

**Lessons Learned from Bystander Intervention Prevention in Ending Sexual
and Relationship violence and Stalking: Translations for Hazing Prevention**

**Jane Stapleton
Prevention Innovations**

**Elizabeth Allan
University of Maine**

2014

Lessons Learned from Bystander Intervention Prevention in Ending Sexual and Relationship violence and Stalking: Translations for Hazing Prevention

While the issues of sexual and relationship violence and stalking (for the purposes of this review, these issues are considered related) and hazing are distinct phenomena, they share many common dynamics and incident characteristics. The findings from the National Study of Student Hazing (Allan & Madden, 2008) indicate that slightly over half of students involved in clubs, teams and organizations experience hazing and the behaviors that are perpetrated against them are abusive, risky and potentially illegal. Alcohol consumption is a major component of hazing and the hazing behavior takes place in both private and public spaces. Coaches, parents, alumni, friends and peers are often aware of the incidence of hazing and in some cases they are present during perpetration. Yet, only a small percentage of students report that they are victims of hazing activities. Hazing is seen as part of campus culture and while nearly half of college students experience hazing, only a small percentage identify these experiences as hazing. Finally, students indicate limited exposure to hazing prevention.

Sexual assault of women is the most common violent crime committed on college campuses today (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000). One in five college women experience a sexual assault during their college career (Fisher, Cullen & Turner, 2000; Krebs, Lindquist, Warner, & Fisher, 2009). The majority of attempted and completed sexual assaults on college campus are perpetrated by

acquaintances (e.g., classmates, residence hall neighbors, dates) or intimate partners of the victim (Fisher et al., 2000; Koss & Harvey, 1991; Sampson, 2002). A recent study of undergraduate students at eight colleges and universities (Banyard, Cohn, Edwards, Moynihan, Walsh & Ward, 2012) found that 19% of women experienced unwanted sexual contact and 5% experienced unwanted sexual intercourse during their first academic year. Women ages 16-24 experience the highest rates of intimate partner violence and 20% of college female students will experience an incident of intimate partner violence (Rennison & Welchans. (2000). Sexual assault does not solely affect women. Three to 4% of American men report an attempted or completed rape during adulthood (Elliott, Mok, & Briere, 2004) and 8% of college men report an attempted or completed assault while in college (Banyard et al., 2012). For men and women, exposure to sexual and intimate partner violence is associated with a multiplicity of negative outcomes, including substance abuse, depressive symptoms, and symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder (e.g., Brener, McMahon, Warren, & Douglas, 1999).

Like hazing, perpetrators of sexual violence often use alcohol and/or drugs to intoxicate victims (Krebs, Lindquist, Warner, Fisher & Martin 2009). Male sexual assault survivors are less likely than female survivors to tell anyone about the assault and both male and female survivors are reluctant to disclose to anyone because they are ashamed, feel it is a private matter, are concerned others will find out, don't want the perpetrator to get into trouble, and are afraid of retribution from the perpetrator, of not being believed, and being blamed for the

assault (Banyard, Ward, Cohn, Plante & Moorhead, 2007). When they do disclose, survivors are most likely to disclose to a close friend and a roommate (Banyard, et. al., 2007). The perpetration of sexual violence on college campuses occurs amidst a culture where there is peer support for forced sex (Abbey, McAuslan, Zawacki, Clinton, & Buck, 2001) and normalization of rape (Lisak & Miller, 2002). The increasing awareness of the problem of sexual violence and the norms that support its perpetration have initiated recent attention to the prevention of sexual violence on college campuses. Recent, 2011, Title IX (US Department of Education) guidance emphasizes the need for colleges and universities to initiate immediate and effective steps, including prevention, to end sexual harassment and sexual violence. Additionally, the Campus SAVE Act (2013 Reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act) specifically requires institutions of higher education to put in place education programs to promote the awareness of rape, acquaintance rape, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking with first-year students and new employees, as well as ongoing prevention and awareness campaigns for students and faculty. These new “oversights” and expectations are motivating colleges and universities to initiate prevention strategies to reduce the incidence of sexual and relationship violence and stalking on campus.

While there is an absence of similar federal guidance to end hazing on campus, the National Collaborative for Hazing Research and Prevention has documented the extent and seriousness of hazing on college campuses (Allan & Madden, 2008). Through its Consortium, the Collaborative has outlined a multi-

year plan to develop an evidence base to support hazing prevention on college campuses. This comprehensive prevention framework includes assessment, planning, capacity building, technical assistance, implementation and evaluation. With an emphasis on research-informed practice and practice-based research, there is much that can be translated from sexual and relationship violence and stalking prevention research and applied to hazing prevention. Highlighting bystander intervention prevention, this report summarizes current theories, literature and research on the prevention of sexual and relationship violence and stalking. Suggestions for the translation of knowledge, research and practice from the sexual and relationship violence prevention field to hazing prevention are highlighted. Rather than a manual, this report is intended to be a guide that shares lessons learned. Thus, this report is meant to inform and build upon the Hazing Consortium's ongoing efforts to develop comprehensive evidence-based hazing prevention strategies.

Suggested Applications:

During year one, the assessment phase, Hazing Consortium partners have worked on their campuses to build comprehensive campus coalitions to support hazing prevention and collected assessment data related to hazing climate, activities and needs/priorities. In conjunction with year one assessment data, this report can be used in year two as a road map to support the development and implementation of hazing prevention strategies. An important component of this application will be the identification of who the bystanders are on campus. While we may traditionally think of bystanders as those individuals

who directly witness hazing, it is important to conceptualize bystanders and bystander intervention within an ecological framework. While the scope may vary from campus to campus, it will be important for Consortium partners to identify bystanders and bystander intervention beyond the individual level. This might include alumni, parents, campus administrators, and business owners. In addition to understanding who the bystanders are, it is equally important to identify elements (i.e. policies, protocols, media messages, etc.) of the community that encourage and/or discourage bystander intervention. This can be accomplished by identifying the multiple levels and opportunities for bystander intervention and detailing the elements that support, as well as serve as barriers to effective intervention and prevention. Finally, attitudes and ideologies about bystander intervention prevention must be understood if ultimately Consortium partners seek to build their communities' capacity to support bystander intervention to prevent hazing.

While the Consortium's work is focused on hazing prevention, it is equally as important for partners to consider the connections between the perpetration, as well as prevention of hazing, sexual and relationship violence and stalking, alcohol and drug abuse, and other illegal or "risky" behaviors on campus. If these offenses are considered as part of a larger system of power and control, then prevention of each type of offense can be strengthened by collaborative approaches which seek to build bystander interventions strategies that transform entire communities on multiple levels. With the development of campus coalitions during year one, Consortium partners have developed strong foundations for

collaborative approaches to bystander intervention to flourish. This is an ideal opportunity to implement comprehensive prevention strategies beyond the silos that sometimes divide our institutions. The Consortium partners and the Hazing Collaborative are well on their way to leading the prevention field and this report can support their important work.

Prevention of Sexual and Relationship Violence and Stalking – Public Health Problems and Approaches and Theories of Prevention

Sexual and relationship violence (also referred to as intimate partner violence and domestic violence) gained recognition as public health problems in the 1990's when the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention identified them as among the most pressing public health problems (National Center for Injury Prevention, 2003) of our time. Data from the 1995 National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS) indicates “that violence results in nearly 2.0 million injuries, more than 550,000 of which require medical attention. Additionally, intimate partner violence victims also lose a total of nearly 8.0 million days of paid work—the equivalent of more than 32,000 full-time jobs—and nearly 5.6 million days of household productivity as a result of the violence (National Center for Injury Prevention, p.19, 2003).”

As such, CDC applied a public health approach to preventing these problems with an emphasis on supporting prevention programs on three levels. The three levels are primary, secondary and tertiary prevention. Primary prevention refers to prevention efforts to stop the problem before it occurs, thus it looks to reduce both the incidence and prevalence of the problem. Secondary

prevention addresses the incidence of sexual and relationship violence while it is occurring. Finally, tertiary prevention addresses the problem after it has occurred by targeting the person who has been victimized.

Within the field of sexual and relationship violence and Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory (1989) guides the approach to prevention by focusing on the relationships between individuals and environments. The levels of the social system include the individual in the center, surrounded by the microsystem, the mesosystem, exosystem and macrosystem. Each level of the social system must be engaged to effect change, thus enacting effective prevention of the problem.

CDC has identified several theories of social change to guide rape prevention and education. These include:

Theory of Reasoned Action (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980) - in order to change behavior, you must increase the belief that the behavior is negative and others disapprove of it

Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991) - our behaviors are influenced by our social and physical environments. In order to change, the environment must support one to engage in a certain behavior.

The Health Belief Model (Becker, 1974) – in order to take preventative action, one must feel susceptible to the problem and feel confident in their ability to take action against it.

The Community Readiness for Prevention Model (Edwards, Jumper-Thurman, Lested, Oetting & Swanson, 2000) – community readiness determine receptivity to prevention messages.

Diffusion of Innovation (Rogers, 1965) – effective diffusion engages “early innovators” to disseminate the prevention messages throughout the social system.

What we know about prevention

In a comprehensive review of prevention programs within the substance abuse, risky sexual behavior, school failure, and juvenile delinquency and violence fields, Nation Crusto, Wandersman, Kumpfer, Seybolt, Morrissey-Kane and Davino 2003 examine the elements of effective prevention programs. They identify nine principles of the effectiveness of prevention programs within three broad areas: program characteristics, matching the program with a target population and implementation and evaluation of prevention programs.

Prevention programs are most effective when they have the following characteristics:

Comprehensive – Programs that have multiple interventions within multiple settings have been found to increase awareness and encourage development of specific skills. It is essential to engage the systems that have an impact on the development of the problem behavior and address the community norms associated with the problem behavior.

Varied Teaching Methods – Effective programs have some type of active, skills-based component that includes interactive instructions and hands-on experiences to increase skills.

Sufficient Dosage – One time programs have limited effect. Thus, prevention programs should expose participants to enough of an intervention for it to have an effect so that it can be measured in quantity and quality. Initial intervention and follow-up or booster sessions support the strength of impact.

Theory Driven – Prevention programs that are grounded in scientific theory of change are the most effective programs.

Prevention Programs need to be appropriate to the target population:

Appropriately Timed – To have maximum impact, interventions must be developmentally appropriate. They should also be timed to prevent precursors to behavior (primary prevention), rather than full-blown problem behavior (tertiary prevention).

Socioculturally Relevant– Prevention needs to be relevant to participants, by local community norms and cultural beliefs and practices. Additionally, prevention programs must address individual needs of participants. Potter, Moynihan and Stapleton (2011) also refer to the importance of target audience in the development of prevention strategies and has developed the concept of “social self identification”. If the target audience doesn’t see themselves in the intervention, the effectiveness of the strategy is reduced or diminished.

Carefully planned evaluation and implementation are essential to effective program:

Outcome Evaluation – In order to determine effectiveness, outcomes of prevention programs must be measured.

Well-Trained Staff – Prevention providers need to be carefully selected, trained and supervised. Other qualities of preventionists include sensitivity and competence in the subject matter and prevention delivery methods. ,

Campuses and Prevention

Despite the fact that college campus communities are at-risk environments for sexual and relationship violence, a recent report by Karjane, Fisher and Cullen (2005) indicates great variability nationally in the extent to which campuses are working to prevent this problem. This study of college and university responses to sexual violence found that less than half of the schools in their study offered training related to sexual assault. Only 60% of the surveyed schools offered educational prevention programs, with few of these programs focused on acquaintance rape (the most common form of sexual violence). Prevention has usually meant educational programming (e.g., Breitenbecher, 2000; Foubert & McEwen, 1998; Heppner, Humphrey, Hillenbrand-Gunn, & Debord, 1995; Lanier, Elliott, Martin, & Kapadia, 1998; Lonsway & Kothari, 2000; O'Brien, 2001; Pinzone-Glover, Gidycz, & Jacobs, 1998; Schewe & O'Donohue, 1996), but these studies demonstrate mixed results regarding effectiveness especially over time (e.g., Lonsway, 1996; Yeater & Donohue, 1999).

Rape prevention curricula also have been criticized for focusing too much on individuals, small groups (such as athletes or fraternity members), or criminal justice policies rather than on wider social change (e.g., Potter, Krider, &

McMahon, 2000; Swift & Ryan-Finn, 1995). Schewe and O'Donohue's (1993) review of rape prevention also specifically highlights ways in which many programs focus on rape avoidance and may be directly or indirectly victim-blaming. Additionally, many traditional programs focus mainly on men as potential perpetrators and women as potential victims. Lonsway (1996) discusses how the main messages of sexual violence prevention programs may be difficult for participants in primary prevention programs to take in, and calls for innovations in programs that would decrease defensiveness and enable participants to examine attitudes and behaviors that may be strongly held and emotionally charged.

In a comprehensive review of campus-based gender violence prevention programming, Gibbons (2013) examines elements of program effectiveness and suggest implications for practitioners. First and foremost, prevention should follow an ecological model which engages all members of the community and includes strategies aimed at policy and organizational practices, as well as cultural change on the individual level. Thus, prevention will require investment of the entire community. They note that prevention programs can create safe climates where victims are encouraged to report, both formally and informally, the incidence of sexual assault. Programs have short-term effects of increasing knowledge of the problem of sexual violence and decreasing rape myths. Effectiveness is reduced over time. Boosters can help sustain program effects and the higher the dosage of the prevention strategy, the greater the effect. Single gender audiences have greater effectiveness than mixed gender ones,

although bystander intervention programs are effective with both mixed and single gender groups. Bystander intervention prevention approaches show the “significant promise” for effecting both knowledge and behavior to prevent violence. Gibbons notes that such outcomes are encouraging because they achieve short and intermediate-level goals that are necessary for longer-term change. However, the impact of prevention on the reduction sexual violence victimization and perpetration has not been measured. This is partly due to the fact that it is difficult to measure the long-term impact of prevention, particularly because communities often find that the dissemination of prevention strategies is often followed by increases in the reported incidence of sexual violence. Some researchers (Banyard, Moynihan, Cares & Warner, 2013 and Gidycz, Orchowski & Berkowitz, 2011) are beginning to attempt to measure the longer-term effects, specifically through bystander prevention strategies.

Bystander Approach

In recent years there has been a paradigm shift in the delivery of prevention programs addressing sexual and intimate partner violence and stalking. Focus has moved away from addressing potential perpetrators and victims, and toward engaging all members of the community. An innovation is the implementation of a bystander approach to reducing the widespread problem of sexual and relationship violence on campuses and in other communities (e.g., Banyard, et al, 2004; 2005, 2007; Berkowitz, 2002; DeKeseredy, Schwartz, & Alvi, 2000; Foubert, 2000; Foubert & Marriott, 1997; Katz 1995, 1995; O’Brien, 2001; Slaby & Stringham, 1994). The bystander approach teaches community members how to

intervene in situations that involve sexual and relationship violence and stalking. Support for prevention programs with a bystander perspective comes from theories and research on the causes of sexual and relationship violence; research on factors that increase the likelihood that men (a traditionally underrepresented group in sexual and relationship violence prevention efforts) will be involved in rape prevention; the key role of informal helpers in strengthening safety nets for survivors and helping criminal justice professionals identify and bring perpetrators to justice; and lessons learned in other areas of prevention about the powerful role of peer norms.

While involving programming that trains groups of individuals, the bystander model takes the next steps toward a broader, community approach to prevention. The model gives all community members a specific role that they can identify with and adopt in preventing the community problem of sexual and relationship violence. This role includes interrupting situations that could lead to assault before the assault happens or during an incident, speaking out against social norms that support sexual and relationship violence, and developing skills to be an effective and supportive ally to survivors.

Criminological theory predicts, and previous research finds, that community norms and attitudes also are important explanatory factors for the prevalence of sexual and relationship violence on college campuses and thus, a key target for prevention efforts. Schwartz, DeKeseredy, Tait, and Alvi (2001) use feminist routine activities theory to explain sexual and relationship violence, particularly on college campuses. Their combined application of feminist routine

activities theory (Schwartz & Pitts, 1995) and male support theory (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997) provides an important theoretical contribution to understanding men's motivation to perpetrate sexual and relationship violence on college campuses. Routine activities theory (Cohen & Felson, 1979) asserts that crimes occur because of the presence of three factors: the presence of likely offenders; the absence of capable guardians; and the availability of suitable targets. While this theory has wide application to understanding many crimes, the absence of addressing the motivation of perpetrators has been criticized (Akers 2000). Schwartz and Pitts (1995) build upon routine activities theory by suggesting that sexual assault on campus occurs because there are motivated offenders on campus. These men are surrounded, supported and rewarded by all-male groups that encourage and legitimate the sexual exploitation of women. Combining feminist routine activities theory with male peer support theory, they argue that men perpetrate this violence because they have other men's support to commit these crimes. These peer norms increase offender motivation for the use of violence in intimate and dating relationships. This makes men more likely to see dating violence as acceptable and women more likely to blame themselves for victimization (Schwartz et al., 2001).

Routine activities theory stresses that the amount and location of crime also is predicted by the "absence of capable guardians (Schwartz et al. p.630)," third parties or bystanders who by their presence and actions may be able to help deter the problem when it is in progress or as a risky situation develops". They argue that communities will have higher rates of sexual violence to the extent

that community and peer norms support individual coercive behavior in relationships, provide excuses for those who use coercion, and lack community members who use informal social control to inhibit perpetrators and protect potential victims. Schwartz et al. found support for this view in data from a national survey of Canadian college campuses. For example, Schwartz and DeKeseredy (1997, 1998, 2000) found higher rates of sexual violence on campuses with higher levels of “male peer support” for sexual violence.

Further empirical support comes from the work of Lisak and Miller (2002), whose detailed interviews with undetected rapists revealed the many ways predators use community contexts to facilitate their crimes. Of nearly 2,000 men who participated in their study, they found that only 6% of their sample had committed crimes that met the legal definition of sexual assault. During in-depth interviews with these men, Lisak and Miller found that 73% of these men had completed multiple sexual assaults, as well as various other crimes, including theft, child abuse and intimate partner violence. Common assumptions about rapists indicate that many men sexually assault women. However, Lisak and Miller’s research confirms that it is actually a small number of men committing sexual assault and that these men are serial rapists who commit multiple assaults. These core sex offenders are surrounded by what Lisak and Miller term “facilitators”. These are community members who help facilitate the core sex offenders’ crimes by making their rooms available to perpetrators so that they can commit their crimes; they buy alcohol that is then used by offenders to intoxicate potential victims, etc. Potential bystanders surround these facilitators

and core offenders. These potential bystanders have multiple opportunities to step in and stop both the facilitators' and offenders' actions.

The core offender's behaviors are normalized and the impact of their actions is camouflaged by a culture of sexism, calloused attitudes toward women and hyper-masculinity. Thus, community norms support offenders' behaviors and these men go undetected. Thus Lisak and Miller call them "undetected rapists". They assert that undetected rapists will not be reached through prevention education, but rather through improved criminal justice responses. Such justice system responses are strengthened, however, by changing community norms that allow perpetrators to hide behind the silence of bystanders.

Such theoretical perspectives suggest that sexual and relationship violence and stalking will be eliminated only when broader social norms also are addressed and a broader range of individuals are reached. When community members realize that they have a role to play in ending sexual and relationship violence, then the community norms that silence victims and bystanders will change so that undetected rapists are no longer hidden behind jokes, rape myths, and the problematic stereotype that rapists are strangers in the bushes (rather than nice looking people you meet at a party or at work). In addition, this research also points to an untapped resource for communities - the powerful role that informal helpers may play in both preventing victimization and assisting survivors (e.g., Mahlstadt & Keeny, 1993; West & Wandrei, 2002). For example, Anderson and Danis (2007) studied informal helping among sorority sisters in one campus community. They noted that sororities, in spite of being an at-risk

sub-community for victimization, had few policies or explicit training to enable their community to deal with dating violence should it happen. They state, “Although participants expressed comfort that the issue of relationship violence would be addressed if it happened, the participants, who are leaders within their sororities, did not express having the comfort, knowledge, and skill levels to do so (p.93).” Prevention programs provide an opportunity for such skill development, widening the safety net for survivors. Banyard et al. (2007) present the first experimental study of this issue and Potter et. al. (2008) apply the bystander framework to social marketing prevention methods with data showing success. Although the number of prevention strategies utilizing some or all of the bystander approach is growing, evaluation of the effectiveness of these programs has not kept pace with these innovations.

Overview of bystander intervention¹

The first research on bystander intervention was initiated by social psychologist (Latane & Darley, 1968) in response to the brutal murder of Kitty Genovese in 1964 (New York Times, March 27, 1964). It is estimated that at least 38 people witnessed and/or heard the perpetrators attack and ultimately murder Ms. Genovese. While several people distracted the perpetrator by turning on lights and making noise, none of the witnesses stepped in to assist the victim. While the perpetrator left the scene of the crime, possibly as a result of the distractions, he came back the scene of the crime three times to assault and ultimately murder Kitty Genovese. Social psychologists at the time asked, “how

¹ Based on presentation, “Using Research to Build Training Content”, by Mary M. Moynihan at the Bystander Intervention Training Institute, June, 2010

could everyday, well-meaning people literally stand by and not intervene while they witnessed such a heinous crime?" This question generated a body of research that examined the situational factors that influence bystander intervention. These factors include:

Recognizing the situation- In order to intervene, one must first be aware of a problem or potential problem and recognize the negative impact on the victim (Batson, 1998). This reduces ambiguity around the circumstances of the situation and increases the likelihood that bystanders will intervene.

Being asked- Those who are asked and agree to help in a situation, are far more likely to intervene than those who are not asked (Moriarty, 1975).

Role model- Having role models who help and witnessing others provide help in other situations facilitate bystander intervention (e.g., Batson, 1998).

Sense of personal responsibility – An individual's bystander actions are influenced the empathy that they have for the victim or potential victim and norms about helping. The higher the empathy, the more likely it is that the potential bystander will intervene, particularly if the social norms of the environment that they are in encourage helping. (Latane´ & Darley, 1976).

Group size - The number of bystanders that witness an event influences whether or not one of the bystanders will intervene. Specifically, the larger the number of bystanders, the slower each individual will be to act to intervene. The responsibility for responding is diffused among the large group which inhibits individual responses. Latane´ and Darley, 1968, identified this phenomenon as "diffusion of responsibility".

Audience inhibition -_The bystander who decides to intervene runs the risk of embarrassment , particularly if their action or the situation in which they are

intervening is misinterpreted and is not actually an emergency. The more people present, the greater this risk of misinterpretation. The presence of others can inhibit helping when individuals are fearful that their behavior can be seen by others and evaluated negatively (Latane´ & Nida, 1981).

Social influence also contributes to the social inhibition of helping. Since an apparent helping situation is likely to be ambiguous, an individual looks to other people to help define it. The presence of others can thus inhibit helping when individuals see the inaction of others and interpret the situation as less critical than it actually is or decide that inaction is the expected pattern of behavior. (Latane´ & Nida, 1981).

Efficacy and skills - Bystander intervention and helping will be increased in situations where costs of intervening are reduced (Christy & Voigt, 1994; Hutson et al, 1991 and Lanier et al 2001). Actual competencies and skills such as actively listening to others, building coalitions with others and planning specific strategies create change (Zimmerman,1995 and Dalton et al., 2001).

Community readiness to change model - More recently, bystander intervention research has focused on the ways that community norms can be influenced by bystander behaviors. Models of community readiness to change suggest that broader community norms may also play role in facilitating bystander willingness to intervene. Efforts to change individual behaviors cannot occur outside an analysis of the broader social context of attitudes that may support or hinder such changes (Edwards et al, 2000).

Bystander Intervention Prevention Strategies

Bystander intervention prevention strategies are grounded in the assumption that sexual and relationship violence and stalking occur because community norms support and encourage such behaviors. Recent research finds that in person prevention programs (Banyard et al, 2012; Katz, Heisterkamp & Flemming, 2011, Moynihan et al, 2011; Gidycz et al, 2011, Langhinrichsen-Rolling et al, 2011; Coker et al, 2011) and more recently social marketing campaigns (Potter, Moynihan, & Stapleton, 2011) and interactive theater projects (Ahrens, Rich & Ulman, 2011) that utilize a bystander framework to make community members aware of their role as an active bystander in preventing sexual and relationship violence and stalking offer thoughtful and effective methods to change cultural norms and attitudes in the communities. Research on engaging communities to end sexual violence through bystander intervention strategies was highlighted in a special issue of the *Journal Violence Against Women* (Volume 17, Number 6, 2011). Evaluations of Bringing in the Bystander®, The Mentors in Violence Program (MVP), The Men's Program and Green Dot suggest that in-person bystander intervention prevention programs increase participants' awareness of the problem of sexual violence and bystander intervention, sense that the prevention of sexual violence is their responsibility, willingness to intervene and self-reported bystander behaviors. In-person programs have also reduced participants' adherence to rape myths, which ultimately support perpetrators' behaviors.

Sexual and relationship violence prevention on college campuses has historically meant the presentation of educational programming, but studies of these programs demonstrate mixed results regarding effectiveness, especially over time (e.g., Anderson & Whiston, 2005). Many sexual prevention initiatives focus either on an in-person workshop or a social marketing campaign. To date, Bringing in the Bystander is the only evaluated in-person prevention program that combines these two strategies synergistically in one community using a bystander framework. Findings from a recent evaluation (Banyard, Potter, Cares, Moynihan, Williams & Stapleton, In Press) of the combination of these prevention strategies indicate that the in-person and social marketing campaign are effective as stand alone prevention strategies. But, the effect of the in-person program is strengthened when the social marketing campaign is used as a booster.

Innovative approaches to the delivery of bystander intervention prevention are interactive theater presentations (Ahrens, Pich & Ulman, 2011) and social marketing campaigns (Potter & Stapleton, 2011). Evaluation findings suggest similar effectiveness to in-person programs in increasing awareness, decreasing rape myths and increasing self reported bystander behaviors. These new approaches to the dissemination of prevention messages offer strategies to engage target audience members by asking them to participate in the actual demonstration of the bystander intervention prevention skills and to consider situations in which to intervene (interactive theater), as well as witness bystander intervention skills through passive techniques (social marketing campaigns) Interactive on-line modules are the latest wave of dissemination strategies, but to

date, none have been scientifically evaluated to determine effectiveness and to ensure that they do not have a backlash effect.

Social marketing campaigns have the potential to increase public knowledge on a given topic and to use this knowledge gain to provide members of the public specific directions for changing their current behaviors (Randolph & Viswanath, 2004). Social marketing campaigns are used routinely to educate specific public audiences on a myriad of issues that range from HIV/AIDs prevention (Dawson & Hartfield, 1996), the perils of smoking (Hersey, et al., 2005), high risk drinking behaviors (DeJong, 2002; Glider, Midyett, Mills-Novoa, Johannessen, & Collins, 2001; Haines, 1996; Thombs & Hamilton, 2002; Turner, Perkins, & Bauerle, 2008), emergency contraception (Trussell, Koenig, Vaughan, & Stewart, 2001), seat belt use (Clark, et al., 1999), health promotion (Wallack, 1990) fruit and vegetable consumption (Shive & Morris, 2006) and bicycle helmet use (Ludwig, Buchholz, & Clarke, 2005). The underlying goal of social marketing campaigns is to change individual behavior by stressing fundamental problems associated with the individual's present behavior. Well developed, and subsequently funded, social marketing campaigns use many of the "principals and techniques" of merchandize marketers (Kotler & Roberto, 1990), including print, radio, online technologies and television. In their review of the prevention field, Wandersman and Florin (2003) highlight the need for primary prevention efforts that target whole communities and specifically recommend media or social marketing campaigns.

Translation to Hazing Prevention

As we look to apply lessons learned from the prevention of sexual and relationship violence and stalking bystander intervention field to hazing prevention, it is important to keep “community” at the center of the translation. Research on the victimization of both the hazing (Allan & Madden, 2008) and sexual violence (i.e. Abbey, McAuslan, Zawacki, Clinton, & Buck, 2001 and McMahan, 2012) and perpetration of sexual violence (Lisak & Miller, 2002) indicate that perpetration often occurs as a “normalized” activity within campus cultures. While not all community members perpetrate these acts, a number of individuals help to facilitate the perpetration of hazing, sexual and relationship violence, and stalking. Additionally, many people directly witness hazing behaviors or learn about the perpetration second hand. These people have the potential to intervene to stop its occurrence and/or provide support to victims after the incident.

Prevention is about changing community norms. Hazing, like sexual and relationship violence and stalking, occurs in the presence of community members and community policies and protocols– or lack thereof, that support its incidence. Similar to Lisak and Miller’s (2002) research on sexual violence perpetration, hazing is done in the presence of facilitators who assist in the perpetration and apathetic bystanders who have the potential to intervene, but instead support its occurrence by normalizing the hazing behavior. The National Study on Student Hazing (Allan & Madden, 2008) finds that many students are aware of and witness acts of hazing on their campus. While the list of hazing behaviors is diverse, one can easily see how facilitators and apathetic bystanders support

hazing behaviors. For example, the student who owns the car that is used to drop off first-year athletes in a remote location and then are left to walk back to campus in the middle of the night helps to facilitate this instance of hazing, even if they “loaned” the car to another team member who drove the students to the remote location. Parents who know that their daughter is the victim of hazing, but suggest that she “suck it up” because the incident is part of being a member of a campus club normalize a hazing culture. Similarly, campuses that have formal anti-hazing policies, but do not make formal efforts to distribute the policy to students and/or do not have hazing prevention programs create a culture where hazing and hazing prevention are not taken seriously. To effectively create a culture that supports anti-hazing, campuses must employ hazing prevention strategies that are based on an ecological model that engages all levels of the social system and includes policy and organizational change, as well as skill building and increasing knowledge on the individual level. Everyone has a role to play in ending hazing.

Feminist routine activity and male support theories, applied to sexual violence by Schwartz, et. al. (2001), may provide important lenses to understand both the motivation and support for hazing on campus. While it is clear that not all hazing is perpetrated by men and in all male groups (Allan & Madden, 2008), it is important to explore the ways in which peers support and reinforce hazing behaviors. This includes understanding factors that would support dismantling, as well as barriers to challenging these peer norms. Despite the existence of anti-hazing laws and campuses anti-hazing policies, the absence of capable

guardians and informal social controls contribute to the likelihood of hazing perpetration. As we look to change community norms and build peer support for anti-hazing, it is essential that we develop hazing prevention strategies that engage bystanders to intervene before, during and after hazing occurs. Primary prevention of hazing requires changing norms that reward and legitimize hazing.

To maximize the likelihood that bystanders will engage in prosocial helping behavior, hazing prevention strategies should include the following information and build upon the following bystander skills: an understanding of the hazing and its negative impact on victims; participants need to see themselves as partially responsible for solving the problem; hazing victims should not be presented as the cause of their own problems; an understanding of the consequences of nonintervention; asking participants to make a commitment to help end hazing activities; build participants' skills and confidence that they possess the skills to intervene; have participants practice decision-making process to assess the situation and choose a safe intervention option in which the benefits of intervening outweigh the costs; provide participants with the opportunity to view individuals who model intervention behaviors; and build a sense within participants that intervening enhances the individual's status in the group or community.

Similarly, hazing prevention strategies should include elements of what we know works in prevention: comprehensive, varied teaching; sufficient dosage; theory driven; appropriately timed; socioculturally relevant; and presented by well-trained staff. Outcome evaluation should measure effects of prevention

strategies, including the impact on the incidence of hazing. The effects of hazing prevention strategies will be prolonged when communities adopt a comprehensive prevention strategy that involve multiple dissemination components, including in-person, social marketing, social norms campaigns and interactive social justice based presentations.

REFERENCES

- Abbey, A., McAuslan, P., Zawacki, T., Clinton, A., & Buck, P. O. (2001). Attitudinal, Experiential, and Situational Predictors of Sexual Assault Perpetration. *Journal Of Interpersonal Violence, 16*(8), 784.
- Ahrens, C., Rich, & Ullman, J. (2011). Rehearsing for Real Life: The Impact of the InterACT Sexual Assault Prevention Program on Self-Reported Likelihood of Engaging in Bystander Interventions. *Violence Against Women 17*: 760-776.
- Akers, R.L. 2000. *Criminological Theories*. 3rd ed. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury.
- Allan, E & Madden, M. (2008). Hazing in View: College Students at Risk. Initial Findings from the National Study of Student Hazing. Available at <http://www.endhazing.ca/files/hazing.pdf>.
- Anderson, L. A. & Whiston, S. C. (2005). Sexual assault education programs: A meta-analytic examination of their effectiveness. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 29*, 374-388.
- Ajzen, Icek (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50* (2): 179–211.
- Ajzen, I. & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Banyard V., Cohn E., Edwards K., Moynihan M. M., Walsh W., & Ward S. (2012). Unwanted Sexual Experiences, Stalking, and Physical Relationship Violence: Six-Month Incidences Among University and College Students in

- New England. University of New Hampshire. Durham, NH. Unpublished report.
- Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., Cares, A. C., & Warner, R. (2013). How Do We Know If It Works? Measuring Outcomes in Bystander-Focused Abuse Prevention on Campuses. *Psychology Of Violence*.
- Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., & Plante, E. G. (2007). Sexual violence prevention through bystander education: An experimental evaluation. *Journal of Community Psychology, 35*(4), 463-481.
- Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2005). Rape Prevention through Bystander Education: Final Report for NIJ grant 2002-WG-BX-0009.
- Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2004). Bystander education: Bringing a broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention. *Journal of Community Psychology, 32*(1), 61-79.
- Banyard V. L., Ward S., Cohn E. S., Plante E. G., Moorhead C., & Walsh W. (2007). "Unwanted sexual contact on campus: A comparison of women's and men's experiences." *Violence and Victims, 22*: 53–71.
- Batson, C. D. (1998). *Altruism and Prosocial Behavior*. In D.T. Gilbert, S.T. Fiske, & Lindzey, G. (Eds.) *The Handbook of Social Psychology II* (pp.282-316). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

- Becker, M.H. The Health Belief Model and Personal Health Behavior. *Health Education Monographs*. Vol. 2 No. 4.
- Berkowitz, A. D. (2002). Fostering Men's Responsibility for Preventing Sexual Assault. In P. A. Schewe (Ed.), *Preventing Violence in Relationships: Interventions Across the Lifespan* (pp. 163-196). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Breitenbecher, K.H. (2000). Sexual assault on college campuses: Is an ounce of prevention enough? *Applied and Preventive Psychology: Current Scientific Perspectives*, 9, 23-52.
- Brener N. D., McMahon P. M., Warren C. W., & Douglas K. A. (1999). Forced sexual intercourse and associated health-risk behaviors among female college students in the United States. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 67(2): 252-259.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1989). Ecological Systems Theory. In R. Vasta (Ed.), *Annals of child development: Vol 6. Six theories of child development: Revised formulations and current issues* (pp.187-251). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Clark, M. J., Schmitz, S., Conrad, A., Estes, C., Healy, M. M., & Hiltibidal, J. (1999). The Effects of an Intervention Campaign to Enhance Seat Belt Use on Campus. *Journal of American College Health*, 47(6), 277-280.
- Cohen, L.E. and M. Felson. 1979."Social Changes and Crime Rate Trends: A Routine Activities Approach." *American Sociological Review* 44:588-608.
- Coker, A.,Cook-Craig, P., Williams, C., Fisher, B.,Clear, E., Garcia, L., & and

- Hegge, L. (2011) Evaluation of Green Dot: An Active Bystander Intervention to Reduce Sexual Violence on College Campuses. *Violence Against Women*, 17: 777-796.
- Dawson, C., & Hartfield, K. (1996). Developing a Cost-Effective Media Campaign Addressing Unprotected Anal Sex Among Gay Men. *AIDS Education and Prevention: Official Publication of the International Society for Aids Education*, 8, 285-293.
- DeJong, W. (2002). The Role of Mass Media Campaigns in Reducing High-Risk Drinking among College Students. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol Supplement*, 14, 182-192.
- Edwards, R. W., Jumper-Thurman, P., Plested, B. A., Oetting, E. R., & L. Swanson (2000). Community readiness: Research to practice. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 28(3):291-307.
- Fisher, B., Cullen, F., & Turner, M. (2000). *The Sexual victimization of college women: findings from two national-level studies*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice and Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Foubert, J. & Marriot, K. (1997), Effects of a sexual assault peer education program on men's belief in rape myths. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 36, 257-266.
- Foubert, J. D., & McEwen, M. K. (1998). An all-male rape prevention peer education program: Decreasing fraternity men's behavioral intent to rape. *Journal of College Student Development*, 39, 548-556.
- Gibbons, R. (2013). *The Evaluation of Campus-based Gender Violence*

Prevention Programming: What We Know about Program Effectiveness and Implications for Practitioners. Harrisburg, PA: VAWnet, a project of the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence. Available at: <http://www.vawnet.org>

Gidycz, C., Orchowski, L. & Berkowitz, A. (2011). Preventing Sexual Aggression Among College Men: An Evaluation of a Social Norms and Bystander Intervention Program. *Violence Against Women*, 17: 720-742.

Glider, P., Midyett, S. J., Mills-Novoa, B., Johannessen, K., & Collins, C. (2001). Challenging the Collegiate Rite of Passage: A Campus-Wide Social Marketing Media Campaign to Reduce Binge Drinking. *Journal of Drug Education*, 31(2), 207-220.

Haines, M. (1996). *A Social Norms Approach to Preventing Binge Drinking at Colleges and Universities.* Newton, MA: The Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention.

Heppner, M. J., Humphrey, C. F., Hillenbrand-Gunn, T. L., & DeBord, K. A. (1995). The differential effects of rape prevention programming on attitudes, behavior, and knowledge. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 42, 508-518.

Katz, J. (1995). Reconstructing Masculinity in the Locker Room: The Mentors in Violence Prevention Project. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(2), 163-175.

Katz, J., Heisterkamp, A., & Fleming, W. (2011). The Social Justice Roots of the

- Mentors in Violence Prevention Model and Its Application in a High School Setting. *Violence Against Women*, 17: 684-702.
- Karjane, H. M., Fisher, B. S., & Cullen, F. T. (2005). *Sexual assault on campus: What colleges and universities are doing about it. NIJ Research for Practice Report. NCJ 205521.*
- Koss, M., & Harvey, M. (1991). *The rape victim: Clinical and community* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kotler, P., & Roberto, E. L. (1990). *Social Marketing: Strategies for Changing Public Behavior.* New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Adult Publishing Group.
- Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C. H., Warner, T. D., Fisher, B. S., & Martin, S. L. (2009). College Women's Experiences with Physically Forced, Alcohol- or Other Drug-Enabled, and Drug-Facilitated Sexual Assault Before and Since Entering College. *Journal Of American College Health*, 57(6), 639-649.
- Latane', B., & Darley, J. M. (1976). Help in a crisis: Bystander response to an emergency. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.
- Latane', B., & Darley, J. M. (1968). Group inhibition of bystander intervention. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 10, 215–221.
- Latane', B., & Nida, S. (1981). Ten years of research on group size and helping. *Psychological Bulletin*, 89, 308–324.
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J, Foubert, J, Brasfield, H, Hill, B & Shelley-Tremblay, S. (2011). The Men's Program: Does It Impact College Men's Self-

- Reported Bystander Efficacy and Willingness to Intervene? *Violence Against Women*, 17: 743-759.
- Lanier, C.A., Elliott, M.N., Martin, D.W., & Kapadia, A. ~1998!. Evaluation of an intervention to change attitudes toward date rape. *Journal of American College Health*, 46, 177–180.
- Lisak, D. and Miller, P. M. (2002). “Repeat rape and multiple offending among undetected rapists.” *Violence and Victims*, 17(1): 73-84.
- Lonsway, K. A. (1996), Preventing Acquaintance Rape Through Education: What Do We Know. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 20: 229–265.
- Lonsway, K.A., & Kothari, C. ~2000!. First year campus acquaintance rape education. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24, 220–232.
- Ludwig, T. D., Buchholz, C., & Clarke, S. W. (2005). Using Social Marketing to Increase the Use of Helmets Among Bicyclists. *Journal of American College Health*, 54(1), 51-58.
- Mahlsteat, D. & Keeny, L. (1999). Female Survivors of Dating Violence and Their Social Networks. *Feminism & Psychology*. 3 (3): 319-333.
- McMahon, Sarah. (2011, October). Changing Perceptions of Sexual Violence Over Time. Harrisburg, PA: VAWnet, a project of the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence. <http://www.vawnet.org>
- Moriarty, T. (1975). Crime, commitment and the responsive bystander: Two field

- experiments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 31, 370–376.
- Moynihan, M., Banyard, V. Arnold, J., Eckstein, R., & Stapleton, J. (2011). Sisterhood May Be Powerful for Reducing Sexual and Intimate Partner Violence: An Evaluation of the Bringing in the Bystander In-Person Program with Sorority Members. *Violence Against Women*, 7: 703-719.
- Nation, M., Crusto, C., Wandersman, A., Kumpfer, K. L., Seybolt, D., Morrissey-Kane, E., & Davino, K. (2003). What Works in Prevention. *American Psychologist*, 58(6/7), 449.
- National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. *Costs of Intimate Partner Violence Against Women in the United States*. Atlanta (GA): Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2003.
- New York Times. (1964). "Queens Woman Is Stabbed to Death in Front of Home". March 15, page 26.
- O'Brien, J. (2001). The MVP Program: Focus on student-athletes. In A. J. Ottens & K. Hotelling (Eds.), *Sexual Violence on Campus: Policies, Programs, and Perspectives* (pp. 98-119). New York: Springer Publishing.
- Pinzone-Glover, H.A., Gidycz, C.A., & Jacobs, C.D. ~1998!. An acquaintance rape prevention program: Effects on attitudes toward women, rape-related attitudes, and perceptions of rape scenarios. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 22, 605–621.
- Potter, S. J., Moynihan, M. M., & Stapleton, J. G. (2011). Using Social Self-Identification in Social Marketing Materials Aimed at Reducing Violence

- Against Women on Campus. *Journal Of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(5), 971-990.
- Potter, S. J., Stapleton, J. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2008). Designing, Implementing, and Evaluating a Media Campaign Illustrating the Bystander Role. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, 36(1), 39 - 55.
- Rennison & Welchans. (2000). Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report: Intimate Partner Violence. Available at <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/ipv.pdf>
- Rogers, E. M. (1962). *Diffusion of innovations* (1st ed.). New York: Free Press
- Schwartz, M. D., DeKeseredy, W. S., Tait, D., & Alvi, S. (2001). Male peer support and a feminist routine activities theory: Understanding sexual assault on the college campus. *Justice Quarterly*, 18: 623-649.
- Schwartz, M. D. & DeKeseredy, W. S. (2000). Aggregation bias and woman abuse: Variations by male peer support, region, language, and school type. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 15: 555-565.
- Schwartz, M. D., & DeKeseredy, W. S. (1997). *Sexual assault on the college campus: The role of male peer support*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Schwartz, M.D. and V. Pitts. 1995. "Toward a Feminist Routine Activities Approach to Explaining Sexual Assault." *Justice Quarterly* 12:10-31.
- Schewe, P., & O'Donohue, W. (1993). *Rape prevention: Methodological*

- problems and new directions. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 13, 667-682.
- Shive, S. E., & Morris, M. N. (2006). Evaluation of the Energize Your Life! Social Marketing Campaign Pilot Study to Increase Fruit Intake Among Community College Students. [Article]. *Journal of American College Health*, 55(1), 33-39.
- Slaby, R. G., & Stringham, P. (1994). Prevention of peer and community violence: The pediatrician's role. *Pediatrics*, 94(4), 608.
- Thombs, D. L., & Hamilton, M. J. (2002). Effects of a Social Norm Feedback Campaign on the Drinking Norms and Behavior of Division I Student-Athletes. *Journal of Drug Education*, 32(3), 227-244.
- Trussell, J., Koenig, J., Vaughan, B., & Stewart, F. (2001). Evaluation of a media campaign to increase knowledge about emergency contraception. *Contraception*, 63(2), 81-87.
- Turner, J., Perkins, H. W., & Bauerle, J. (2008). Declining Negative Consequences Related to Alcohol Misuse Among Students Exposed to a Social Norms Marketing Intervention on a College Campus. *Journal of American College Health*, 57(1), 85-94.
- Wallack, L. (1990). Mass Media and Health Promotion: Promise, Problem, and Challenge. In C. Atkin & L. Wallack (Eds.), *Mass Communication and Public Health: Complexities and Conflicts* (pp. 41-50). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Wandersman, A., & Florin, P. (2003). Community interventions and effective prevention. *American Psychologist*, 58(6), 441-448.

Yeater, E.A., & O'Donohue, W. ~1999!. Sexual assault prevention programs:
Current issues, future directions, and the potential efficacy of interventions
with women. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 19, 739–771.