

Running head: COMPARISON OF TWO CONDOM USE COURSES

Toward Errorless Condom Use: A Comparison of
Two Courses to Improve Students' Condom Use Skills

Dana F. Lindemann¹, Thomas A. Brigham¹, Colin R. Harbke¹, and Teresa Alexander¹

Send correspondence to:

Thomas A. Brigham

Department of Psychology

Washington State University

Pullman, WA 99164-4820

e-mail: brigham@mail.wsu.edu

phone: (509) 335-4634

fax: (509) 335-5043

¹ Department of Psychology, Washington State University, Pullman, WA

Running head: COMPARISON OF TWO CONDOM USE COURSES

Toward Errorless Condom Use: A Comparison of
Two Interventions to Improve Students' Condom Use Skills

ABSTRACT

Traditionally, researchers have focused HIV/AIDS prevention efforts on increasing condom use, yet few researchers have assessed condom use skills. Because incorrect condom use may lead to condom failure, promoting condom use without ensuring participants have the skills necessary for correct condom use may lead to increased risk of exposure. This study compared the effects of two condom use courses on condom use skills. These courses were administered as part of a HIV/AIDS educational program for college students. Participants in the treatment groups ($n = 179$) attended either a limited, 1-Session, or extended, 3-Session, condom use course, and an additional 108 participants served as a Control Group. Condom use skills increased among participants in both treatment groups; however, the greatest improvement was among participants in the 3-Session Group. This finding supports use of the extended, 3-Session course as a more effective means for improving condom use skills.

KEYWORDS: MOCUS, Condom Use Skills, Condom Use Failures, HIV/AIDS Interventions

INTRODUCTION

Correct and consistent condom use is the only effective method of protection against HIV/AIDS among those sexually active, and thus a common goal of intervention programs has been to promote consistent condom use (Langer et al., 1994). Although many researchers have successfully increased reported condom use following interventions, few have assessed condom use skills. For example, a recent synthesis of studies with adolescents showed that among the 56 interventions reviewed, only three (5%) included an assessment of condom use skills (Johnson et al., 2003).

It is important to emphasize both consistent and correct condom use skills (Boldsen et al., 1992; Farris et al., 2003; Langer et al., 1994). Condoms only prevent HIV transmission when used effectively (Civic et al., 2002). By not ensuring that participants have the skills necessary to use condoms correctly, programs may inadvertently increase incorrect and ineffective condom use. Incorrect condom use may lead to condom failures (i.e., breakage, slippage, or leakage) that increase risk of exposure (Crosby, 1998; Fishbein and Pequegnat, 2000). It has been demonstrated that condom users may not be aware of a failure until after ejaculation (Quirk et al., 1998). In addition, experience with condom failures may increase negative attitudes toward condoms (Kelly, 1995) and reduce the likelihood of future condom use (Norris and Ford, 1994; Richters et al., 1993). For example, Norris and Ford found that both negative experiences with condoms and negative attitudes toward condoms relate to decreased willingness to use condoms in the future and condom use during the last occasion of sexual intercourse.

Among studies where condom use failures were measured, 1 to 13% of condom uses failed (Messiah et al., 1997; Richters et al., 1995; Spruyt et al., 1998; Trussell et al., 1992; Warner et al., 1998), and 19 to 61% of participants reported having experienced a failure (Albert

et al., 1991; Civic et al., 2002; Norris and Ford, 1994; Sanders et al., 2003). Although there is little research on the causes of condom use failures, Trussell et al. found that condom brand is not a predictor of failure. However, personal ability to use a condom correctly may be a consideration when weighing the costs and benefits of condom use (Catania et al., 1989) and user error may contribute to condom failures (Kelly, 1995). Therefore, it is possible that condom use failures result from user error and may be reduced by improving condom use skills.

There are two widely used methods for instructing consumers on correct condom use: written instructions on condom packaging and direct instruction as part of HIV/AIDS interventions. Condom use instructions provided on condom packaging are subject to space restrictions and typically include a few vaguely described steps accompanied by some illustrations. On the other hand, condom instructions provided as part of HIV/AIDS interventions are more complete. Frequently, researchers provide basic information about condoms, demonstrate how to correctly use condoms, and have participants practice correct condom use (see Belcher et al., 1998; Gibson and Lovelle-Drache, 1991; Kelly, 1995; Malow et al., 1994; Sorensen, et al., 1991; St. Lawrence et al., 1999).

Many researchers who have evaluated HIV/AIDS interventions that incorporated condom use instruction reported success (Belcher et al., 1998; Eldridge et al., 1997). Often in these evaluations the researchers compared interventions based on different approaches; such as information only versus behavioral skills training (BST) interventions. Overall, this research has consistently demonstrated that BST produces more positive benefits than information only programs (Belcher et al.; Eldridge et al.). Given the goal of such training is to produce errorless condom use, research is needed to determine how much and what type of BST is required to achieve that goal. Therefore, the next step in developing the most effective condom use course

is to evaluate the effects of differing BST interventions on condom use skills.

A second issue in this development process is that condom use self-efficacy has been the most widely used indicator of condom use skills. Although these self-report measures are easily administered, there is only a weak relationship between self-efficacy and actual skill level (Langer et al., 1994). As a result, use of a direct observation scale to assess actual condom use skills has been recommended (Farris et al., 2003; Lindemann and Brigham, 2003). There are several condom use skills tests available (see Farris et al.; Kamb et al., 1998; Langer et al.; Lindemann and Brigham; Sorensen et al., 1991; St. Lawrence et al., 1999). Of these tests, the Measure of Observed Condom Use Skills (MOCUS, Lindemann and Brigham) was used in the present study because it is the only test that: (a) includes both application and removal steps, (b) includes only those steps to condom usage necessary for preventing breakage, leakage, and slippage, (c) limits each item to a single, directly observable behavior, (d) includes only universally recommended steps for correct use, and (e) has demonstrated reliability.

The purpose of this research was to evaluate the effects of two different condom use behavioral skills training courses on condom use skill level, using MOCUS performance as the outcome measure. The courses varied in time (1-session versus 3-session) and content (limited versus extensive demonstrations and practice). Both conditions were administered as part of a 16-week HIV/AIDS educational program for college students. It was hypothesized that participants in both treatment groups would show an increase in condom use skills; however, it was expected that those receiving the extensive, 3-session course would show the greatest improvement and demonstrate more errorless performance on the MOCUS.

METHOD

Participants

Participants were 287 undergraduates recruited from Introductory Psychology classes, residence halls, and Greek housing. Participants were 161 females and 120 males (2% unknown) who ranged from 18 to 56 years old ($M = 19.85$, $SD = 3.47$). Participants were primarily white (80%) and in their freshmen or sophomore year (71%). Eighty-three percent of participants reported ever having sex, and 89% of those reported prior condom use.

Participants in the treatment groups ($n = 179$) were students enrolled in Psychology 106 (Psychology Applied to Daily Living: Dealing with Alcohol, Friends, and Sex), an elective course offered through the Department of Psychology. The Psychology 106 students were randomly assigned to one of two treatment groups (1-Session or 3-Session Group). Control subjects ($n = 108$) were recruited from the Human Subjects Pool, which is primarily composed of Introductory Psychology students. Previous research comparing these two populations pre-intervention found no significant differences in the self-reported frequency of sexual intercourse (vaginal, oral, or anal) and the use of condoms (Peeler and Brigham, 2001). As a consequence, in terms of sexual behavior and attitudes, Psychology 106 students and students from the introductory psychology subject pool appear to be equivalent groups. The Department of Psychology and the University Institutional Review Board approved use of human subjects for this research.

Measures and Materials

The MOCUS (Lindemann and Brigham, 2003) was used to assess condom use skill level. The MOCUS consists of 7 dichotomous items (see Table I) and has demonstrated acceptable Guttman Scalability (Reproducibility = .93; Plus Percentage Ratio = .75) and high inter-observer

agreement (98%). Each item on the MOCUS is a single, directly observable behavior that may prevent condom failure (see Table I). With one exception, the MOCUS was administered according to Lindemann and Brigham. Based on the authors' recommendation, condom removal instructions were changed from "Please demonstrate how to handle the condom while pulling out" to read "Please demonstrate what to do with the condom while pulling out."

Setting: The Psychology 106 Course

Psychology 106 (Brigham, 2001; Brigham et al., 2002; Horn and Brigham, 1996) is a 16-week, 1-credit elective course offered to any university student. The enrollment for the entire course is approximately 200 students per semester, and students are divided into smaller sections (i.e., 10 to 20 students per section). Each section meets once per week for 50 minutes, and is taught by two peer instructors using a discussion, rather than lecture format. Class time includes a review of homework assignments, information presented from the unit for that week, and in-class activities. These activities include role-plays and condom comparison and application exercises. Homework assignments for each unit include a brief reading assignment and some task. Tasks include monitoring behaviors, purchasing condoms, and calling hotlines to get HIV information. Class grades are based on attendance, homework assignments, a short paper, and final exam score.

Peer instructors were chosen from a group of advanced undergraduate students who expressed interest in teaching Psychology 106 by submitting an application. Relevant experience, interview performance, schedule availability, and references were the primary criteria used to select peer instructors. Peer instructors attended an initial, 16-hour training session. During the semester, peer instructors met with their supervisors weekly to review material and prepare class for that week. Peer instructors used a manual (Donahoe, Peeler, and

Brigham, 2001) that outlined the discussion and activities for each class period.

Experimental Design and Procedure

A 2 X 3 mixed experimental design was employed, where time (i.e, pre- and post-test) was the within-subjects factor, and level of treatment (i.e., Control vs. 1-Session Course vs. 3-Session Course) was the between-subjects factor. Participants in all groups were administered the MOCUS at pre-testing (weeks 2 and 3 of Psychology 106 course) and post-testing (weeks 15 and 16 of Psychology 106 course). The average latency between pre- and post-testing was 98 days. Participants in the Control Group did not receive any condom use training, participants in the 1-Session Group received a limited, 50 minute condom use course (week 12 of Psychology 106 course), and those in the 3-Session Group received an extensive, 150 minute condom use course (three, 50 minute sessions; weeks 11, 12, and 13 of Psychology 106 course).

Participants were randomly assigned to treatment groups based on their Psychology 106 class section. For example, if a subject was enrolled in Section 3 of the course, and Section 3 was randomly assigned to the 1-Session Group, then that participant was in the 1-Session Group, as well as all other students enrolled in Section 3. There were 12 sections of the Psychology 106 course, and 6 class sections were randomly assigned to each of the two treatment groups. Peer instructors assigned to each section administered the condom use courses. Descriptions of the condom use courses are given in Table II.

At pre- and post-testing, participants were individually escorted to a private testing room, where a research associate administered the MOCUS. Participants were given a lubricated condom, wooden penile model, and the following instructions: "Please demonstrate how to apply a condom using this model." As the participant placed the condom on the model, the observer recorded if each MOCUS step for condom application was performed correctly. After the

participant placed the condom on the model, the following instructions were given:

Now I would like you to rotate the model so it is parallel to the floor, as though the penis is still inside the partner. Please demonstrate what to do with the condom as the penis is removed from the partner. Then demonstrate how to remove the condom from the penile model.

As the participant demonstrated removal, the observer again recorded if each step was completed correctly. At the completion of post-testing, participants in all groups were provided a debriefing form that included the correct steps to condom usage.

RESULTS

Of the 287 participants who were administered the MOCUS at pre-testing, 235 returned for post-testing (18% attrition overall). Attrition was similar across the Control (13%; $n = 94$ remained), 1-Session (20%; $n = 72$), and 3-Session Groups (22%; $n = 69$). Attrition was slightly greater for the treatment groups because some students withdrew from Psychology 106 between pre- and post-testing.

At pre-test, the percentage of participants who incorrectly performed each item on the MOCUS ranged from 7% to 65%, and more than half of the participants incorrectly performed Items 3, 6 and 7 (see Table I for item descriptions). Item level performance was consistent such that the proportions of participants who incorrectly performed each item were similar across groups, $\chi^2(2, N = 287)$ values ranged from 0.89 ($p = .64$; Item 3) to 5.48, ($p = .06$; Item 6). As displayed in Figure 1, mean pretest MOCUS scores and standard errors were similar across groups, Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA by ranks $H(2, 284) = 1.67, p = .43$. At both pre- and post-testing, MOCUS scores did not significantly differ between males and females, $F(1, 230) = 1.11, p = .29$, or between whites and non-whites, $F(1, 232) = 1.02, p = .32$.

A significant Group by Time interaction on mean MOCUS scores was found using repeated measures ANOVA, $F(2, 232) = 27.33, p < .001$ (see Figure 1). Planned contrasts were completed to compare improvement over time on MOCUS scores between the Control Group and the 1-Session Group, and between the 1-Session Group and the 3-Session Group. The 1-Session Group improved significantly more than the Control Group, $F(1, 232) = 23.80, p < .001$, and the 3-Session Group improved significantly more than the 1-Session Group, $F(1, 232) = 4.65, p = .03$. Because ANOVA may be inappropriate due to the MOCUS's ordinal scaling, analogous non-parametric comparisons were used to compare improvement (i.e., change scores) between the Control ($M = 0.38, SD = 1.76$) and 1-Session Groups ($M = 1.76, SD = 1.66$), $U = 4.94, p < .001$, and between the 1-Session and 3-Session Groups ($M = 2.42, SD = 2.01$), $U = 2.02, p = .04$.

Chi-Square test-of-difference of proportions were computed to compare the proportions of participants who scored perfectly on the MOCUS between treatment groups. This analysis was important because every step on the MOCUS prevents some risk of condom failure; thus, the goal of the interventions was for subjects to score perfectly on the MOCUS (i.e., errorless condom use, preventing any risk of pathogen transmission). At pre-test, there were no differences between groups on the proportion of subjects who scored 7 (i.e., 100%) on the MOCUS, $\chi^2(2, N = 287) = 0.20, p = .91$. At post-test, however, the proportion of subjects who scored 7 on the MOCUS was greater among the 1-Session Group (40%) than the Control Group (17%), $\chi^2(1, n = 167) = 10.76, p = .001, OR = 3.21$, and greater among the 3-Session Group (60%) than the 1-Session Group, $\chi^2(1, n = 145) = 5.80, p = .02, OR = 2.25$ (see Figure 2). The distribution of total MOCUS scores at pre- and post-test for each group can be seen in Figure 3.

DISCUSSION

There was a significant positive change on condom use skills among both treatment groups, and the 3-Session Group improved more than the 1-Session Group. Further, at post-test a greater proportion of subjects in the 3-Session Group performed all steps on the MOCUS correctly compared to those from the 1-Session Group. Although both condom courses led to increased condom use skills, these data support use of the more extensive, 3-session condom use course as a more effective means to increase errorless condom use skills.

These data also support the argument that it is important to promote both consistent and correct condom use (Boldsen et al., 1992; Farris et al., 2003; Langer et al., 1994). Although the vast majority of this sample reported prior condom use, at pre-test less than 10% correctly performed all steps on the MOCUS. Because the MOCUS only includes steps that prevent breakage, slippage, or leakage, incorrectly performing even one item on the MOCUS may lead to increased likelihood of experiencing one of these failures. Thus, these data provide strong evidence that the majority of college students in our sample do not have all the skills necessary to use condoms correctly.

The percentage of errorless performance by the 3-Session Group increased from less than 10% to 60% while that of the 1-Session Group reached 40%. This difference in performance is substantial and socially meaningful for those achieving errorless performance, but not sufficient. The 3-Session Group practiced putting a condom on a pseudo penis three times, took a written test over the steps for correct condom use, and completed a variety of other activities related to condom use. Given the goal of 100% errorless performance, we hoped to achieve a result of at least 80% of those students demonstrating errorless performance. One possible mistake in the

design of the training was bunching all of the condom use skills training in a single class session. Perhaps a distributed practice strategy with practice in more than a single session would have produced more errorless performances (see Johnson et al., 2003). Alternatively, the sequence of instructional activities or some components in that sequence may need to be changed. Future research should systematically examine various combinations of instruction and practice. However, clearly from a public health perspective, the objective of condom use instruction needs to be mastery rather than improvement.

Because college students, while at high risk for STDs such as Chlamydia and HPV, are at much lower risk for HIV/AIDS, the implications of these findings for prevention work with higher risk populations (i.e., men who have sex with men and injection drug users) is unclear. The analysis is further complicated by the paucity of studies with these groups that directly assess condom use skills. Nonetheless, it is reasonable to predict that brief instruction will be no more effective with high-risk populations than with younger college students. Thus, the results pose a double challenge for prevention efforts. The first is to determine via direct assessment if current condom use training procedures are effective. Should they be found ineffective, the next challenge is to design more extensive training packages that higher risk populations will complete. However, the critical first step is to add more direct methods of assessing condom use skills to prevention programs.

A limitation of this study was that course attendance was not experimentally controlled. It is possible that individual participant's failure to attend all of the condom use sessions may have negatively affected the data for their respective group and, as a result, the data reported here may underestimate the efficacy of both treatments. Records of attendance provided by the Psychology 106 instructors indicated that 14 students (16%) did not attend the single treatment

session from the 1-Session Group. Among those in the 3-Session Group, 5 students (6%) missed the first session, 7 (9%) missed the second session, and 8 (10%) missed the third session, and no students missed multiple sessions. Although the Psychology 106 instructors recorded attendance, to guarantee participants' confidentiality there was no way of linking a student's class attendance to his or her MOCUS scores. As a result, we elected to analyze data from all participants for whom their assigned treatment was available to them. Nonetheless, student absences may have accounted for some of the differences in performance on the MOCUS. To provide the most accurate assessment of the effect of condom courses on participants' skill levels researchers should attempt to control for the negative effect of course absences in their methodology.

The participants in this study were students who volunteered for this course, yet 25% of those in the 3-Session Group missed one of the sessions. Although these absences may follow a typical pattern among college students, it raises questions about the feasibility of getting members from other, more high-risk groups to commit to extended training. Because we have evidence that longer training leads to greater errorless performance, it is important for researchers to establish similar trainings specifically designed for members of these groups. Although it is likely the current pattern of results will be similar among other populations, it is important to first understand, using direct observation, the efficacy of current programs targeting high-risk populations.

CONCLUSIONS

Although the extensive, 3-session course produced a high level of errorless condom use, we had hoped for even better results. More research is needed to find the most effective combination and order of components to ensure all participants acquire errorless condom use skills. In addition, further research is needed to assess the utility of the extensive course to other

populations at risk of pathogen transmission in the event of condom failure (e.g., men who have sex with men or injection drug users). After incorporating the modifications necessary to insure an acceptable proportion of participants acquire errorless condom use skills, this version of the extensive multi-session course should be combined with an intervention that successfully promotes consistent condom use. Only through a marriage of interventions designed to promote errorless condom use skills and to promote consistent condom use can we achieve the public health goal of reducing the frequency of sexually transmitted diseases.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The present research was completed in partial fulfillment for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Psychology. The authors thank Christian Lentz, Carol Young, Tiffani Maynard, and Emily Verbon for their greatly appreciated assistance in data collection, and Paul Bolls, Lisa Fournier, Jeff Joireman, and Craig Parks for their general support and guidance for this project.

REFERENCES

- Albert, A. E., Hatcher, R. A., and Graves, W. (1991). Condom use and breakage among women in a municipal hospital family planning clinic. *Contraception, 43*, 167-176.
- Belcher, L., Kalichman, S., Topping, M., Smith, S., Emshoff, J., Norris, F., and Nurss, J. (1998). A randomized trial of a brief HIV risk reduction counseling intervention for women. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 66*, 856-861.
- Boldsen, J. L., Jeune, B., and Madsen, P. C. (1992). Aspects of comfort and safety of condom: A study of two thousand intercourses among volunteer couples. *Scandinavian Journal of Social Medicine, 20*, 247-252.
- Brigham, T. A. (2001). *Psychology applied to daily living: Dealing with friends, alcohol, and sex (2nd ed.)*. Boston: Pearson Publishers.
- Brigham, T. A., Donohoe, P., Gilbert, B., Thomas, N., Zemke, S., Koonce, D., and Horn, P. (2002). Psychology and AIDS education: Reducing high-risk sexual behavior. *Behavior and Social Issues, 12*, 10-18.
- Catania, J. A., Dolcini, M. M., Coates, T. J., Kegeles, S. M., Greenblatt, R. M., Puckett, S., Corman, M., and Miller, J. (1989). Predictors of condom use and multiple partnered sex among sexually-active adolescent women: Implications for AIDS-related health interventions. *The Journal of Sex Research, 26*, 514-524.
- Civic, D., Scholes, D., Ichikawa, L., Grothaus, L., McBride, C. M., Yarnall, K. S., and Fish, L. (2002). Ineffective use of condoms among young women in managed care. *AIDS Care, 14*, 779-788.
- Crosby, R. A. (1998). Condom use as a dependent variable: Measurement issues relevant to HIV prevention programs. *AIDS Education and Prevention, 10*, 548-557.

- Donahoe, P., Peeler, C. and Brigham, T. A. (2001). *Teaching psychology applied to daily living: A peer instructor's guide*. Boston: Pearson Publishers.
- Eldridge, G. D., St. Lawrence, J. S., Little, C. E., Shelby, M. C., Brasfield, T. L., Service, J. W., and Sly, K. (1997). Evaluation of an HIV risk reduction intervention for women entering inpatient substance abuse treatment. *AIDS Education and Prevention, 9 (Supplement A)*, 62-76.
- Farris, C. A., Fenaughty, A. M., and Lindemann, D. F. (2003). A condom skill scale: Assessing condom skills among female drug users. *Journal of Drug Education, 33*, 217-231.
- Fishbein, M., and Pequegnat, W. (2000). Evaluating AIDS prevention interventions using behavioral and biological outcome measures. *Sexually Transmitted Diseases, 27*, 101-110.
- Gibson, D. R., and Lovelle-Drache, J. (1991). Individual counseling. In J. L. Sorensen, L. A. Wermuth, D. R. Gibson, K. Choi, J. R. Guydish, & S. L. Batki (Eds.), *Preventing AIDS in drug users and their sexual partners* (pp. 117-129). New York: Guilford.
- Horn, P., and Brigham, T. A. (1996). A self-management approach to reduce AIDS risk in sexually active heterosexual college students. *Behavior and Social Issues, 6*, 3-21.
- Johnson, B. T., Carey, M. P., Marsh, K. L., Levin, K. D., and Scott-Sheldon, L. A. J. (2003). Interventions to reduce sexual risk for the Human Immunodeficiency Virus in adolescents, 1985-2000: A research synthesis. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine, 157*, 381-388.

- Kamb, M. L., Fishbein, M., Douglas, J. M., Rhodes, F., Rogers, J., Bolan, G., Zenilman, J., Hoxworth, T., Malotte, C. K., Iatesta, M., Kent, C., Lentz, A., Graziano, S., Byers, R. H., Peterman, T. A., for the project RESPECT study group: A randomized controlled trial. (1998). Efficacy of risk-reduction counseling to prevent human immunodeficiency virus and sexually transmitted diseases. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 280, 1161-1167.
- Kelly, J. A. (1995). *Changing HIV risk behavior: A practical guide*. New York: Guilford.
- Langer, L. M., Zimmerman, R. S., and Cabral, R. J. (1994). Perceived versus actual condom skills among clients at sexually-transmitted disease clinics. *Public Health Reports*, 109, 683-687.
- Lindemann, D. F., and Brigham, T. A. (2003). A Guttman scale to assess condom use skills among college students. *AIDS and Behavior*, 7, 23-27.
- Malow, R. M., West, J. A., Corrigan, S. A., Pena, J. M., and Cunningham, S. C. (1994). Outcome of psychoeducation for HIV risk reduction. *AIDS Education and Prevention*, 6, 113-125.
- Messiah, A., Dart, T., Spencer, B. E., and Warszawski, J. (1997). Condom breakage and slippage during heterosexual intercourse: A French National Survey. *American Journal of Public Health*, 87, 421-424.
- Norris, A. E. and Ford, K. (1994). Associations between condom experiences and beliefs, intentions, and use in a sample of urban, low-income, African-American and Hispanic youth. *AIDS Education and Prevention*, 6, 27-39.

- Peeler, C. and Brigham, T. A. (2001, May). *An analysis of the effects of a course designed to reduce the frequency of high risk sexual behavior and heavy drinking*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for Behavior Analysis, New Orleans, LA.
- Quirk, A., Rhodes, T., and Stimson, G. V. (1998). 'Unsafe protected sex': Qualitative insights on measures of sexual risk. *AIDS Care, 10*, 105-114.
- Richters, J., Donovan, B., and Gerofi, J. (1993). How often do condoms break or slip off in use? *International Journal of STD and AIDS, 4*, 90-94.
- Richters, J., Gerofi, J., and Donovan, B. (1995). Why do condoms break or slip off in use? An exploratory study. *International Journal of STD and AIDS, 6*, 11-18.
- Sanders, S. A., Graham, C. A., Yarber, W. L., and Crosby, R. A. (2003). Condom use errors and problems among young women who put condoms on their male partners. *Journal of American Medical Womens Association, 58*, 95-98.
- Sorensen, J. L., London, J., and Morales, E. (1991). Group counseling to prevent AIDS. In J. L. Sorensen, L. A. Wermuth, D. R. Gibson, K. Choi, J. R. Guydish, and S. L. Batki (Eds.), *Preventing AIDS in drug users and their sexual partners* (pp. 99-115). New York: Guilford.
- Spruyt, A., Steiner, M. J., Joanis, C., Glover, L. H., Piedrahita, C., Alvarado, G., Ramos, R., Maglaya, C., and Cordero, M. (1998). Identifying condom users at risk for breakage and slippage: Findings from three international sites. *American Journal of Public Health, 88*, 239-244.

St. Lawrence, J. S., Crosby, R. A., Belcher, L., Yazdani, N., and Brasfeld, T. L. (1999). Sexual risk reduction and anger management interventions for incarcerated male adolescents: A randomized controlled trial of two interventions. *Journal of Sex Education and Therapy*, 24, 9-17.

Trussell, J., Warner, D. L., and Hatcher, R. A. (1992). Condom slippage and breakage rates. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 24, 20-23.

Warner, L., Clay-Warner, J., Boles, J., and Williamson, J. (1998). Assessing condom use practices: Implications for evaluating method and user effectiveness. *Sexually Transmitted Diseases*, 25, 273-277.

Table I.

Items on the Measure of Observed Condom Use Skills (Lindemann and Brigham, 2003).

Application Steps	
Item 1 ^{a, b}	Without using teeth or fingernails, open condom package by tearing along edge
Item 2 ^b	Place condom right-side out on tip of penis
Item 3 ^a	Pinch tip of condom with two fingers
Item 4 ^{b, c}	Roll condom down the penis until reaching the base
Removal Steps	
Item 5 ^{b, c}	Hold condom at base of penis and remove the penis from the partner
Item 6 ^b	Pinch tip of condom so that ejaculate is in the tip
Item 7 ^b	Holding the condom at the tip and base, carefully slide the condom off the penis

Note. Each item prevents risk of exposure due to condom use failure: ^a denotes item preventing breakage, ^b denotes items preventing leakage, and ^c denotes items preventing slippage.

Table II.

Descriptions of the 1-Session and 3-Session Condom Use Courses.

1-Session (Limited) Condom Use Course		
<u>Session 1:</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion • Skills Training • Homework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduction to condoms - Condom demonstration by peer instructors - Condom application practice (once, with lights on) - Roleplay talking about condoms with partner - Condom comparison activity (3 types of condoms) - Purchase/pick-up free condoms and give one to a friend - Assertive statements worksheet - Placing condoms in your environment worksheet
3-Session (Extensive) Condom Use Course		
<u>Session 1:</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion • Skills Training • Homework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduction to condoms - Condom demonstration by peer instructors - Roleplay talking about condoms with partner - Purchase/pick-up free condoms and give one to a friend - Assertive statements worksheet - Placing condoms in your environment worksheet
<u>Session 2:</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion • Skills Training • Homework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discuss homework - Review/condom demonstration by peer instructors^a - Condom application practice (once each with lights on, lights off^a, and spinning in a chair to simulate intoxication^a) - Condom application relay^a - Roleplay teaching a friend how to use a condom^a - Teach a friend how to use a condom^a
<u>Session 3:</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion • Skills Training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review homework^a - Written exam on steps to correct condom use^a - Condom comparison activity (3 types of condoms)

^a denotes activity not included in the 1-Session (Limited) condom use course

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. Mean MOCUS scores at pre- and post-test for the Control, 1-Session, and 3-Session Groups. Error bars represent 1 *SE* around the mean.

Figure 2. Percentage of participants who scored 7 on the MOCUS (no risk of failure) for the Control, 1-Session, and 3-Session Groups.

Figure 3. Distribution of total MOCUS scores at pre- and post-test among the: (a) Control Group, (b) 1-Session Group, and (c) 3-Session Group.