EIGHT

The Intervention Initiative: theoretical underpinnings, development and implementation

Rachel A. Fenton and Helen L. Mott

Introduction

The bystander approach to prevention of violence against women is predicated upon empowering bystanders to intervene in a positive, pro-social way upon witnessing an event that they recognise to be problematic. The intervention made has potentially powerful social effects: it sends a clear message to the culprit about the social unacceptability of their behaviour, while concurrently alerting other bystanders to the appropriateness of challenging it. Constant and reinforced messaging about the unacceptability of behaviour within communities can thus shift social norms as to what constitutes desirable behaviour. While this narrative appears instinctive, bystander programmes are multi-faceted interventions underpinned by complex and sophisticated theory. The growing evidence base, predominantly from the US, indicates the aptitude of bystander intervention for university settings, its potential importance and promise denoted by legal and funding requirements for US universities (Campus SaVE Act, 2013; DeGue, 2014).

Aware of the promise of bystander interventions from the developing evidence base, and of the work done by the National Union of Students (NUS) and Alison Phipps (for example NUS, 2011) in exposing the problem of violence against women in UK universities, in late 2013 Public Health England commissioned an evidence review of bystander intervention for this setting (Fenton et al, 2016), to identify best evidence and practice from which to develop a public health intervention toolkit for all universities to use for the prevention of sexual and domestic violence (SDV), which became *The Intervention Initiative* (Fenton et al, 2014, hereafter referred to as TII).

The creation of TII at the University of the West of England was preceded by an intensive development period including the trialling of existing resources with student focus groups, and extensive consultation with an Expert Advisory Group (EAG) and a Student Bystander Committee (SBC). Our EAG comprised national and regional experts in SDV and our SBC was recruited from across the university and comprised students of different genders, sexualities, ethnicities, ages, years of study, disciplines and countries of origin. TII was published online in 2014,[1] becoming the first evidence-based bystander programme for the sector, and is available free of charge. It is an eight-hour facilitated intervention designed to be delivered to small groups over time. The research and programme have had significant impact on the higher education sector. Within six months of its publication, four government departments had written to all Vice Chancellors asking them to look at implementing TII, and from this point onwards – and particularly since Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) catalyst funding was made available with adherence to TII a condition of funding – a growing number of universities are implementing it in various ways. The results from a full statistical evaluation using a curriculum-based design with a cohort of students, funded by Public Health England, are promising (Fenton and Mott, 2017b). Student evaluations showed excellent self-report learning outcomes (Fenton and Mott, 2015).

TII is predicated on bystander theories, social norms theory, the criteria for effective prevention programming (Nation et al, 2003) and Prochaska and DiClemente's (1983) transtheoretical model of behaviour change (TTM) as applied to bystander intervention by Banyard et al (2010). The TTM suggests that both communities and individuals pass though several stages – from precontemplation or denial of the problem, to contemplation or awareness of the problem, to preparation or intending to take action, to actual action through modified behaviour, and finally to maintenance or continued behaviour change (Banyard et al, 2010). TII is thus a complex model designed to have multi-faceted prevention capabilities, as illustrated by the theory of change (in Fenton and Mott, 2017), which sets out the internal processes participants will pass through to achieve behaviour change and the intermediate and distal outcome measures designed to evaluate this. TII aims to accomplish two core interwoven purposes in order to engender a reduction in violence at the community level: first, that potential bystanders will intervene to prevent problematic behaviours; and second, that it operates strategically to change a number of the attitudes, beliefs, social norms and peer group relationships which

facilitate perpetration and impede bystander behaviour (Fenton et al, 2016: 20).

As detailed analysis of the evidence base for bystander programmes is available elsewhere (Fenton et al, 2016; Fenton and Mott, 2017a), this chapter will concentrate particularly on the methodological and pedagogical application of the evidence to each session of TII, its overarching structure, and the relationship with the outcome measures, in order to substantiate that TII may genuinely claim to be evidence-based. This is important because in the current climate a multitude of interventions which are not necessarily evidence-based, nor tested, are available for the sector, some of which are marketed for a substantial fee.

Evaluations of bystander programmes for university settings

There is a methodological difficulty inherent in using reduced incidence of violence as the primary measure of success (see Fenton et al, 2016: 40 for a discussion) and thus it is not surprising that for bystander programmes rigorous evaluative/outcome evidence such as randomised control trials is limited. However, Coker et al (2016) do provide evidence of lower reported rates of victimisation and perpetration at campus-level. Considerably more significant evidence is available for proxy measures, such as decreases in rape myth acceptance, sexist attitudes, perceptions of peer sexist attitudes, denial of violence as a problem, actual and intended perpetration of violence, increases in empathy for rape survivors, confidence and intention to intervene, and knowledge about violence (see Fenton et al, 2016). These intermediate outcome measures correlate with those risk and protective factors which are agreed to be related to SDV victimisation and perpetration. They are important for evaluating prevention likelihood when incidence cannot be measured and additionally evaluate how and in what way the programme is working as participants pass through the necessary stages for intervening, as detailed later.

The development of TII: bystander theories

Perhaps the key to the promise of bystander intervention for this setting is that its very ethos – becoming a positive pro-social bystander – is intrinsically appealing, or at the very least, unobjectionable, and may engage men. Prevention efforts have shifted away from addressing men as potential perpetrators and women as potential victims which created resistance and were not effective (Flood, 2006; Powell, 2011;

Berkowitz, 2013). Efforts now focus on situating responsibility for ending violence within the community as a whole by engaging everyone as pro-social bystanders (Berkowitz, 2013). The underpinning approach of TII is thus the fostering of a *shared social identity* among students as 'students of X university', which transcends other identities. This does not diminish the importance of other social identities nor mean that violence and abuse is not differentially experienced by different individuals and groups but rather asserts that as 'a student of X university' they will act to prevent violence against others in this community.

In order to be able to act to prevent violence, bystanders must complete the stages required to move from inaction to action, as outlined by Latané and Darley (1970) in their organising framework for understanding bystander behaviour. Thus a bystander must notice an event, understand that it is problematic, decide that they are part of the solution thus assuming responsibility for helping and, finally, possess the skills to intervene effectively and safely (Banyard et al, 2009; Berkowitz, 2009; Powell, 2011). These four stages constitute the skeleton framework of TII and also map particularly well onto the ten processes of change of the TTM (Prochaska and DiClemente, 1983; Banyard et al, 2010; for a summary table see Fenton et al, 2016: 22). Of the eight hours of training which constitute TII, the first three stages for intervention are covered in sessions one to five, and the skills training (stage 4) is covered in sessions five to eight. The sessions are detailed later.

Sessions one to five of TII: from noticing the event to assuming responsibility

Noticing an event and interpreting it as problematic requires knowledge. Although knowledge by itself is not sufficient to produce behavioural change (DeGue et al, 2014), it is a crucial precursor to noticing a problematic event and key to the consciousness-raising process of the TTM. The knowledge required in the field of SDV relates to the recognition of: the risk factors for victimisation and perpetration; the impact on victims; behaviours along the continuum of sexual violence (Kelly, 1987) (for example, everyday sexism, hostile attitudes towards women, rape myth acceptance); the early warning signs of domestic abuse; and potentially dangerous situations (Fenton et al, 2016: 17). An increased sense of motivation or responsibility is essential to accompany knowledge and can be fostered through increasing empathy for victims (also a protective factor against perpetration), and through a gender-

transformative approach which engenders a critical understanding of participants' own attitudes about gender equality and violence, such as those manifested by rape myth acceptance. There is strong evidence that bystander programmes are effective in generating positive attitudinal changes, such as significantly reduced rape myth acceptance and sexism and that knowledge, empathy, and attitudes and beliefs are related to intermediate outcomes for programme success (see Fenton et al, 2016).

In line with this, TII explores bystander theory, relevance of SDV to the student community, gender inequitable attitudes, empathy, and facts about SDV in sessions one to four. It is here, in the noticing stage, that deeper understandings about the intersection of social identities and differential experiences of SDV can be fostered. These sessions correspond with the consciousness-raising (information gathering), dramatic relief (being emotionally moved, empathy), environmental re-evaluation (understanding harms caused in the environment and one's own role in this), social liberation (realising that it would be liberating and empowering to be free of the problem), self-re-evaluation (acknowledgement of previous unsafe practices), and stimulus control (thinking of how to divert risks for problematic behaviour) processes of the TTM (see Fenton et al, 2016: 31). As noted earlier, bystander approaches seek to engage everyone as part of the community in preventing violence and abuse. Engaging men has proven particularly challenging because, in critically exploring gender roles, gender equality and masculinity, men may perceive interventions as blaming of men or labelling them as perpetrators (Casey et al, 2012). While situating men as pro-social bystanders is an important and potentially effective theoretical means to deflect defensiveness and hostility, the content of any intervention must simultaneously be mindful of the role of gender in violence perpetration and victimisation. This tension between recognising that men are more frequently the perpetrators of violence on the one hand, and not generating resistance on the other will need to be constantly negotiated. The bystander framework operates like a masquerade: what is seen and experienced by participants is the outward guise of becoming a bystander – which is inclusive and non-gendered – but underneath the mask the intervention is acknowledging and addressing the gendered nature of violence, and aiming to reduce actual and intended perpetration.

Following extensive consultation with our SBC, TII introduces bystander theory in a neutral context (not related to SDV) to engage participants' interest in bystander intervention as a social phenomenon per se in the opening session of TII. In recognition of the importance of the first session for student engagement and 'buy-in', the sensitivity

of the topic of SDV, and the importance of engaging men from the outset, the session facilitates discussion and debate about students' own previous bystander behaviour, and encourages the processing of emotions about when and why they may, or not, have intervened and the consequences of doing or not doing so. The session subsequently introduces the extent of SDV within student communities as an issue directly relevant for the participants for which participants can be 'part of the solution' (Berkowitz, 2011, 2013).

Session 2 aims to shift attitudes supportive of gender based violence (GBV) by critically exploring norms surrounding masculinity and femininity, and gender inequality (the most commonly identified attitudinal risk factor for men's violence against women; Ricardo et al, 2011). In taking this gender-transformative approach, the input of our SBC and further male student feedback was crucial in addressing the engagement of male participants. Of particular note was the advice not to mention feminism or use any words associated with feminism perhaps because of the social undesirability and stigma associated (or perceived to be associated) with the label 'feminist' (Roy et al, 2007). While universities may offer young feminists spaces for engaging with feminism and resisting sexism (Lewis et al, 2016), we were mindful that TII needs to be applicable across the board and that some disciplines are almost exclusively male-dominated. Thus for example, we instruct facilitators not to use language that might be associated with feminism but to wait for the language to come from participants themselves. The session gives men space to explore and process how they feel when confronted with the reality of GBV and with some examples of 'lad culture' – which are used as a springboard to launch discussion of male peer group behaviours. Facilitators are instructed that maintaining positivity is crucial, and to reiterate throughout the session that male participants are not being blamed for violence against women and that most men do not perpetrate, and to emphasise that men have a powerful role in ending other men's violence. The session seeks to generate a critical understanding of the continuum of sexual violence and the importance of intervening to prevent underlying sexist behaviour within this. This is indicated because studies show that college students may have trouble identifying 'low and no risk' situations for intervention, be less willing to intervene to prevent everyday sexist behaviour, and less likely to refuse to participate in sexist activities not explicitly related to sexual violence (McMahon, 2010; McMahon et al, 2011; McMahon and Banyard, 2012). We use a clip from a UK television documentary *Blurred Lines: The New Battle of the Sexes* (2014) which engagingly sets out the results of a psychological

study demonstrating the effects of sexist humour on the social attitudes of sexist and non-sexist men. Although all sessions in the first half of the programme work to increase empathy, session 2 also incorporates a specific empathy exercise (adapted from Plante, 2002 in Banyard et al, 2005) to enable participants to process the significant life changes which might follow assault or abuse.

Sessions 3 and 4 explain the nature of SDV within the framework of the first three steps of bystander intervention. We do not discuss the low reporting rates for violence (descriptive norms) to guard against discouraging reporting and encouraging a sense of impunity on the part of any potential perpetrators. Presenting information about injunctive norms is likely to be more effective, such as about the strength of social disapproval of sexual violence (see Paul and Gray, 2011). Session 3 examines the law on rape and sexual assault in detail; imperative for knowledge in order to be able to notice the event and for consciousness-raising. We seek to draw participants' attention to male sexual victimisation within a gendered understanding of sexual violence. While there is only limited evidence that knowledge of law may have some positive effect on behavioural intent (Withey, 2010) it is nonetheless an important component of the intervention. From a criminological standpoint, a more definite understanding of the behaviours which constitute criminal offences can increase conditions for decreased motivation to perpetrate and increased capable guardianship, including increased potential confidence to intervene and the increased likelihood of reporting (Fenton et al, 2016). A good example of this would be the recognition of behaviours now recognised to be commonplace and normalised in UK student populations such as unwanted groping (NUS, 2011) actually constituting a sexual offence in criminal law (in this case a sexual assault under s.3 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003). This session challenges, and seeks to reduce, rape myth acceptance (RMA) which serves to legitimise sexual aggression by men and downplay their responsibility for it, and is a predicting factor for perpetration (McMahon, 2010). RMA is recognised in the literature as an important attitude indicator and potential impediment to bystander intervention (McMahon, 2010). RMA is important not only as an attitudinal outcome measure per se but because lower RMA is associated with lower denial (precontemplation) and increased responsibility (contemplation) and action in the stages of change (Banyard et al, 2010). McMahon (2010: 9) also found that those students who endorse more rape myths are less likely to intervene as bystanders. Reducing RMA is thus a potentially important component in increasing bystander programme effectiveness. Law also serves

as a useful springboard; for example, examination of the law on consent in this session facilitates wider discussion about what consent means – particularly in circumstances of incapacity (such as through intoxication) – and how it can be communicated.

This session brainstorms potential situations appropriate for intervention by asking participants about the kinds of situations they might now notice and in which they might be motivated to take responsibility for action. One technique that TII adopts is to increase recognition of the negative consequences for an offender, as men may be more likely than women to intervene with perpetrators (Banyard, 2011). Thus TII aims to increase the responsibility and motivation of men to intervene by suggesting that they can be a friend by stopping a friend from 'doing something stupid'.

Session 4 examines coercive and controlling behaviour in the many forms that it can manifest, including stalking (a particular problem in universities) and online abuse, within the bystander framework. The session begins with an interactive empathy exercise scripted by a public health specialist from our EAG. The exercise solicits an understanding of what life would be like if they lived on an island controlled by a dictator, the risks involved in planning to leave the island, and how coercion and control can be subtly expressed. The session strongly promotes the message that domestic violence can affect anyone regardless of age, sexuality, ethnicity, gender, background and religion, to increase inclusivity. It simultaneously ensures that understandings are positioned against an awareness of the gendered aetiology, prevalence and impact of domestic abuse. There is far less literature on the application of bystander prevention to domestic violence and little that evaluates prevention in universities. Coupled with the dearth of quantitative data about domestic violence in student populations from student surveys (which have concentrated far more on sexual viole), the input of the SAG **{in full – or do you mean EAG?}** national data became particularly important in designing this session. Focus on recognising the early warning signs of domestic violence was identified as key for this population, and as key for intervention strategies. In order to combat resistance and to continue to engage men, we consciously 'de-gendered' the early warning signs while ensuring that students were nevertheless made aware of the very gendered nature of domestic abuse. Key messages for participants centre on not influencing a victim's decision to leave a relationship and referring a victim to specialist services (provided online and in a handout). The session also seeks to dispel myths about the ease of leaving an abusive relationship and fosters a non-judgemental approach. The technique

of understanding consequences for perpetrators, couched as 'being a friend' (outlined earlier for session 3) is also adopted here in terms of noticing, and being motivated to act against a friend's problematic behaviour towards a partner.

At this stage, participants should be assuming an increased willingness, motivation and responsibility to act, in readiness for skills training in the second half of the programme. It is also important to note that a further outcome of these attitudinal and cognitive shifts for participants will be a contemporaneous decrease in their own likelihood to perpetrate violence (Fenton et al, 2016: 23) and this lends weight to the multi-faceted theoretical promise of bystander approaches to prevent violence.

Social norms theory

Social norms theory can be integrated into bystander programming to mitigate some of the barriers to bystander intervention (Berkowitz, 2009, 2013), and accordingly, is incorporated throughout TII. In relation to bystander intervention, the mutually reinforcing interaction of pluralistic ignorance and false consensus (Berkowitz, 2013) is key. Pluralistic ignorance denotes the misperception of others' desire to intervene, which prevents intervention – which, in turn, leads the wrongdoer to suffer from false consensus, the incorrect conviction that others are like oneself when they are not (Berkowitz, 2009, 2013).

The social norms approach to behaviour change is a theory and evidence-based approach aimed at correcting the misperceptions which influence behaviour (Berkowitz, 2003, 2013). In this context, the social norms concern norms which scaffold violence against women, such as peer support for violence which can facilitate men's violent behaviour (Schwartz et al, 2001; 12; Gidycz et al, 2011; Berkowitz, 2013; Witte and Mulla, 2013) and misperceptions that inhibit bystander intervention (Brown and Messman-Moore, 2010).

An understanding of social norms theory opens session 2 of TII and here we introduce the emblem and logo of TII: the red and green people, which denote, respectively, problematic behaviour and healthy, positive behaviour. The emblem is used as an illustrative and visual pedagogical device for understanding social norms and the effects of positive intervention. The visual reappears in sessions 3 and 4 to demonstrate the connections between misperceptions of norms and perpetration of SDV, and the negative link with willingness to intervene, as evidenced in the literature. The emblem is intended to be associated with social norms and trigger these associations whenever they return throughout the programme. While we recognise that the

idea of red and green behaviours is simplistic and risks interpretation as dividing society into 'good' and 'bad' people, rather than behaviours exhibited by people which vary across time and situation, TII is designed for all students regardless of academic background and our SBC advised on the effectiveness of the design for understanding key messages, particularly for students with no social science background.

Rather than rely purely on second hand messages about other people's social norms misperceptions from reported studies, even where participants were college students and therefore similar to TII participants, it was theorised that maximal effectiveness is likely to be achieved by correcting participants' own norms. Thus at the start of the first session, students are asked to complete a social norms questionnaire which asks questions relating to their own norms and their perceived peer norms (of students of the same sex as themselves) about SDV (Witte and Mulla, 2013). For example, participants are asked how likely they would be, and how likely they think people in their peer group would be, to 'Do something to help a very intoxicated person who is being brought upstairs to a bedroom by a group of people at a party' on a scale of 'not at all, rarely, neither likely/unlikely, likely, extremely likely'. Direct feedback is given to students during session 5 about their own misperceptions via slides which illustrate the percentage differences between their own norm individual questions and their perceived norms. The difference in these percentages is then discussed and participants are invited to recollect the importance of these misperceptions in terms of willingness to intervene. Participants are shown that their misperceptions map onto those found by other studies, evidenced in sessions 3 and 4. Again the red and green people visuals are used to reinforce the social norms data. The critical message for participants is that it is far safer to intervene than they thought: far more people share their positive, healthy beliefs than they had thought and they are therefore in the majority. Thus the facilitator is able to correct the misperceptions of the social norm held by TII participants and participants' barriers to intervention will be lowered.

Sessions five to eight of TII: possessing the skills to act

The final stage for being able to intervene to prevent violence is possessing the requisite skills for safe and effective interventions in a comprehensive array of situations. Assuming responsibility is not sufficient: programmes that equip participants with situation-specific skills for intervening are more likely to be successful (Banyard, 2011). A perception of having a 'skills deficit' has been found to be a significant

barrier to intervention, particularly for women (Burn, 2009 cited in Banyard, 2011) and thus confidence in one's skills and self-efficacy are key. The literature indicates significantly increased efficacy (confidence to intervene) scores for bystander intervention programmes (Banyard et al, 2009). Thus, sessions 5 to 8 of TII are based on the acquisition of relevant and specific skills, confidence to intervene and intervention strategies and these sessions relate to the counter-conditioning (acquisition of new skills to replace old strategies), social liberation (realising that it would be liberating and empowering to be free of the problem), helping relationships (social support for helping is available), reinforcement management (social rewards for prevention behaviour) and self-liberation (belief in own ability and commitment to carry out prevention behaviour) processes of the TTM (see Fenton et al, 2016: 31). Participants are taught to strategise and consider relevant intervention options for 'in the moment' interventions which require very different skills to supportive interventions post-disclosure.

Session 5 begins the transition from didactic to experiential learning by utilising a film from the New Zealand campaign 'Who are you?' which is designed specifically for young adults to discuss who could have intervened in a scenario which, devoid of intervention(s), ultimately ends in the rape of an intoxicated young woman. The film rewinds to show concrete examples of different potential bystanders and their actions that could have prevented the rape. We then move to exploring intervention strategies and introduce a chart derived from the literature (Berkowitz, 2009, 2013) illustrating intervention methods, which reappears through the next sessions. The work by Berkowitz (2009, 2013) constitutes the mainstay of the teaching and theoretical strategising on interventions, and in producing handouts with tips and phrases and examples of interventions we have adapted best examples from bystander programmes worldwide for UK language and contexts.

During sessions 6, 7 and 8, role play is introduced. The sessions transition from reading already-scripted dialogue to participants scripting their own. Role play develops communication skills and research suggests that the very act of role playing may itself contribute to opinion change in the direction espoused by the role play (Janis and King, 1954). Role plays may also operate as a potential vehicle for understanding intersectionality, such as the experiences of women and men who identify as LGBT. The role plays thus constitute a multi-faceted way of facilitating intervention. In session 6 we adopt a script from a real-life scenario which is based on male-on-male violence, both to ensure continued relevance to, and engagement of, men, and because male participants are likely to have many opportunities to

practice bystander intervention yet concurrently be less committed to intervening (Brown et al, 2014). The role play scenarios were developed with extensive consultation with our EAG and an emergency (999) phone call script was written for us by an Avon and Somerset Constabulary call handler, and one script on disclosing a rape to a friend was provided by a student rape survivor based on her own experience. Many scenarios were provided by Somerset and Avon Rape and Sexual Abuse Services. Thus authenticity was ensured. We also used scenarios from existing programmes worldwide where they could be adapted linguistically and contextually to suit a UK audience. The role plays included in TII are a starting point and we encourage facilitators in different parts of the UK to develop their own scenarios to reflect the experiences of their own demographics and audiences and to further explore intersectionality.

Crucial to the success of role play is that it reflects not only real-life situations and contexts but is written in the language used by participants (McMahon et al, 2011). Thus, once we had scripted our scenarios to incorporate different intervention strategies and techniques, they were re-scripted by our SBC into what they termed (UK) 'student-speak', to ensure salience for our participants.

In addition to taking participants through the stages for bystander intervention so as to effect internal change as described above, there are several important features, which scaffold effective prevention programming, to which TII adheres, as discussed in the following section.

Effective prevention programming criteria

Successful prevention programming should adhere to the well-established criteria for effective behaviour change set out by Nation et al (2003). There are three categories: the characteristics of effective prevention programmes; principles matching programme to target population, and principles related to implementation and evaluation. These categories and how bystander interventions should adhere to them have been discussed elsewhere (Fenton and Mott, 2017a). We suggest that the criteria can be discussed under the broader terms of pedagogy, and design and implementation. The criterion that interventions should be theory-driven has been discussed in relation to TII at length earlier.

Pedagogy (sociocultural relevance, varied teaching methods and fostering relationships)

TII adopts a multiplicity of pedagogical techniques, such as presentation of material by facilitators via on-screen slideshows **{check this change is okay – PowerPoint is a specific piece of software and other presentation software is available (if less ubiquitous!)}** role and smaller group discussion and group work, interactive exercises and role play skills training. We consulted extensively with our SBC on use of materials. Participant interaction is key as this in itself may result in social norms corrections as well as security in participation, the building of enduring relationships and the heightening of positive group norms. As visual and engagement aids TII uses a variety of YouTube clips, prevention videos, excerpts from documentaries, posters from prevention campaigns and the recurring emblem of red and green people, to reinforce messaging. Given that it is crucial for a prevention programme to be directly relevant to the lives of its participants, each session of TII utilises quantitative and/or qualitative data which are taken from UK student surveys to ensure that the problem of SDV is conveyed as proximal and salient to participants' lives and lived experiences, fostering a social norm that places responsibility firmly on them, as part of their community, to prevent violence. For example, in session 2, we use the testimony of a student (NUS, 2011) who was sexually harassed by a group of male students and then sexually assaulted by one of the group as a springboard to discussing male peer group norms and social identity, 'lad culture', empathy for the victim and escalation. Where possible we use YouTube and video clips that are in UK, as opposed to US, English and we adapted resources from the US into UK English. In addition, students also made their own motivational bystander film, which was filmed in various parts of the university in which students of a mix of genders, ages, ethnicities, courses of study and countries of origin talk about being an active bystander and pledge to be active bystanders. The film is played at the end of session 1 to facilitate motivation and 'buy-in' for the programme. While there are many such US films it was felt vitally important to script a specific culturally-relevant UK film with which participants could identify. TII also gives space to participants to air their feelings about the material by confronting any potential disconnect or resistance to ensure that the programme remains relevant to them. In session 2, when confronted with data evidencing the gendered nature of SDV, male participants are given space to talk about, and process, how they feel, whether they feel angry or annoyed or defensive or blamed so

that their feelings are acknowledged and reassurance can be given. This space is of course also open to women to process their reactions to the gendered nature of violence, as women may also be resistant. However, at this precise point in the intervention, particular attention is paid to men because if they feel blamed for perpetration, they may not return to the programme. Women's resistance is unlikely to manifest as feeling blamed. Discussing resistance is built in to the programme throughout. For example, in session 3 when we discuss RMA and victim-blaming, we address resistance using just-world theory and defensive attribution theory – and examine how defensive attribution may operate differently for men and women. The programme intends to create a 'safe' learning environment where feelings can be acknowledged and discussed and this is created not just by the materials but through the establishment of 'ground rules' for the sessions at the start between the participants and the facilitator which include how to talk about feelings, how to respect each other and about confidentiality within the group.

Design and implementation (comprehensive, dosage, timing, well-trained staff and outcome evaluation)

The evidence suggests that longer programmes appear to have more impact (Banyard et al, 2007) and that single-session interventions 'are not effective at changing behaviour in the long term' (DeGue, 2014: 1). As a complex intervention TII thus requires time: TII is designed as eight 1-hour sessions that can be delivered in this format or in others, such as four 2-hour sessions, and delivered to small (mixed or same sex) groups of seminar or tutorial size (10–25 participants) by (ideally) the same facilitator per group to foster ongoing relationships. TII was designed to be placed within student timetables and potentially feature within curriculum design backed up by visible affirmative institutional messaging about expected attendance. This model has been successfully trialled (Fenton and Mott, 2015, 2017b) both at UWE and elsewhere. We suggest that required attendance at all sessions is the preferred approach in order to have the greatest reach, because those who need to be exposed to the message may strategically evade attending (Rich et al, 2010). However, we recognise that some institutions do not mandate attendance and so institutions will have to decide on how they implement in accordance with their own attendance rules, and, of course, provide other options for victims/survivors who may feel unable to participate. Institutions might make module credits available, for example, when they cannot mandate attendance. The careful positive and inclusive framing of TII is designed to deflect any resistance which

may be provoked by expected or required attendance. The programme is cumulative and sequential, intended to be delivered at intervals, for example, spaced out across semesters, thus repeating and reinforcing the message over time. We suggest that maximal effectiveness will be achieved by delivery from the very start of entrance to university in order to set the tone for appropriate behaviour throughout students' university careers.

The arguments as to whether interventions should be delivered by peers or by professional facilitators/university staff have been discussed elsewhere (Fenton and Mott, 2017a). We strongly suggest that the use of highly-skilled professional facilitators who have undergone disclosure training is the appropriate university-led response because TII is a complex intervention and facilitators must navigate the sensitive social environments that the subject matter engenders.

A self-report learning outcome questionnaire is included in TII for students to fill in anonymously at the end of TII. It includes 15 questions on learning outcomes and five questions on the structure and flow of the programme (measured on a scale of 1 to 5), and space for qualitative commentary on the programme and its facilitation. This gives facilitators a good measure of how, and if, the programme is meeting its learning objectives, its acceptability to students, and facilitates ongoing review of the programme. This evaluation is important for university managers and for sustainability. However, some interventions are in fact harmful, achieving the opposite effect to that intended (Hilton et al, 1998; Hilton, 2000; Flood, 2006) and thus any potential 'backlash' – which may ultimately lead to a potential increase, as opposed to decrease, in violence – must be assessed. Thus, in order to measure the effects and success of the programme, a pre and post evaluation using appropriate measures for attitudinal and behaviour change should be conducted.

Conclusion

The introduction of fees and league tables have rendered students consumers, and universities businesses. University reputation, student recruitment, teaching excellence, graduate employability and the student experience are high on the agenda for UK universities at the current time. The introduction of an evidence-based bystander programme aligns perfectly with this agenda. This is because lower perpetration and victimisation levels should equate with less opportunity for reputational damage to the university and more opportunity for an enhanced student experience. Together with the acquisition of professional and

leadership skills in sessions 5–8 which support graduate employability and teaching excellence, these advantages of TII, if marketed correctly, could positively impact student recruitment.

The work done by activists, academics, journalists, the third sector, and latterly Universities UK and HEFCE in establishing tackling violence against women as a priority for universities has meant that at this moment in history UK universities are ready to act and resistance to acknowledging the problem for fear of reputational damage has been, for many senior managers, overcome. However, potentially effective programming, such as TII, costs time and money because there is no quick 'tick box' solution to violence against women. A strategy consisting solely of individual-level interventions, such as one-off workshops, cannot expect to make an impact on prevalence of SDV and, as the White House Task Force points out, 'continuing to invest scarce resources in low- or no-impact strategies detracts from potential investments in more effective approaches and may be counter-productive' (DeGue, 2014: 8). Although all the resources are free and available online as a public health intervention, TII nonetheless requires resourcing. The positive recommendation for bystander programming in *Changing the Culture* (Universities UK, 2016) refers to *evidence-based* bystander programming and thus senior managers should beware implementing programmes that cannot demonstrate a theoretical and pedagogical adherence to the research literature including the criteria for effective programming, and which have not been evaluated for negative effects.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to our colleague Phil Rumney for his input into session 3 of TII.

Note

[1] www.uwe.ac.uk/interventioninitiative **{worth saying that this is where is was originally published but that it has since moved to http://socialsciences.exeter.ac.uk/research/interventioninitiative/ ?}**

References

Banyard, V.L. (2011) 'Who will help prevent sexual violence: creating an ecological model of bystander intervention', *Psychology of Violence*, 1 (3): 216–29.

Banyard, V.L., Eckstein, R.P. and Moynihan, M.M. (2010) 'Sexual violence prevention: the role of stages of change', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25 (1): 111–35.

Banyard, V.L., Moynihan, M.M. and Plante, E.G. (2007) 'Sexual violence prevention through bystander education: An experimental evaluation', *Journal of Community Psychology*, 35 (4): 463–81.

Banyard, V.L., Moynihan, M.M. and Crossman, M.T. (2009) 'Reducing sexual violence on campus: The role of student leaders as empowered bystanders', *Journal of College Student Development*, 50 (4): 446–57.

Banyard, V.L., Plante, E.G. and Moynihan, M.M. (2005) *Rape Prevention Through Bystander Education: Bringing a Broader Community Perspective to Sexual Violence Prevention*, Document No. 208701, Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/208701.pdf

Berkowitz, A.D. (2003) 'Applications of social norms theory to other health and social justice issues', in H. Wesley Perkins (ed) *The Social Norms Approach to Preventing School and College Age Substance Abuse: A Handbook for Educators, Counselors, and Clinicians*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp 259–79.

Berkowitz, A. (2009) *Response Ability: A Complete Guide to Bystander Intervention*, Chicago: Beck and Co.

Berkowitz, A. (2013) '*A Grassroots' Guide to Fostering Healthy Norms to Reduce Violence in our Communities: Social Norms Toolkit*, Atlanta, GA: CDC, www.alanberkowitz.com/Social_Norms_Violence_Prevention_Toolkit.pdf

Berkowitz, A.D. (2011) 'Using how college men feel about being men and "doing the right thing" to promote men's development', in J.A. Laker and T. Davis (eds) *Masculinities in Higher Education: Theoretical and Practical Implications*, New York: Routledge, pp 161–76.

Blurred Lines: The New Battle of the Sexes (2014) TV Programm **{production company? Director? Date/channel aired?}**

Brown, A.L. and Messman-Moore, T.L. (2010) 'Personal and perceived peer attitudes supporting sexual aggression as predictors of male college students' willingness to intervene against sexual aggression', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25 (3): 503–17.

Brown, A.L., Banyard, V.L. and Moynihan, M.M. (2014) 'College students as helpful bystanders against sexual violence: Gender, race, and year in college moderate the impact of perceived peer norms', *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 38 (3): 350–62.

Campus SaVE Act (2013) Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, pub. L. 113-4, §4, 127 stat. 54, (2013).

Casey, E.A., Carlson, J., Fraguela-Rios, C., Kimball, E., Neugut, T.B., Tolman, R.M. and Edelson, J.L. (2012) 'Context, challenges, and tensions in global efforts to engage men in the prevention of violence against women: an ecological analysis', *Men and Masculinities*, 16: 228–51.

Coker, A.L., Bush, H.M., Fisher, B.S., Swan, S.C., Williams, C.M., Clear, E.R. and DeGue, S. (2016) 'Multi-college bystander intervention evaluation for violence prevention', *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 50 (3): 295–302.

DeGue, S. (2014) *Preventing Sexual Violence on College Campuses: Lessons from Research and Practice. Part One: Evidence-based Strategies for the Primary Prevention of Sexual Violence Perpetration*, Washington DC: White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault, https://notalone.gov/assets/evidence-based-strategies-for-the-prevention-of-sv-perpetration.pdf **{can't track this PDF down via this link – or on the ch[illegible]ngourcampus.org site – please provide alternative URL}**

DeGue, S., Valle, L.A., Holt, M.K., Massetti, G.M., Matjasko, J.L. and Tharp, A.T. (2014) 'A systematic review of primary prevention strategies for sexual violence perpetration', *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 19 (4): 346–62.

Fenton, R.A. and Mott, H.L. (2017a) 'The Bystander Approach to Violence: Considerations for Implementation in Europe', *Psychology of Violence*, 7(3): 450–58.

Fenton, R.A. and Mott, H.L. (2017b) *Preliminary Evaluation of The Intervention Initiative, a Bystander Intervention Program to Prevent Violence Against Women in Universities* (under review).

Fenton, R.A. and Mott, H.L. (2015) *The Intervention Initiative: Student Feedback February 2015*, Bristol: University of the West of England, https://public.uwe.ac.uk/faculties/BBS/BUS/law/Law%20docs/bystander/Partners/Student_Feedback_report.pdf **{this is an intranet address, so can't be accessed without a student/staff log-in – is there a public facing URL?}**

Fenton, R.A., Mott, H.L., McCartan, K. and Rumney, P.N.S. (2014) 'The Intervention Initiative toolkit and website' http://www1.uwe.ac.uk/bl/research/interventioninitiative/thetoolkit.aspx **{Intervention Initiative website has moved – please provide new URL}**

Fenton, R.A., Mott, H.L., McCartan, K. and Rumney, P.N.S. (2016) *A Review of Evidence for Bystander Intervention to Prevent SDV in Universities* (No. 2016011), London: Public Health England, www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/515634/Evidence_review_bystander_intervention_to_prevent_sexual_and_domestic_violence_in_universities_11April2016.pdf

Flood, M. (2006) 'Changing men: Best practice in sexual violence education', *Women Against Violence*, 18: 26–36.

Gidycz, C.A., Orchowski, L.M., and Berkowitz, A.D. (2011) 'Preventing sexual aggression among college men: An evaluation of a social norms and bystander intervention program', *Violence Against Women*, 17 (6): 720–42.

Hilton, N.Z., Harris, G.T., Rice, M.E., Smith Krans, T., and Lavigne, S.E. (1998) 'Antiviolence education in high schools: Implementation and evaluation', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 13(6): 726–42.

Hilton, N.Z. (2000) 'The role of attitudes and awareness in anti-violence education', *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment and Trauma*, 3(1): 221–38.

Janis, I.L. and King, B.T. (1954) 'The influence of role playing on opinion change', *The Journal Of Abnormal And Social Psychology*, 49(2): 211–18.

Kelly, L. (1987) 'The continuum of sexual violence' in Hanmer, J., and Maynard, M. (eds) *Women, Violence and Social Control*, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, pp 46–60.

Latané, B. and Darley, J.M. (1970) *The Unresponsive Bystander: Why Doesn't He Help?* New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.

Lewis, R., Marine, S. and Keeney, K. (2016) '"I get together with my friends and I change it": Young feminist students resist 'laddism', 'rape culture' and 'everyday sexism"', *Journal of Gender Studies*, 27 (1): 56–72.

McMahon, S. (2010) 'Rape myth beliefs and bystander attitudes among incoming college students', *Journal of American College Health*, 59 (1): 3–11.

McMahon, S. and Banyard, V.L. (2012) 'When can I help? A conceptual framework for the prevention of sexual violence through bystander intervention', *Trauma, Violence and Abuse*, 13 (1): 3–14.

McMahon, S., Postmus, J.L. and Koenick, R.A. (2011) 'Conceptualizing the engaging bystander approach to sexual violence prevention on college campuses', *Journal of College Student Development*, 52 (1): 115–30.

Nation, M., Crusto, C., Wandersman, A., Kumpfer, K.L., Seybolt, D., Morrissey-Kane, E. and Davino, K. (2003) 'What works in prevention: Principles of effective prevention programs', *American Psychologist*, 58 (6–7): 449–56.

NUS (National Union of Students) (2011) *Hidden Marks: A Study of Women Students' Experiences of Harassment, Stalking, Violence and Sexual Assault*, London: NUS, www.nus.org.uk/Global/NUS_hidden_marks_report_2nd_edition_web.pdf

Paul, L.A. and Gray, M.J. (2011) 'Sexual assault programming on college campuses: using social psychological belief and behavior change principles to improve outcomes', *Trauma, Violence and Abuse*, 12 (2): 99–109.

Powell, A. (2011) *Review of Bystander Approaches in Support of Preventing Violence Against Women*, No. P-052-V B, Carlton, VIC, Australia: Victoria Health Promotion Foundation.

Prochaska, J.O. and DiClemente, C.C. (1983) 'Stages and processes of self-change of smoking: toward an integrative model of change', *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 51 (3): 390–95.

Ricardo, C., Eads, M. and Barker, G. (2011) *Engaging Boys and Young Men in the Prevention of Sexual Violence*, Pretoria, South Africa: Sexual Violence Research Initiative and Promundo, www.svri.org/menandboys.pdf **{URL no longer works – please provide alternative}**

Rich, M.D., Utley, E.A., Janke, K. and Moldoveanu, M. (2010) "'I'd rather be doing something else": male resistance to rape prevention programs', *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 18 (3): 268–88.

Roy, R.E., Weibust K.S. and. Miller C.T. (2007) 'Effects of stereotypes about feminists on feminist self-identification', *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31: 146–56.

Schwartz, M.D., DeKeseredy, W.S., Tait, D. and Alvi, S. (2001) 'Male peer support and a feminist routine activities theory: Understanding sexual assault on the college campus', *Justice Quarterly*, 18 (3): 623–49.

Universities UK (2016) *Changing the Culture, Report of the Universities UK Taskforce Examining Violence Against Women, Harassment and Hate Crime Affecting University Students*, London: Universities UK, www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Documents/2016/changing-the-culture.pdf

Withey, C. (2010) 'Rape and sexual assault education: where is the law?', *New Criminal Law Review*, 13 (4): 802–25.

Witte, T.H. and Mulla, M.M. (2013) 'Social Norms for Intimate Partner Violence', *Violence and Victims*, 28 (6): 959–96.