirement would necessitate a thorough review of the content of existing programs. If we are to address the argument posited by both the literature and the study participants, we need to determine what works, what is promising, what is unknown, and what doesn’t work in sexual assault prevention.

However, the question of what programs work best to reduce sexual assault is difficult to answer. Trustworthy data on the effects of such programs is almost nonexistent. For the most part, programs are evaluated by those who produce them, hardly a disinterested source (Fogg, 2009). Even given those cautions, the reports are not encouraging. At best programs may produce some reduction of sexual assaults, or, more often, of the likelihood to commit a sexual assault, but only for a limited amount of time (Fogg, 2009). If UHM is committed to creating a responsible community and to positive change, careful research into best practices must precede before we can grow and thrive in the area of sexual assault prevention.
I am reminded that looking towards the future requires change. Change is inevitable, but whether it happens to an institution or is driven by it is an important distinction. Denhardt and Denhardt (2003) provides useful context for developing successful change strategies. Though Denhardt’s (2003) work focuses on a model for government procurement processes, it offers some valuable insights for change in a variety of institutions, including college campuses. In Denhardt’s (2003) study communication between parties was found to be essential so that “solutions were developed in partnership” (p. 61). They also found that working in close physical proximity helped to create successful change. Characteristics of the procurement model that appear to respond to important concerns offered by participants in this study included kaiāulu and kuleana. Denhardt’s (2003) model aligns with the Native Hawaiian values of community responsibility and preparing the groundwork for a sexual assault prevention program at UHM.

Preparing the groundwork for a successful outcome is essential so that time and resources are utilized to their best effect. Eckel and Kezar (2003) conducted a study to ascertain how institutional culture affects methods to create change in higher education institutions. Building on earlier work by Curry (1991) that proposed that change occurs in institutions where it is valued, the authors found that there is a relationship between campus culture and change strategies. They suggest that each campus examine its culture in depth to permit a more successful change process. They used Bergquist’s (1992) typology of four campus cultures as a starting point for matching strategies to institutions. Bergquist (1992) described collegial, managerial, developmental and negotiating cultures. Each category represents different institutional values that facilitate or hinder various approaches to change. It is not clear what category best describes UHM’s institutional culture but I recommend that a straightforward study be conducted to find out. Kotter (2002) emphasizes the role of urgency in creating motivation for
change, and Cantalupo’s (2009) claim that sexual assaults may presage campus shootings certainly adds urgency to this proposed research study.

The urgency of such a future study also highlights the research findings which placed value in a bystander focus for sexual assault prevention and interventions that go beyond the individual level discussed by previous researchers (Berkowitz, 2002), or a focus only on men (Foubert, 2000; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 2000) to models of community levels of change. The literature review on theories of both community readiness to change, and competent communities and social action (Dalton, Elias, & Wandersman, 2001) and studies of helping and bystander intervention behavior (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 2000; Banyard, et. al., 2007) aid in the proposal of a theoretical model for sexual assault prevention programming at UHM. The conceptual model focuses on increasing community members’ receptivity to prevention messages and training; helping all community members become more sensitive to issues of sexual assault and teaching them skills to intervene with the intent to prevent sexual assaults from occurring; and support survivors who may report a sexual assault. Thus, unlike many other programs, this approach does not rely on identifying men as potential perpetrators or focus on women as victims, messages which may promote defensiveness. It is believed that such an approach may reduce both men and women’s resistance to sexual assault prevention messages and enhances efforts to change broader group and community norms around sexual assault. It adds to previous discussions of sexual assault prevention a message that is broad and has applicability to all community members, a message that has the potential to create a responsible community and positive social change at UHM.

Change is in the air, and the preparation of the groundwork for successful sexual assault prevention requires that we engage and empower the students to share as agents of change. The
creation of a living and learning community free of sexual assault is the ultimate goal. This vision requires a cultural shift that moves beyond the mere prevention of sexual assault towards a community that adopts healthy and caring sexual attitudes and practices. Faculty, staff, administrators, and students must play key roles in the creation of a campus community culture that reflects and promotes respect, equality, civility, healthy relationships, and healthy sexuality.

So then, let us all journey together in preparing the groundwork for a caring and committed community. This researcher firmly believes that as educators, we have the opportunity to engage and empower the students to work actively on the design and implementation of an inclusive, comprehensive, and campus-wide sexual assault prevention program for the University of Hawai‘i Mānoa, entitled: Ho‘omana o Mānoa: Engaging and Empowering Students, Sexual Assault Prevention Program for the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa.

And so this thesis ends, as a new chapter begins. I hope that I have fulfilled the responsibility of the research. I hope that I have honored my kūpuna (elders), and the voices of all those who passionately participated in this study. I continue striving for excellence of my kūpuna; always aware of what else to do, how else to help, and how best to learn. I close now with my Papa’s words, closing words that I shared with all participants at the conclusion of our talking story sessions:

ʻĀmama, ua noa.

And now it is released, and now the prayer is said.
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APPENDIX A

Focus Group Questions

1. Do you feel that UHM is doing enough to educate students about the harmful consequences of sexual assault on campus?

2. How is violence against women defined and perceived by members of the student community at this university? In what situations within the student culture are abusive behaviors towards women perceived as acceptable? In what situations are they tolerated?

3. How aware do you think male students are about the issue of sexual assault at your school? What solutions to ending violence against women do students offer?

4. How would you design an effective sexual assault prevention program at UHM?

5. Is there anything else you’d like to tell me about your experiences or your opinions about sexual assault and gender violence education and programming?
APPENDIX B

Consent Form

Agreement to Participate in an Interview

*Ho‘omana o Mānoa: Engaging and Empowering our Students*
Sexual Assault Prevention Program for the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa

Penny-Bee Kapilialoha Bovard, Principal Investigator
Department of Sociology, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96822

You are invited to participate in a research study. This research project is being conducted as a component for a graduate qualitative research methods class, as well as a component of a master’s thesis. The purpose of this research is to engage and empower our students to work actively on the design and implementation of an institutionalized sexual assault prevention program for the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, titled: *Ho‘omana o Mānoa: Engaging and Empowering our Students*, Sexual Assault Prevention Program for the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa.

**INFORMATION**

This study will be conducted by Penny-Bee Kapilialoha Bovard, a graduate student in the Department of Sociology at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. The methods of data collection for this study will be interviews. The interviews will be informal and conversational and will focus on your experiences and knowledge regarding the issues of sexual assault and prevention on college campuses, and in particular, the University of Hawai‘i. With your permission, the interviews will be audio taped by the researcher. A transcript of these tapes will be made and used for data analysis.

The sessions will be audio-taped, and the audio-tapes transcribed to ensure accurate reporting of the information that you provide. No one’s name will be asked or revealed during the interviews. The audio-tapes will be stored in locked files before and after being transcribed. All tapes will be destroyed after the study and research is completed. You may choose not to be taped.

A transcript of these tapes will be made and used for data analysis. In all cases, personal data will be removed, and an identifying code will be used in its place. The researcher is anticipating using a total of 5 participants with each interview lasting approximately 1 and ½ hours in length. Participants must be at least 18 years old to participate.

**RISKS**

The researcher anticipates minimal risks associated with this project. Your participation in this evaluation is completely voluntary and you may withdraw your consent to participate at any time during the process. If you choose to do so, any information derived from your participation will be deleted from the evaluations findings.
Agreement to Participate in an Interview
Ho‘omana o Mānoa: Engaging and Empowering our Students
Sexual Assault Prevention Program for the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa

BENEFITS

A potential benefit of participating in this research is the opportunity to contribute in the discussions regarding the design and implementation of a sexual assault prevention program at the University of Hawai‘i.

CONFIDENTIALITY

The transcribed data, CDs and disks, identifying code, and signed informed consent forms will be kept in a locked, secured area. The researcher will have sole access to these areas. Once the study and research is completed, the key to the identifying code will be destroyed by the researcher. All findings used in any written reports or publications which result from this evaluation project will be reported in aggregate form with no identifying information. It is, however useful to use direct quotes to more clearly capture the meanings in reporting the findings from this form of evaluation. You will be asked at the end of the interview if there is anything you said which you do not want included as a quote. If the results of the study are published or presented, representative quotes may be used to validate the findings. In this case all identifying cues will be removed, and different initials will be used to protect your identity. Your participation in this evaluation will be strictly confidential and voluntary.

I have read the information provided above. I have asked all the questions I have at this time. I voluntarily agree to participate in this research study.

Printed Name of Participant

Signature of Participant       Date

Please contact Principal Investigator Penny-Bee Kapilialoha Bovard at (808)392-7955 if you have any questions regarding this research project.

If you cannot obtain satisfactory answers to your questions, or have comments or complaints about your treatment in this study, please contact: Committee on Human Studies, University of Hawai‘i, Biomed Building, Room B-104, Honolulu, HI 96822. Telephone: (808)956-5007. E-mail: uhirb@hawaii.edu.
APPENDIX C

Interview Questions

1. How is your department working to promote the prevention of sexual assault? What types of programming, and how successful?

2. How can we engage and empower our students to become agents for change regarding sexual assault prevention at UHM?

3. How can we create a sense of community responsibility, both on and of campus to design and develop an effective sexual assault prevention program for UHM?

4. Is there anything else you’d like to tell me about your experiences or your opinions about sexual assault and gender violence education and programming?