

**Rapid evidence assessment of current  
interventions, approaches, and policies on  
sexual violence on campus**

Prepared by:  
Hannah Bows, Stephen Burrell and Nicole Westmarland  
*Durham University Centre for Research into Violence and Abuse  
(CRiVA)*

Prepared for:  
Durham University Sexual Violence Task Force  
September 2015

# Contents

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>Chapter One - Sexual Violence in the University Context .....</b>   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Chapter Two – Intervention Types.....</b>   | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Bystander approaches .....</b>  | <b>7</b>  |
| Bringing in the Bystander .....  | 7         |
| The Men's Program .....  | 9         |
| The Green Dot programme .....  | 11        |
| Other US bystander based programmes .....  | 12        |
| UK bystander intervention programmes.....  | 13        |
| Single versus missed sex groups.....   | 14        |
| <b>Campaign and awareness raising approaches .....</b>   | <b>15</b> |
| 'Good lad' workshops.....  | 15        |
| NUS I Heart Consent campaign .....   | 16        |
| US campaigns .....   | 16        |
| <b>Sexual assault risk reduction campaigns/programmes.....</b>   | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Self defence programmes .....</b>   | <b>19</b> |
| <b>Chapter Three - Policy Responses .....</b>  | <b>20</b> |
| UK policies.....   | 20        |
| Sample of US policies.....   | 20        |
| <b>Chapter Four – General Findings.....</b>  | <b>26</b> |
| Many US universities have dedicated centres or offices for responding to and preventing sexual violence.....   | 29        |
| Most of the UK-based programmes have not been evaluated for long enough to have the long term outcomes known.....  | 30        |
| No UK university is auditing their sexual assault rates, meaning they will find it difficult to show progress in the future or properly target campaigns and interventions. .... | 31        |
| Few universities in the UK are training staff in how to respond to disclosures of sexual violence. ....  | 31        |

## Chapter One - Sexual Violence in the University Context

The incidence and impacts of sexual violence experienced by students, particularly though not exclusively female students, at colleges and universities has been researched and documented over the last few decades in the US but has remained a neglected topic in the UK until recently. US research shows that between a fifth and one quarter of women are raped at some point during their academic careers, and research has found even higher rates of sexual assault victimisation more broadly (54% - Koss *et al*, 1987). As might be expected in a university setting, as many as 90% of women know are assaulted at colleges and universities know their attacker (Fisher *et al*, 2000; Humphrey & White, 2000; Krebs, Lindquist, Warner, Fisher, & Martin, 2009). Gender and biological sex are among the most important predictors of the risk of sexual assault, however a growing body of research also suggests that sexuality is an important predictor in the risk of sexual assault. For instance, Martin *et al* (2011) found a higher prevalence of sexual assault among lesbian and bisexual women than heterosexual women, both before and during college years. Likewise, gay and bisexual men experience assaults at higher rates than heterosexual men. For example, Balsam *et al* (2005) note that 11.6 per cent of gay men and 13.2 per cent of bisexual men report being raped, compared to 1.6 per cent of heterosexual men.

Similar to sexual violence in other contexts, the perpetrator is most likely to be a partner or acquaintance (Gross, Winslett, Roberts, & Gohm, 2006). In the UK, a study by NUS (2010) found that one in seven students experienced serious sexual or physical violence and 68% had been sexually harassed. However, despite these useful statistics, few universities publish the data on the number of reported sexual violence incidence at their university and the majority have not conducted specific research to attempt to measure the prevalence of sexual violence at their institutions, although universities in the US are legally required to record allegations of sexual violence under the Clery Act, something UK institutions are not currently required to do. Furthermore, despite the fact that university communities are 'at-risk' environments for sexual and relationship violence, there is considerable variability internationally in the extent to which education institutions are working to prevent this problem (Karjane, Fisher, & Cullen, 2005).

However, some universities are taking positive steps to measure and document this – the University of Texas has just announced the launch of a system-wide study on sexual assault. They believe this effort may be one of the most comprehensive studies in the nation on dating and sexual violence at college campuses ([http://www.elpasotimes.com/news/ci\\_28538781/ut-launches-system-wide-study-sexual-assault](http://www.elpasotimes.com/news/ci_28538781/ut-launches-system-wide-study-sexual-assault)). In the UK, a recent investigation by The Guardian revealed that fewer than half of 'elite' universities in Britain systematically log all allegations of sexual violence or sexual harassment and monitor the levels. Furthermore, the study found that one in five Russell Group universities do not have specific guidelines for students

on how to report such allegations. This is not to suggest that four in five universities have specific sexual violence/harassment policies – rather, it tends to be contained within broader policies.

The majority of victims do not report to the police, consistent with the findings on sexual violence outside of university contexts. Sable et al's (2006) findings indicate that barriers to reporting sexual violence prevalent 30 years ago, prior to efforts by the rape reform movement, continue to be considered important among college men and women. The barriers rated as the most important were (1) shame, guilt, embarrassment, not wanting friends and family to know; (2) concerns about confidentiality; and (3) fear of not being believed. Both genders perceived a fear of being judged as gay as an important barrier for male victims of sexual assault or rape and fear of retaliation by the perpetrator to be an important barrier for female victims.

Existing research suggests that post-assault, the majority of survivors of rape and sexual assault turn to friends or family for informal support (Ahrens, 2006; Ahrens, Campbell, Ternier-Thames, Wasco, & Sefl, 2007). However, some research has also found that survivors are likely to disclose to academic staff at the institutions where they have been raped, including professors or lecturers (as well as other university staff members such as college principals). A study by Richards *et al* (2013) exploring disclosure of sexual violence by college students to university professors found that forty-two per cent of the overall sample of academics reported that they had received a student disclosure of crime victimization. Moreover, approximately two thirds of the participants who reported receiving a student disclosure of crime victimization indicated that their most recent student disclosure was of gendered violence (e.g., sexual assault or domestic violence). The data also suggest that student disclosures are a campus-wide phenomenon. Participants from a range of academic disciplines reported receiving student disclosures of crime victimization. As predicted, the majority of student disclosures occurred in a professor's office, were believed to have been instigated by a specific topic or incident in class. This suggests that both male and female professors who teach classes that discuss sensitive topics must be prepared to receive student disclosures of crime victimization.

The impacts of receiving a negative response to this disclosure have been well documented, and there are concerns about the lack of training provided to university staff on how to handle disclosures of sexual violence. The recent suicide of Hannah Stubbs, a Keele University student who reported rape to the university, highlights the importance of this issue and the potential devastating impacts of rape on students and the need for universities to adequately prevent and respond to sexual violence. The existing concerns are exacerbated by a lack of individual university policies; although universities in the USA and UK have more general harassment policies and procedures which incorporate sexual harassment, discrimination and assault (or 'misconduct') the majority of these policies are limited to defining the behaviours which are encompassed

by terms used. Few universities have specific sexual violence or more broad violence against women policies, although a small number in the USA have implemented these. In the UK, there is no mention of universities or students at all in the most recent government policy documents on tackling violence against women and girls (Home Office 2011, 2010). However, the End Violence Against Women Coalition has carried out an analysis of pre-existing legislation and state that UK universities in fact already are legally obliged to ensure that women at university are able to enjoy their university experience free from abuse (Banyard 2014; Whitfield & Dustin 2015). Furthermore, the government have recently announced they will be launching an inquiry into sexual violence against women at universities, with Universities UK being asked to set up a taskforce in coordination with the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills to investigate how violence against women and 'lad culture' can be tackled at British universities.

Much of the current literature has focused on the need to prevent sexual assaults at colleges and universities (Ward, Chapman, Cohn, White, & Williams, 1991). Most of this research emerges from the US, where there are legal obligations including Title IX and the Clery Act (1990) for colleges and universities to make efforts to prevent and respond to sexual violence. Title IX obliges institutions which receive federal funding to take necessary steps to prevent sexual assault on their campuses, and to respond quickly and effectively when an assault occurs (Potter, Krider & McMahon 2000; White House Council on Women and Girls 2014 p.24). The Clery Act means that institutions that take part in federal financial aid programmes must report annual statistics on crime which takes place on or near their campuses, as well as developing and implementing policies around prevention, and ensuring that the basic rights of victims are met (Potter, Krider & McMahon 2000; White House Council on Women and Girls 2014).

The Office for Civil Rights in the Department of Education has the responsibility for enforcing Title IX in institutions. It can initiate an investigation proactively or based upon a formal complaint made by a student (White House Council on Women and Girls 2014). Institutions can be denied federal funds if they are found to violate Title IX. Some of the procedures the OCR requires institutions to develop include comprehensive arrangements for educating both students and employees about sexual violence; policies and practices for responding to sexual violence allegations, sufficient training for university officials in responding to complaints; and policies to ensure that survivors are provided with the remedies and resources needed to continue to pursue their education (White House Council on Women and Girls 2014). If referrals are made from other agencies to the Department of Justice then it can initiate legal action to necessitate universities to improve how they respond to sexual violence on campus (White House Council on Women and Girls 2014). There is also growing pressure on UK universities and colleges to respond to the need for sexual violence prevention. This has led to a

range of prevention programs, education and training and response initiatives starting to take form in the UK.

## Chapter Two – Intervention Types

### Bystander approaches

**Key point 1.**

***There is strong evidence across a range of studies that shows positive short-term outcomes for a range of bystander intervention style programmes.***

The bystander intervention approach is based on the idea that tackling sexual violence means not just working with victims and perpetrators but the community as a whole – that ‘bystanders’ in the community can play a key role in preventing sexual violence from taking place. For this reason, bystander programmes focus on educating third parties about sexual violence and encouraging them to take an active role in preventing or responding to sexual violence incidents. This can range from speaking to the perpetrator and asking them to stop their behaviour, helping victims to get out of the situation, calling for help and/or alerting authorities.

However, there are three primary issues within the bystander literature which present challenges to clearly defining what behaviours are included in relation to preventing sexual violence (McMahon, 2012):

1. Sexual assault and dating violence bystander interventions are often grouped together without differentiating
2. Evaluations of bystander intervention programmes tend to measure individuals’ willingness to engage in a range of behaviours which typically cover multiple levels of preventing (i.e. primary and secondary)
3. The discussion of bystander intervention includes a range of potential stages of intervention, including emergency situations posing higher risk to victims, to situations posing no immediate risk but which may indirectly support sexism or violence.

### Bringing in the Bystander

‘Bringing in the Bystander’ is one such programme, which instructs participants in how they can play an important prevention role as bystanders when ‘risky’ situations are observed both before and during acts of sexual violence, and after if a friend discloses that they have been victimised (Cares, Banyard, Moynihan, et al. 2015; Potter, Moynihan, Stapleton, et al. 2009). It is based around the idea of addressing the attitudes and norms of both individuals and communities around sexual violence and the costs and benefits of engaging in helpful bystander behaviour (Cares, Banyard, Moynihan, et al. 2015;

Potter, Moynihan, Stapleton, et al. 2009). It seeks to emphasise the role that everyone in the community can play in preventing sexual violence – as opposed to simply approaching men as potential perpetrators and women as potential victims (Cares, Banyard, Moynihan, et al. 2015; Potter, Moynihan, Stapleton, et al. 2009). It is delivered to single-gender groups, and is based around active learning exercises such as role plays to help participants to develop their skills and consider how they can intervene safely and be a supportive ally to survivors (Cares, Banyard, Moynihan, et al. 2015).

Cares, Banyard, Moynihan et al. (2015) evaluated how effective the programme was on two different campuses in New England in the US, and found that whilst overall it appeared to have worked at both, there were important differences in terms of whom it was most effective with and how. On the first campus where the programme was implemented, there was a significant positive change in attitudes among both women and men associated with participation in the prevention programme (Cares, Banyard, Moynihan, et al. 2015). On the second campus however, there was a much stronger alteration in women's attitudes than those of men, with there being a limited degree of change in men's attitudes initially and very little sustained change after a year (Cares, Banyard, Moynihan, et al. 2015). One reason for this may have been because the second campus was dominated more by men, potentially creating a context in which male peer norms are particularly influential and attitudes and beliefs about women and sexual violence are more opposed to what the BitB programme promotes (Cares, Banyard, Moynihan, et al. 2015). Unlike the first campus, here there was also no tradition of anti-violence work. Furthermore, the second campus is spread across an urban area with a high crime rate and some gang activity, meaning that men in particular (who are more likely to intervene using physical action) may have perceived there to be a greater danger to intervening as a bystander (Cares, Banyard, Moynihan, et al. 2015). Of course, it is also possible that the co-facilitators on the second campus simply did not connect as effectively with the male participants as they did with the females (Cares, Banyard, Moynihan, et al. 2015).

Potter, Moynihan, Stapleton, et al. (2009) carried out a study specifically on a poster campaign around the Bringing in the Bystander programme at a midsized public Northeastern university in the US. The posters featured images of 'typical' scenes at university that modelled prosocial bystander behaviour in the prevention of sexual violence and intimate partner violence. The posters were displayed for four weeks and were placed in residence halls and other areas where students would spend most of their time outside of class (Potter, Moynihan, Stapleton, et al. 2009). This was with the goal that they would be seen frequently by students. Potter, Moynihan, Stapleton, et al. (2009) found that those research participants who reported witnessing the posters did demonstrate an increased awareness of the problem, and a greater willingness to engage in actions geared towards reducing sexual violence when compared with those students who did not see the poster. However, students who had also taken part in a face-to-face Bringing in the Bystander training session had higher scores on the Action



scale (Potter, Moynihan, Stapleton, et al. 2009). The primary role of poster campaigns such as this one may therefore be to raise awareness about the issue; providing students with an opportunity to contemplate sexual violence at university and how they could reduce it (Potter, Moynihan, Stapleton, et al. 2009). The use of provocative imagery in media such as posters can help to encourage contemplation, which is vitally important when the dominant norms and culture on campuses can often facilitate or encourage sexual violence. However, they should not be the only tools used by universities to try and bring about change, but part of a wider strategy (Potter, Moynihan, Stapleton, et al. 2009). Potter, Moynihan, Stapleton, et al. (2009) contend that universities must also offer students training programmes in person, to enable them to learn and practice skills in intervening in safe, pro-social ways.

In another study on social marketing based around modelling pro-social bystander behaviour, by Potter, Moynihan & Stapleton (2011), the method of social self-identification was used with posters from the 'Know your Power' campaign. This involved using content which staged and cast scenes to appear alike the people and contexts commonly encountered by the target audience, so that it would feel familiar to them (Potter, Moynihan & Stapleton 2011). This was based around seeking to examine the extent to which social self-identification in poster images affected the target audience of university students and their willingness to intervene as pro-social bystanders (Potter, Moynihan & Stapleton 2011). The social marketing campaign was put into practice over a four-week period at a midsize Northeastern public university in the US, with posters placed throughout the campus and nearby local businesses which were regularly used by students (Potter, Moynihan & Stapleton 2011). It was found that those who had witnessed the posters and felt that the scenes they depicted were familiar to them were significantly more likely to consider taking action to prevent a situation where there was the potential for sexual violence to take place (Potter, Moynihan & Stapleton 2011). In addition, students who did perceive familiarity with the content of the posters were also more likely to report that they had behaved in a way similar to that which was represented by the poster (Potter, Moynihan & Stapleton 2011).

### The Men's Program

Another variation on the bystander intervention approach is that of 'The Men's Program'. This was developed to apply specifically to men at university, and aims to minimise defensiveness among men whilst successfully challenging rape-supportive behaviours and beliefs which they may possess (Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Foubert, Brasfield, et al. 2011). Given the influence of peer culture, such as that of fraternities, upon group norms that can reinforce attitudes that perpetuate the use of sexual violence, the programme aims to introduce new cultural norms in men's peer groups

that can in turn spread changes in outlook and behaviour increasingly widely among peers (Foubert & Newberry 2006).

In a study by Foubert and Newberry (2006) at a medium-sized public university in the US, The Men's Program featured a video in which a man's experience of rape by another man is described, to develop men's understanding of how such an experience might feel. This is based on the idea that men are more likely to empathise with a male survivor, whilst depictions of a female survivor may have less, or even the opposite, impact (Foubert & Newberry 2006). This experience is then broadened out to rape more generally, and the centrality of power and control to its perpetration, before considering how men can go about supporting a rape survivor (Foubert & Newberry 2006). Foubert and Newberry (2006) contend that skilled facilitators can help men to understand women's experiences through the use of scenarios concerning a man as a survivor. It also appears to be most effective to present male-on-female rape from the context of a bystander perspective, rather than simply contemplating a woman they know being raped. This means, for example, considering a situation where a man rapes a woman they know, and another man does nothing about it (Foubert & Newberry 2006). In the final part of the workshop the men discuss how consent is defined, and how they can intervene to tackle jokes about rape, acts which demean women, and bragging about abusing women among their peers. It is approximately a one-hour workshop presented by four undergraduate male peer educators (Foubert & Newberry 2006).

In this research project, the programme was delivered in two different forms, and both were found to have significant impacts on fraternity men (Foubert & Newberry 2006). One version of the programme had an additional element around bystander intervention, and this appeared to have a greater impact than the programme which ended with a discussion around defining consent (Foubert & Newberry 2006).

In a more recent research project on The Men's Program at an urban university in the Southeastern part of the US, Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. (2011) examined the extent to which the project influenced male students' perceptions of their efficacy to take part in bystander actions and their self-reported willingness to intervene and help potential victims, as well as their acceptance of rape myths. Those men who attended The Men's Program did self-report substantial increases in their perceived bystander efficacy as well as their willingness to intervene, with a 21% difference compared to those men who did not (Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Foubert, Brasfield, et al. 2011). In addition, significant reductions were found in rape myth attendance by those men who did attend The Men's Program compared with those who did not (Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Foubert, Brasfield, et al. 2011). Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. (2011) therefore concluded that these findings should encourage university practitioners and policymakers to feel confident in addressing the issue of sexual violence among students, and that this kind of prevention programming should become included as a routine part of life on campus.

In an earlier study on The Men's Program at a Mid-Atlantic public university in the US, which did not feature elements of bystander intervention, Foubert (2000) found a significantly lower reported likelihood for perpetrating rape among the men who took part after a seven-month academic year. There was also a decrease in the acceptance of rape myths at this time. However, a change in sexually coercive behaviour was not found in those who participated in the program (Foubert 2000). Foubert (2000) speculated that a one-off programme may not be enough to bring about this kind of change, and seven months may also not be sufficient time to wait to observe alterations in behaviour. He also raises the possibility that the participants' responses after seven months were shaped by the programme itself. With an increased knowledge about sexual violence, it's possible that programme participants were more able to identify and thus report their behaviour as being sexually coercive than those in the control group (Foubert 2000).

### The Green Dot programme

#### **Key point 2.**

**Many bystander intervention programmes have relatively similar content and outcomes. However, the strongest evidence for a bystander intervention programme appears to be for the Green Dot programme.**

The 'Green Dot' programme was established at the University of Kentucky. It seeks to train students to intervene with 'active bystander behaviours' to reduce intimate partner and sexual violence on campuses, in ways that are both safe and effective (Coker, Cook-Craig, Williams, et al. 2011). It is made up of programs, strategies, curricula and training courses designed to address power-based personal violence across settings (Edwards, 2009). The Green Dot curriculum includes encouraging individuals to engage in both proactive and reactive bystander intervention (Edwards, 2009). In one evaluation of the programme, Coker et al. (2011) carried out a cross-sectional survey on a random sample of undergraduates at the University of Kentucky, which 2,504 students completed. They found that those who had taken part in the active bystander training in the last two years (14% of the sample) had significantly lower rape myth acceptance scores than those who had not (Coker, Cook-Craig, Williams, et al. 2011). These students also reported conducting a significantly greater amount of bystander behaviours, as well as observing more self-reported active bystander behaviours in comparison to those who had not done the training (Coker, Cook-Craig, Williams, et al. 2011). Students who had taken part in the training specifically were also found to have much greater active bystander behaviour scores compared to those who

had only heard a Green Dot speech. Both groups reported a higher number of observed and active bystander behaviours than students who had participated in neither (Coker, Cook-Craig, Williams, et al. 2011).

According to 5 year study conducted at the University of Kentucky there was a greater than 50 per cent reduction in the self-reported frequency of sexual violence perpetration by students at schools that received the Green Dot training, compared to a slight increase at schools that did not (Coaker et al., 2014).

### Other US bystander based programmes

In an experimental evaluation of a bystander intervention programme, 389 undergraduate students at a US university were randomly assigned to one of two single-sex treatment groups or a control group (Banyard, Moynihan & Plante 2007). Up to two months after taking part in either a one or three session version of the programme, participants in the treatment conditions did demonstrate improvements across measures of attitudes, knowledge, and behaviour, such as rape myth acceptance and knowledge of sexual violence, whilst those in the control group did not (Banyard, Moynihan & Plante 2007). Prosocial bystander attitudes, increased bystander efficacy, and increases in self-reported bystander behaviours were also observed. Whilst significant changes took place after both one and three session doses, more significant change was found with the longer programme (Banyard, Moynihan & Plante 2007). Most of the effects of the programmes were maintained at both the four and twelve month follow-ups, and it appeared to have a positive impact upon both women and men (Banyard, Moynihan & Plante 2007).

Gidycz, Orchowski & Berkowitz (2011) investigated the impact of a social norms and bystander intervention programme at a medium-sized Midwestern university in the US. This involved a 1.5 hour prevention programme and a 1 hour booster session for male students. It contained several components, including an empathy induction, challenging social norms, discussing consent, and bystander intervention (Gidycz, Orchowski & Berkowitz 2011). The men were also encouraged to articulate ways in which they felt uncomfortable with different elements of expectations around gender roles and in particular masculinity, and to consider alternatives that may be more positive (Gidycz, Orchowski & Berkowitz 2011). There was also a 'risk-reduction' programme which women students were invited to participate in (Gidycz, Orchowski & Berkowitz 2011).

A number of positive outcomes were reported for the men who participated in the programme. In comparison with those in the control group, the men who attended the programme found sexually assaultive behaviour less reinforcing; demonstrated greater decreases in associations with sexually assaultive peers and exposure to sexually explicit media; and believed that their friends would be more likely to intervene if they

witnessed inappropriate behaviour in others (Gidycz, Orchowski & Berkowitz 2011). Unlike other bystander intervention programmes however, the participants did not exhibit an increased tendency to intervene as a result of taking part, which may be because there was not as significant an emphasis on the development of intervention skills compared to other programmes (Gidycz, Orchowski & Berkowitz 2011). However, men with a history of sexually assaultive behaviour who attended the programme did indicate increases in the perception that other men would intervene in dangerous dating situations. After four months, they were also less likely to believe that sexually assaultive behaviour was reinforcing (Gidycz, Orchowski & Berkowitz 2011). Gidycz et al. (2011) argue that the continuous reinforcement of prosocial norms in the campus culture may be crucial in order to prevent men with a history of sexual aggression from enacting further aggressive behaviour.

After four months men who attended the programme were also less likely to engage in sexually aggressive behaviour - 1.5% as opposed to 6.7% of men in the control group (Gidycz, Orchowski & Berkowitz 2011). There were no differences in rates of sexual violence among the men after seven months, however, which may illustrate the need for more intensive interventions to sustain change. Yet other positive gains were reported after seven months, including being more willing to label unconsensual actions as rape (Gidycz, Orchowski & Berkowitz 2011). Gidycz et al. (2011) also contend that given that it is often a minority of men who commit the majority of assaults, targeted interventions which reduce the inclination to rape among high-risk groups, and engaging bystanders to intervene with them, may be important steps in the investigation and development of sexual violence prevention work.

### UK bystander intervention programmes

Bystander intervention programmes do not yet have a significant presence at UK universities. However, the University of the West of England has developed the Intervention Initiative, with funding from Public Health England, as a free resource for higher and further education institutions. The initiative aims to prevent sexual coercion and intimate partner violence through an evidence-based educational programme that empowers students to act as pro-social citizens (Fenton, Mott, McCartan, et al. 2014). It is based around eight 60-90 minute mixed-sex sessions, delivered by trained facilitators who may or may not be academic staff and have training in how to respond to disclosures (Fenton, Mott, McCartan, et al. 2014). The initiative is influenced by bystander intervention approaches and is a community-level intervention, with the idea that it should be delivered to all members of the community, and timetabled rather than provided on a voluntary ad-hoc basis (Fenton, Mott, McCartan, et al. 2014).

Another bystander intervention model which has been developed for universities and colleges in the UK is the 'Get Savi' (Students Against Violence Initiative) programme, put

together by Scottish Women's Aid. It features five sessions and aims to build confidence and skills in students to speak up against sexism and homophobia, and the language and attitudes to underpin all forms of violence and abuse against women (Scottish Women's Aid 2015). Rather than encouraging intervention in physical circumstances, the initiative provides participants with the opportunity to contemplate and talk about strategies for speaking out against sexual violence and abuse towards women (Scottish Women's Aid 2015). It is based upon 'four golden rules': to 'go to where people are', address sexism as a social problem, create a safe space in which people can critically consider situations in which violence against women can be perpetrated, and to ensure support from the community and institution (Scottish Women's Aid 2015). It also utilises a reflexive model of training, which means adapting and shifting the programme depending on who is participating in it (Scottish Women's Aid 2015).

Meanwhile, the University of Lincoln has launched an action research project entitled 'Stand Together' in order to tackle violence against women on campus. This features a university-wide prevention education programme, in partnership with third sector organisations as well as the students' union and student societies (Stand Together 2015). It includes peer education programmes which involve student volunteers, a poster campaign, and a theatre project which is facilitated by Scottish Women's Aid, the White Ribbon Campaign and Tender societies (Stand Together 2015). Student volunteers are receiving two days of training from Scottish Women's Aid and the White Ribbon Campaign, which will include learning how to recognise harmful attitudes and behaviour such as sexist and homophobic comments and jokes, victim-blaming attitudes, and abusive behaviour, and will be trained about how they can speak out and challenge these kinds of practices and offer support to those affected societies (Stand Together 2015). Once this training has been completed, the student volunteers will then deliver workshops in pairs for other groups of students and pass on their knowledge and skills. All three of these programmes involve conducting research during their implementation in order to evaluate their impact, however as of yet these evaluations have not been completed societies (Stand Together 2015).

### Single versus missed sex groups

#### **Key point 3.**

**While the emerging UK programmes are tending to orient towards mixed gender groups, US evidence suggests single sex groups may be more appropriate.**

In their review of sexual assault prevention programmes, Vladutiu, Martin and Macy (2011) argue that universities should consider interventions which are targeted at

single-gender audiences. They found that programmes were effective at improving rape attitudes, behavioral intent, rape awareness, rape knowledge, rape empathy, and rape myth acceptance depending on if there is an all-female or all-male audience (Vladutiu, Martin and Macy, 2011). For example, the Bringing in the Bystander programme is delivered to single-gender groups, based on the assessment that prevention messages around sexual violence are understood by women and men differently, and have different impacts upon them (Cares, Banyard, Moynihan, et al. 2015). The Men's Program is an all-male workshop based on the idea that programmes are likely to have a much greater impact on the attitudes and behavioural intentions of men, the primary perpetrators of sexual violence, if they are aimed specifically at them (Foubert & Newberry 2006). Gidycz, Orchowski & Berkowitz (2011) also point out that the goals of programming for women and men do not overlap, and fears of embarrassment may make it difficult for men to discuss their attitudes openly when women are present. Banyard, Moynihan & Plante (2007) encourage bystander intervention programmes to be applied to single-sex groups in accordance with much of the literature around rape prevention.

### Campaign and awareness raising approaches

In the UK, there has been a growth in campaigning among student groups seeking to bring attention to the issue of sexual violence and pressure universities and government to take greater action around the issue. This has ranged from the National Union of Students to individual student unions, and from feminism societies to specific campaigns such as It Happens Here at both Oxford and Durham, and Cambridge Speak Out together with other campaigns led by the Cambridge University Students' Union Women's Office. Some of these groups have also initiated their own awareness raising and prevention campaigns. While many of these sound promising, few have had evaluations conducted.

### 'Good lad' workshops

In an attempt to tackle 'lad culture' and violence against women on campus, a group of students at Oxford University initiated the 'Good Lad Workshops'. These focus specifically on men's practices, and are offered for groups of men within the university such as sports teams, drinking societies, clubs, and JCR/MCR members (Good Lad Workshop 2015). They discuss issues relating to consent, masculinity, peer pressure, power and responsibility (Good Lad Workshop 2015). Rather than admonishing men as potential perpetrators who only have to obey the law, the workshops promote the idea of 'positive masculinity', and challenge men to not only feel an obligation to avoid causing harm to women, but opportunities to make a positive difference in women's lives (Good Lad Workshop 2015). Durham University hosted a visit from Good Lad project in 2015.

## NUS I Heart Consent campaign

### **Key point 4.**

**Early evaluations of the NUS I Heart Consent campaign shows participants have increased understanding and felt positive about the programme.**

I Heart Consent is a collaborative project by the NUS Women's Campaign and the student organisation Sexpression:UK. It originated from the University of London Union's Women's campaign, which initiated 'I Heart Consent' workshops for students in 2013 (I Heart Consent 2014). The 'consent education' programme aims to work with universities and colleges in the UK to facilitate positive, informative and inclusive conversations and campaigns about consent. The model for these workshops is a 1 hour and 40 minute interactive discussion around defining consent; treating other people and their sexualities and boundaries with respect; rape culture and victim-blaming; myth busting; and taking action (I Heart Consent 2014). Post-workshop commitments and activities are also encouraged, in order to broaden the challenging of misconceptions of consent on campus and in wider society (I Heart Consent 2014).

An evaluation of a pilot of the programme with 20 students' unions who had delivered workshops has been carried out. The range of workshops includes 'train the trainer' sessions for those interested in facilitating consent workshops at their students' union; and consent workshops ran by students unions. The pilot evaluation reports found that 80% of those attending 'train the trainer' workshops felt they had a better understanding of sexual consent following the training and felt confident to talk to others about sexual consent. For those attending 'consent' workshops, 91% felt they had taken away a better understanding of sexual consent following the workshop and the vast majority felt the workshops provided a comfortable environment to discuss sexual consent. However, there is no evidence about how successful the workshops were in terms of changing attitudes and behaviours and preventing sexual violence.

## US campaigns

The approach of using peer educators to facilitate prevention work appears to have a positive impact in some contexts. For example, Schwartz, Griffin, Russell, et al. (2006) carried out a study on an interactive prevention programme around dating violence at a university in the US. This was delivered by student peer educators, and sought to increase awareness about the forms that intimate partner violence takes, the ways in which it is underpinned by gender role stereotypes, strategies for avoiding partner



violence, and raising social responsibility around the issue (Schwartz, Griffin, Russell, et al. 2006). It was divided into three segments and made use of a range of different educational media, which included vignettes, an educational lecture in a talk show format, and a panel discussion with audience participation (Schwartz, Griffin, Russell, et al. 2006). Immediately following the programme, stereotypical and misogynistic attitudes in both fraternity and sorority members were found to have decreased. Schwartz, Griffin, Russell, et al. 2006 (2006) argue that key to this impact was the involvement of participants themselves, and making the programme relatable to the contexts of their own lives.

In an earlier research project, Lonsway and Kothari (2000) examined the FYCARE (First Year Campus Acquaintance Rape Education) intervention at a large Midwestern university in the US. This was a mandatory rape prevention education programme for first year undergraduate students. Its core features included a lecture and discussion about rape myths and interactive participation and media presentations. Attempts were made to integrate the understanding of rape as an expression of power and control, and an avoidance of confrontational techniques that risk alienating participants and reducing the opportunity for successful change (Lonsway & Kothari 2000). The 2 hour workshops were facilitated by students as peer educators, who had been trained in a semester-long course, with two female and two male facilitators at each workshop. The goals of the programme included strengthening awareness of rape and relevant campus services among students; providing information as to safety measures and escape strategies for female students; challenging rape myths and common perceptions and attitudes which may be rape-supportive; and increasing students' sense of personal responsibility for stopping rape in their own lives and those of their peers - especially among men (Lonsway & Kothari 2000).

After completing the programme, in comparison with those who had not attended a workshop, participants indicated increased sexual assault knowledge, reduced support for rape myths, and less rape-supportive judgments in response to a hypothetical scenario (Lonsway & Kothari 2000). However, in the unrelated context of introductory psychology courses, no comparable impact was found. This suggests that at least some of the successful outcomes found may be explained by the evaluation taking place immediately after the programme itself (Lonsway & Kothari 2000). However, this was not the case with sexual assault knowledge, where a significant increase was observed even several weeks after the workshops and in the unrelated context of introductory psychology (Lonsway & Kothari 2000). It is also noteworthy that following the establishment of the program, there was at least a 100% increase in use of the university's Office of Women's Programs service, and a significant growth in the number of reported sexual assaults to the university police department (Lonsway & Kothari 2000). However, they are not always appropriate - Vladutiu, Martin and Macy (2011) argue that programmes facilitated by professionals are more effective for improving attitudes around rape and behavioral intentions among students, whilst for

reducing rape myth acceptance peer-facilitated programs should be considered. Banyard (2014) meanwhile argues that whether the facilitator is a peer or a professional may make less of a difference than there being sufficient training and support in place for facilitators.

## Sexual assault risk reduction campaigns/programmes

### Key point 5.

**Some US universities developed 'risk reduction' programmes for female students, however academic evaluations found no conclusive evidence that victimization reduced as a result of these. This was especially the case for women who were already survivors. This is also an approach that can be criticized as being 'victim blaming.'**

Sexual assault risk reduction programs for women 'operate under the belief that although only perpetrators can truly prevent sexual violence women can nonetheless reduce their risk for violence by *assessing* dating and social situations for riskiness, *acknowledging* when situations are risky, and *acting* quickly and forcefully when risk is detected' (Gidycz *et al*, 2015, p.781).

One specific risk reduction in Ohio, US has focused specifically on self-defence and risk. The first Ohio University Sexual Assault risk reduction programme emerged in the early 1990s and several programmes and evaluations have since been developed by Christine Gidycz, which various modifications made to the programme following evaluations. The initial evaluation (Hanson & Gidycz, 1993) of college women found that the program was effective in decreasing sexual assault among women with no history of sexual assault, it was not effective for women who had a history of sexual assault. However, when the program was modified to provide additional information that was specifically tailored to sexual assault survivors, it was found to be ineffective for both women with and without assault histories (Breitenbecher & Gidycz, 1998).

*The program begins with a didactic presentation of information on sexual assault that includes local statistics to make women aware of both the global problem of sexual assault as well as their own personal risk. Following this, the first video, "I Thought it Could Never Happen to Me" (Gidycz, Dowdall, et al., 1997), which consists of a series of interviews with seven college student rape survivors, is presented and risk factors are highlighted. Both of these components attempt to stimulate central processing by personalizing the information and encouraging active and personal discussion. The second video, "Sexual Assault Risk Factors: A*

*Training Video" (Gidycz, Loh, et al., 1997), which depicts a date rape scenario and highlights risk factors, is presented. Consistent with a social learning framework, following the tape, role-plays are used to model protective behaviors that could have been used in the date rape scenario depicted on the tape. The program concludes with a handout and discussion of resistance strategies. in accordance with the health belief model, the videos also highlight personal risks for sexual assault while providing women with risk reduction strategies and skills. (Gidycz et al, 2001, p.1047)*

Subsequent evaluations have found no conclusive evidence that participation in the programme decreases the rate of victimisation (Gidycz et al., 2001; Gidycz et al., 2006; Orchowski et al., 2008).

Follow-up studies with participants consistently demonstrate that within nine weeks of program completion, students' attitudes typically rebound to pre-program levels (Breitenbecher and Gidycz 1998; Breitenbecher and Scarce 1999; 2001; Frazier et al. 1994; Gidycz, Layman et al. 2001; Gidycz, Lynn et al. 2001)

### Self defence programmes

Self-defence programs generally focus on teaching students—typically women—how to defend themselves against a sexual (and/or physical) assault. Women typically, learn how to effectively use their own fists, knees, fingers, and elbows as potential weapons and how to target vulnerable places on their assailant, including the eyes, nose, throat, and groin (Bart and O'Brien 1981, 1985; Brecklin and Ullman 2005; Ullman 1998). Some studies have suggested this training enables women to be more effective at thwarting potential attacks (Brecklin and Ullman 2005; Raleigh 2013) and to feel more confident (Hollander, 2014) however they are often limited to attacks that occur in specific situations and contexts and fail to address the broader cultural and societal issues which enable sexual violence.

## Chapter Three - Policy Responses

### UK policies

#### **Key point 6.**

**There is no UK university that outlines the specific penalties that a student offender may be subjected to. Instead, any consequences are constrained within general disciplinary policies.**

Oxford University has implemented a number of policies around sexual violence: a harassment policy and procedure which includes sexual harassment and sexual violence, but is not specific to either and does not extensively cover these individual areas; guidance for staff on handling cases of sexual assault or sexual violence which provides academic and administrative staff with advice on how to handle disclosures and important numbers/organisations to contact where applicable, including SARCs.

### Sample of US policies

#### **Key point 7.**

**Some US universities, including Chicago, Michigan, and Dartmouth, have specific penalties that cover a broad range of options. Harvard has a specific Office of Sexual Assault Prevention and Response.**

Harvard University has a specific Office of Sexual Assault Prevention and Response which delivers awareness raising, education and bystander programs and provides information to victims of assaults – there is a dedicated helpline and they offer ‘escorts’ to help students get home safely at night, available until 2am during the week and 3am at weekends. However, the university does not have a specific sexual assault policy – in fact, it comes under a much broader harassment policy which does little other than state a zero tolerance approach and provide definitions of the behaviours that come under the harassment jurisdiction. No guidance on reporting or the consequences for perpetrators is provided.

By comparison, The University of Chicago has a specific policy on ‘sexual misconduct’ which includes definitions and outlines specific relationships between students and

other students, as well as student-academic staff relationships. In terms of investigating complaints, the policy states:

*The University is committed to providing a prompt, fair, impartial, and thorough investigation and resolution that is consistent with the University's policies and is transparent to the complainant and the respondent. Such an investigation may occur alongside an independent law enforcement investigation and will be conducted by University officials who do not have a conflict of interest or bias for or against the complainant or the respondent. University officials participating in disciplinary proceedings involving sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking receive, at a minimum, annual training on issues related to these offenses, as well as training on how to conduct an investigation and hearing. In most cases, the University's investigation will be completed within 60 days of a complaint. The University, in its discretion, may extend its investigation for good cause. If the timeframe for the investigation is extended, the University will provide written notice to the complainant and the respondent of the delay and the reason for the delay.*

*The complainant's and/or respondent's sexual history with others will generally not be sought or used in determining whether sexual misconduct has occurred. However, in certain circumstances the sexual history between the parties may have limited relevance to explain context. For example, if consent is at issue, the sexual history between the parties may be relevant to determining whether consent was sought and given during the incident in question. Additionally, under limited circumstances necessary to understand the context, sexual history between the parties may be relevant to explain an injury, to provide proof of a pattern, or to address an allegation.*

*The standard used in such proceedings is a preponderance of the evidence. The respondent and complainant are entitled to bring a person of their choice to the proceedings, whose role is limited to providing support, not acting as an advocate, participant, or witness. In the interests of limiting the number of people with confidential information about the matter, each of the parties is expected to identify one support person and to make a change only in exceptional circumstances. The complainant, the respondent, and appropriate University officials will receive timely and equal access to information that will be used during disciplinary proceedings. The complainant and respondent are simultaneously informed, in writing, of the result of the proceedings, the procedures for seeking review of the result, and when the result becomes final. This notification will include the determination of whether a violation occurred, any sanction, and the rationale for the result and sanction. If the complainant or respondent seeks review of the result, both will be simultaneously informed in writing of any change to the outcome.*

*Sanctions for a student found responsible for sexual assault, domestic or dating violence, or stalking include but are not limited to warning, probation, loss of privileges, discretionary assignments such as community service or academic work, restitution or fines, removal from the University House System, restrictions regarding access to University property or University events, discharge from student employment, probation, suspension, and expulsion. After a University degree is awarded, if a Dean of Students is*

*informed of misconduct that occurred before the degree was awarded, disciplinary proceedings may be initiated. If the University-wide Disciplinary Committee is convened, the Committee may recommend revocation of a degree. For employees, possible sanctions are suspension, demotion, salary decrease, diminution of responsibilities, termination of employment or appointment, disqualification from future employment, and prohibition from accessing University property.*

The University of Michigan has a specific policy on sexual assault which includes the reporting and response procedure -

<http://studentsexualmisconductpolicy.umich.edu/content/university-michigan-policy-sexual-misconduct>. The range of sanctions includes:

- **Formal Reprimand:** A formal notice that the student has violated University policy and that future violations may be dealt with more severely.
- **Disciplinary Probation:** A designated period of time during which the student is not in good standing with the University. The terms of probation may involve restrictions of student privileges and/or set specific behavioral expectations.
- **Restitution:** Reasonable and limited compensation for loss, damage, or injury to the appropriate party in the form of money or material replacement.
- **Restriction from Employment at the University:** Prohibition of or limitation on University employment.
- **Class/Workshop/Training/Program Attendance:** Enrollment in and completion of a class, workshop, training, or program that could help the student or the University community.
- **Educational Project:** Completion of a project specifically designed to help the student understand why certain behavior was inappropriate and to prevent its recurrence.
- **University Housing Transfer or Removal:** Placement in another room or housing unit or removal from University housing. Housing transfers or removals may be temporary or permanent depending on the circumstances.
- **Professional Assessment:** Completion of a professional assessment that could help the student or the University ascertain the student's ongoing supervision or support needs to successfully participate in the University community.
- **Removal from Specific Courses or Activities:** Suspension or transfer from courses or activities at the University for a specified period of time.
- **No Contact:** Restriction from entering specific University areas and/or from all forms of contact with certain persons.
- **Suspension:** Separation from the University for a specified period of time or until certain conditions are met.
- **Expulsion:** Permanent separation from the University.

Dartmouth University has an overarching 'Sexual Respect' campaign, which includes policies on: Unified Disciplinary Procedures for Sexual Assault by Students and Student Organizations; Undergraduate Sexual Harassment, Domestic Violence, Dating Violence,

and Stalking; Employee Sexual Harassment; Employee Sexual Misconduct; and Consensual Relationships. It is committed to carrying out a survey on 'sexual assault and sexual misconduct' on a regular basis. It has a Title IX Coordinator; a Sexual Assault Awareness Programme; a Dartmouth Bystander Initiative; Responder workshops; a Rape Aggression Defense Programme; a Student Presidential Committee on Sexual Assault; Sexual Assault Peer Advisors; Movement Against Violence; Sexperts (Sexual Health Peer Advisors); and WISE@Dartmouth, which seeks to empower victims of domestic and sexual violence and stalking to become safe and self-reliant through crisis intervention and support services (Dartmouth University, 2015).

Pasky-McMahon (2008) has put forward a template for complying with US federal policy around sexual violence on campus, which may also be useful for British universities considering how they could develop a policy around sexual violence. It features nine parameters which have been identified by the National Institute of Justice as being essential for determining compliance with the federal law. A higher education institution's sexual violence should comprise: 1) a definition of sexual assault that includes verbal and behavioural definitions of consent and sexual assault, 2) specifics of a sexual assault policy, 3) who will be trained to respond, 4) methods for students to report assault, 5) prevention efforts and resources for victims, 6) review for practices or policies that prevent reporting, 7) practices or policies that encourage reporting, 8) methods for investigating and punishing offenders, and 9) an area that contains methods to evaluate the effectiveness of current policies, including methods that enhance reporting (Pasky-McMahon, 2008). Pasky-McMahon (2008) states that a zero-tolerance response towards sexual violence against faculty, staff, and a diverse student population must be reflected in campus sexual violence policies. She also recommends two additional parameters which are not specified by the National Institute of Justice, based upon the good practice of Penn State University: addressing the financial costs a victim faces when receiving care after sexual assault, and the victim's need for a trained campus advocate to provide support and knowledge on and off campus (Pasky-McMahon, 2008).

The template Pasky-McMahon proposes outlines a plan that should support survival beyond victimisation, however ultimately the goal is for higher education institutions "to take responsibility for creating campuses that are safe havens for students to live, learn, and work without the threat of sexual violence" (Pasky-McMahon, 2008, p. 363). The template is as follows:

### **Model Policy for the Prevention and Response to Sexual Assault Template**

I. Definition of sexual assault includes:

- A. Explanation of consent
- B. Descriptive scenarios of sexual assault including non-stranger sexual assault
- C. Definition of terms

- II. Design of the sexual assault policy incorporates:
  - A. Clear statement of commitment to deter sexual assault
  - B. Provisions for public acknowledgement of commitment
  - C. Identified methods for policy distribution to campus community
  - D. Ease of policy accessibility to entire campus
- III. Provisions for training for:
  - A. Resident assistants and resident coordinators
  - B. Students, faculty, and staff
- IV. Methods to support student reporting include:
  - A. Information about what students are to do if sexually assaulted
  - B. IHE response to a report of a sexual assault
  - C. Plan to protect victim confidentiality
  - D. Availability of anonymous victim reporting
  - E. Clear response if victim has violated alcohol or drug policy
- V. Prevention efforts and resources for victims
  - A. Published availability of resources that support:
    - 1. Sexual assault prevention programs
    - 2. Campus safety within residence halls
    - 3. Campus safety on campus
    - 4. Victim's health and on-campus forensic services
    - 5. Victim's mental health
- VI. Identification of methods/policies that prevent reporting
  - A. Annual evaluation of students' knowledge of:
    - 1. Who to notify when a sexual assault has occurred
    - 3. IHE response to a sexual assault
    - 4. IHE policy for victim confidentiality
    - 5. IHE policy for victim protection
    - 6. IHE response to victim's use of illegal drugs or under age alcohol consumption
- VII. Encourage victim reporting with inclusion of methods that:
  - A. List services to aid victim
  - B. Demonstrate victim safety
  - C. Outline campus law-enforcement protocols
  - D. Provide for health needs of the victim
  - E. Outline prevention education for the campus community
  - F. Show strong visible commitment to assure victim confidentiality
- VIII. Guidelines to investigate and punish perpetrators include:
  - A. Methods to address dual jurisdiction
  - B. Set procedures for investigating sexual assault
  - C. Identified procedures for discipline and punishment of perpetrators
- IX. Policy demonstrates:
  - A. Public record documenting IHE implementation of the policy
  - B. Record of assessment of effectiveness of policy



C. Record of policy implementation  
D. Periodic review for currency of policy  
(Pasky-McMahon, 2008, p. 364)

## Chapter Four – General Findings

This chapter pulls together some general findings that have not fitted thematically into previous chapters.

### **Key point 8.**

**We found very little information or evidence of effectiveness of specific support for survivors. Working closely with a local Rape Crisis Centre, as Durham does, is a model that is likely to increase in the future given the partnership working in the new NUS project Stand by Me.**

### **Key point 9.**

**We also found very little information or evidence relating to male rape or same sex sexual violence.**

Research indicates that rape prevention programs are most effective when they are tailored to the community (McMahon, 2007; Potter, Moynihan, & Stapleton, 2011). In a review of 69 studies of college-based prevention efforts, Anderson and Whiston (2005) found only one program with content designed for a specific ethnic group – this therefore reveals a gap for prevention programmes that are specifically tailored to specific groups and are culturally sensitive to the differences among student communities.

Despite research showing lesbian and bisexual college women and gay and bisexual college men report higher levels of victimisation than their heterosexual counterparts, there has been very little research and very few programmes or initiatives targeting specific groups.

However, in a research project on a sexual assault prevention programme at a Northeastern US university, Rothman and Silverman (2007) found that there was a reduction in reported sexual assault victimisation among those who had attended the programme (12%, compared with 17% among those who did not). This was the case for women, men, heterosexual students, and students who had no prior experience of sexual assault victimisation (but not those who had had previously been a victim of sexual violence). There was also a reduction in prevalence of sexual assault

victimisation among non-heterosexual students who took part in the programme (from 27% to 18%), however this was with a small sample. Yet the study does suggest that heterosexual women may not be the only beneficiaries of universal sexual assault prevention programmes in terms of reduced victimisation (Rothman & Silverman 2007).

**Key point 10.**

**Changes appear both stronger and longer lasting when interventions are multi dimensional and span the student life span.**

In their review of sexual assault prevention programmes Vladutiu, Martin and Macy (2011) found that those initiatives that feature multiple sessions with long session lengths are most effective. Longer programmes, especially those which included a lecture-based format, were most effective at improving attitudes around rape and tackling the acceptance of rape myths (Vladutiu, Martin and Macy, 2011). In addition, programmes should be supplemented with mass media and public service announcements across campus (Vladutiu, Martin and Macy, 2011). Banyard (2014) has also noted that longer programmes have been found to be more effective, and that they should also have sociocultural relevance, as well as being sensitive to timing and differences in experience and development among students at different points in their academic career. For example, many programmes are directed at students earlier in their academic careers, when they may be most at risk of sexual violence victimisation (Banyard, 2014). In addition, follow-up programming such as 'booster' sessions is important in order to support durability in impacts upon participants (Banyard, Moynihan & Plante, 2007).

The evaluation of the Bringing in the Bystander programme by Cares et al. (2015) on two different campuses in New England in the US, found that whilst overall it appeared to have worked at both, there were important differences in terms of whom it was most effective with and how. This provides a challenge to those who seek prevention tools which are one off interventions that require few resources and can easily be applied to a range of communities (Cares, Banyard, Moynihan, et al. 2015). The authors argue that future sexual violence and partner violence prevention work must seek an ongoing presentation of messages, with educational efforts that appear throughout the course of a students' time on campus, are institutionalised in order to encourage longevity, and flexible so that they can be adapted to meet the changing needs of different communities (Cares, Banyard, Moynihan, et al. 2015). This could for example mean that the programme is delivered for first-year students as a first step and then built upon each year as they progress through their time at university (Cares, Banyard, Moynihan, et al. 2015).

Lonsway and Kothare found that the impact of the FYCARE Intervention was much more substantial and sustained in those students who had also taken part in another rape education programme, even if it was years after that had occurred, such as during high school. This implies that cumulative participation in rape education has the potential to increase the chances of positive change, or at least reduce the deterioration of it, and illustrates the importance of multiple and repeated forums for rape prevention work (Lonsway & Kothari 2000). In his research around The Men's Program, Foubert (2000) also argued that a one-off workshop around sexual violence is not enough to bring about long-lasting change in attitudes or behaviours.

The importance of a comprehensive, all-encompassing approach is also emphasised by many scholars, such as Banyard (2014) and Messner, Greenberg and Peretz (2015). This means that prevention programmes should be backed up with clear and effective university policies, procedures, and practices, that clearly demonstrate that sexual violence will not be tolerated, and that the university is committed to supporting victim-survivors. This is not least because anything positive learnt from prevention education could immediately be undone if the university itself contradicts these lessons with an inadequate or ineffective response to incidents of sexual violence on its campus.

**Key point 11.**

**Leadership at the most senior levels is an important component of an holistic approach.**

The developers of the Intervention Initiative argue that it should act as one component of an overall institutional approach which addresses prevention, policy, monitoring and reporting, the provision and signposting of relevant specialist response and support pathways, and fostering cultural change (Fenton and Mott, 2015). They also point out that student unions and other student-led organisations have a vital role to play by working in conjunction with institutions, especially in relation to bringing about cultural change (Fenton and Mott, 2015). This should include the following:

- Senior leaders being seen and heard promoting culture of zero tolerance to violence across the university.
- An academic representative or champion in each academic faculty and department who has received disclosure training and can act as a first point of contact for student and staff. All staff who have tutoring responsibilities and departmental managers should also have received basic awareness training in how to be a first responder, and familiar with the pathway to reporting. Every staff member should understand the importance of confidentiality. This could be

achieved through awareness raising and disclosure training at departmental away days, for example.

- A clear policy statement that specifically addresses all forms of violence and abuse against women, which includes behaviour that contributes to a 'conducive context'. For example, the University of the West of England and its Student Union have made a joint policy statement on zero tolerance to sexual and domestic violence, abuse and harassment. This should include the enforcement of sanctions against individuals, clubs or societies that breach expected good conduct. There should also be readily accessible and straightforward, transparent processes for handling reports which are victim-centred.
- A user-friendly step by step pathway which can be readily found by students and staff, and which outlines their options for reporting violence and abuse that they have suffered or witnessed. This should include clear information about what will happen and how support can be accessed whether or not they wish to make a report.
- The availability of confidential support for victim-survivors from trained, supported specialists, who have training in risk assessment, within the institution. How this support can be accessed and what it consists of should be clearly document, and referral pathways should be clearly laid out, with specialist support in the local community and via national agencies also clearly identified for staff and students, friends and family.
- A centralised system for recording reports made both internally and externally, together with the commissioning or conducting of standardised surveys of students' experiences of violence and abuse.
- Collaboration between university and student leaders, service providers and criminal justice agencies, to ensure that knowledge, resources and plans are shared.

(Fenton and Mott, 2015)

In addition, among students there should be visibility from Students' Union leaders around the issue, campaigning and creating and maintaining a visible culture, holding institutions and peers to account, and data collection by the Students' Union itself and in collaboration with the university (Fenton and Mott, 2015).

Internationally, but particularly in the UK, universities have been more focused on social norms and prevention related work than directly on what to do with student offenders.

Many US universities have dedicated centres or offices for responding to and preventing sexual violence.

For example, the Harvard University Office of Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (<http://osapr.harvard.edu>), the Boston University Sexual Assault Response and Prevention Center (<http://www.bu.edu/sarp/>), and the Stanford University Office of Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence Education and Response (<https://sara.stanford.edu/>).

- Most research, interventions and policies focus on undergraduate students with less focus on postgraduates, and even less on academic staff and non-academic staff such as cleaners, security staff, catering staff etc.

Most of the UK-based programmes have not been evaluated for long enough to have the long term outcomes known.

The development and implementation of educational programs and awareness raising is generally viewed as a positive thing and many of the evaluations report positive results. However, in answering whether these programs ‘work’, it is important to consider how ‘success’ is defined. The majority of existing evaluations measure the effectiveness of programmes and interventions by focusing on a decrease in rape-supportive attitudes/belief in rape myths; customer satisfaction; and behavioural intentions (Breitenbecher and Scarce, 2001). Several concerns with these forms of measuring the effectiveness of programmes have been raised, particularly in relation to the lack of longitudinal studies measuring changes in attitudes or behaviours over a long period of time – the majority of studies measure attitudes and indicators of behaviour immediately before and after a programme, campaign or educational workshop. Furthermore, very few studies have measured the effectiveness of education/bystander programmes in actually reducing the incidence of sexual violence.

One UK-based project for which there is evidence, but which has been aimed more at young people in schools and youth settings, is Rape Crisis Scotland’s Sexual Violence Prevention Project. An evaluation of this intervention found that the delivery of workshops from Rape Crisis Scotland’s Sexual Violence Prevention resource pack project did have a substantial impact on both the knowledge and attitudes of the young people who took part (McNeish & Scott 2015). After three workshops, the vast majority of the participants had a greater knowledge of how people can be affected by sexual violence and abuse, what the law consists of around sexual violence, and where support can be found for people who have been raped or sexually assaulted (McNeish & Scott 2015). Young people’s awareness of sexual violence was also found to have increased after the workshop sessions, together with the importance of equality and consent in healthy relationships, and that the responsibility for sexual violence lies solely with the perpetrator and not the victim (McNeish & Scott 2015). A third of young people had changed their opinions around sexual violence after the three workshops, and this was more likely to be the case among boys than girls – in part because the views of boys

before the workshop had were further away from the messages delivered by the workshops than those of girls (McNeish & Scott 2015).

No UK university is auditing their sexual assault rates, meaning they will find it difficult to show progress in the future or properly target campaigns and interventions.

The University of Texas has just announced the launch of a system-wide study on sexual assault. They believe this effort may be one of the most comprehensive studies in the nation on dating and sexual violence at college campuses ([http://www.elpasotimes.com/news/ci\\_28538781/ut-launches-system-wide-study-sexual-assault](http://www.elpasotimes.com/news/ci_28538781/ut-launches-system-wide-study-sexual-assault)). In the UK, a recent investigation by The Guardian revealed that fewer than half of elite universities in Britain systematically log all allegations of sexual violence or sexual harassment and monitor the levels. Furthermore, the study found that one in five Russell Group universities do not have specific guidelines for students on how to report such allegations.

Few universities in the UK are training staff in how to respond to disclosures of sexual violence.

This is despite it being clear, for example throughout many of the US studies discussed here, that training for a wide range of staff is vital in helping them to feel more confident to respond effectively to students who disclose to them, and ensuring that students receive an appropriately supportive response (Cantalupo, 2011).

It is also important for there to be a contact point where anonymous reports can be made, as highlighted for example by Grauerholz, Gottfried, Stohl, et al. (1999) and Pasky-MacMahon (2008).

# References

---

- Alegría-Flores, K., Raker, K., Pleasants, R. K., Weaver, M. A., & Weinberger, M. (2015). Preventing Interpersonal Violence on College Campuses: The Effect of One Act Training on Bystander Intervention. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 1-24.
- Ahrens, C. (2006). Being Silenced: The Impact of Negative Social Reactions on the Disclosure of Rape. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 38, 263-274.
- Ahrens, C., Campbell, R., Ternier-Thames, N., Wasco, S., & Sefl, T. (2007). Deciding Whom to Tell: Expectations and Outcomes of Rape Survivors' First Disclosures. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 31, 38-49.
- Ahrens, C. E., Rich, M. D., & Ullman, J. B. (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(6), 760-776.
- Banyard, V.L. (2014). Improving College Campus-Based Prevention of Violence Against Women A Strategic Plan for Research Built on Multipronged Practices and Policies. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*. 15 (4), 339-351.
- 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), 463-481.
- Banyard, V. L., Ward, S., Cohn, E. S., Plante, E. G., Moorhead, C., and Walsh, W. (2007). Unwanted Sexual Contact on Campus: A Comparison of Women's and Men's Experiences. *Violence and Victims*. 22 (1), 52-70.
- Breitenbecher, K. H., & Scarce, M. (2001). An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of a Sexual Assault Education Program Focusing on Psychological Barriers to Resistance. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 16 (5), 387-407.
- Cantalupo, N.C. (2011). Burying Our Heads in the Sand: Lack of Knowledge, Knowledge Avoidance and the Persistent Problem of Campus Peer Sexual Violence. *Loyola University Chicago Law Journal*. 43, 205-266.
- Cares, A.C., Banyard, V.L., Moynihan, M.M., Williams, L.M., et al. (2015). Changing Attitudes About Being a Bystander to Violence Translating an In-Person Sexual Violence Prevention Program to a New Campus. *Violence Against Women*. 21 (2), 165-187.
- Casey, E. A., & Lindhorst, T. P. (2009). Toward a Multi-Level, Ecological Approach to the Primary Prevention of Sexual Assault Prevention in Peer and Community Contexts. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*. 10 (2), 91-114.



- Coker, A.L., Cook-Craig, P.G., Williams, C.M., Fisher, B.S., et al. (2011). Evaluation of Green Dot: An Active Bystander Intervention to Reduce Sexual Violence on College Campuses. *Violence Against Women*. 17 (6), 777–796.
- Coker, A. L., Fisher, B. S., Bush, H. M., Swan, S. C., Williams, C. M., Clear, E. R., & DeGue, S. (2014). Evaluation of the Green Dot bystander intervention to reduce interpersonal violence among college students across three campuses. *Violence Against Women*. 21 (12), 1507-1527.
- Durfee, A., & Rosenberg, K. (2009). Teaching Sensitive Issues: Feminist Pedagogy and the Practice of Advocacy-Based Counseling. *Feminist Teacher*. 19 (2), 103-121.
- Edwards, D. (2009). *Ending Violence One Green Dot at a Time: Instructor Manual*. Lexington, KY.
- Englander, E. (2015). Here's How Rape on Campus Remains a Hidden Crime. *The Conversation*. [Online]. Available at: <https://theconversation.com/heres-how-rape-on-campus-remains-a-hidden-crime-44644> (Accessed: 24 September 2015).
- Fenton, R.A., Mott, H.L., McCartan, K. and Rumney, P. (2014). *The Intervention Initiative* [Online]. Available at: [www.uwe.ac.uk/bl/research/InterventionInitiative](http://www.uwe.ac.uk/bl/research/InterventionInitiative) (Accessed: 23 September 2015).
- Fenton, R.A. and Mott, H. (2015). *Strategy for Addressing Sexual and Domestic Violence in Universities: Prevention and Response* [Online]. Available at: <http://www1.uwe.ac.uk/bl/research/interventioninitiative/foruniversities/violencepreventionstrategy.aspx> (Accessed: 24 September 2015).
- Fisher, B., Cullen, F., & Turner, M. (2000). *The Sexual Victimization of College Women*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Programs, National Institute of Justice Research Report. [Online]. Available at: <http://ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/182369.pdf> (Accessed: 24 September 2015).
- Foubert, J.D. (2000). The Longitudinal Effects of a Rape-prevention Program on Fraternity Men's Attitudes, Behavioral Intent, and Behavior. *Journal of American College Health*. 48 (4), 158–163.
- Foubert, J.D. (2010). In Their Own Words: Sophomore College Men Describe Attitude And Behavior Changes Resulting From a Rape Prevention Program 2 Years After Their Participation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 25, 2237-2257.
- Foubert, J. and Newberry, J.T. (2006). Effects of Two Versions of an Empathy-Based Rape Prevention Program on Fraternity Men's Survivor Empathy, Attitudes, and Behavioral Intent to Commit Rape or Sexual Assault. *Journal of College Student Development*. 47 (2), 133–148.
- Foubert, J.D., Newberry, J.T., & Tatum, J.L. (2007). Behavior Differences 7 Months Later: Effects of a Rape Prevention Program on First Year Men who Join Fraternities, *NASPA Journal*. 44, 728-749.

Gibbons, R. (2013). *The Evaluation of Campus-Based Gender Violence Prevention Programming: What We Know about Program Effectiveness and Implications for Practitioners*. VAWNet.org. [Online]. Available at: [http://www.vawnet.org/assoc\\_files\\_vawnet/ar\\_evaluationcampusprogramming.pdf](http://www.vawnet.org/assoc_files_vawnet/ar_evaluationcampusprogramming.pdf) (Accessed: 24 September 2015).

Gidycz, C. A., Layman, M. J., Rich, C. L., Crothers, M., Gyls, J., & Matorin, A., (2001). An Evaluation of an Acquaintance Rape Prevention Program: Impact on Attitudes, Sexual Aggression, and Sexual Victimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 16, 1120-1138.

Gidycz, C. A., Lynn, S. J., Rich, C. L., Marioni, N. L., Loh, C., & Blackwell, L. M. (2001). The Evaluation of a Sexual Assault Risk Reduction Program: A Multisite Investigation. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 69 (6), 1073-1078.

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), 720-742.

Gidycz, C. A., Orchowski, L. M., Probst, D. R., Edwards, K. M., Murphy, M., & Tansill, E. (2015). Concurrent Administration of Sexual Assault Prevention and Risk Reduction Programming Outcomes for Women. *Violence Against Women*. 21 (6), 780-800.

Gidycz, C. A., Rich, C. L., Orchowski, L., King, C., & Miller, A. K. (2006). The Evaluation of a Sexual Assault Self-Defense and Risk-Reduction Program for College Women: A Prospective Study. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 30(2), 173-186.

Good Lad Workshop (2015). *The Good Lad Workshop: Promoting Positive Masculinity* [Online]. Available at: <http://www.goodladworkshop.com/> (Accessed: 23 September 2015).

Gross, A., Winslett, A., Roberts, M., & Gohm, C. (2006). An Examination of Sexual Violence Against College Women. *Violence Against Women*. 12, 288-300.

Hanson, K. A., & Gidycz, C. A. (1993). An Evaluation of a Sexual Assault Prevention Program. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 61, 1046-1052.

Hayes-Smith, R., Richards, T.N., Branch, K.A. (2010). 'But I'm not a counsellor': The Nature of Role Strain Experienced By Female Professors When a Student Discloses Sexual Assault and Intimate Partner Violence. *ELiSS*. 2 (3).

Hollander, J. A. (2014). Does self-defense training prevent sexual violence against women?. *Violence Against Women*, 20(3), 252-269.

Holtzman, M., & Menning, C. (2014). A New Model for Sexual Assault Protection Creation and Initial Testing of Elemental. *Journal of Applied Social Science*. 1-17.

Home Office (2010). *A Call to End Violence Against Women and Girls*. London: HMSO.

Home Office (2011). *A Call to End Violence Against Women and Girls: An Action Plan*, London: HMSO.

Humphrey, J. A., & White, J. W. (2000). Women's Vulnerability to Sexual Assault From Adolescence to Young Adulthood. *Journal of Adolescent Health*. 27, 419-424.

I Heart Consent (2014). *Workshop Facilitator Guide for I Heart Consent* [Online]. Available at: <http://www.nusconnect.org.uk/resources/i-heart-consent-guide> (Accessed: 23 September 2015).

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Foubert, J.D., Brasfield, H.M., Hill, B., et al. (2011). The Men's Program: Does It Impact College Men's Self-Reported Bystander Efficacy and Willingness to Intervene? *Violence Against Women*. 17 (6), 743-759.

Lonsway, K.A. and Kothari, C. (2000). First Year Campus Rape Education: Evaluating the Impact of a Mandatory Intervention. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 24 (3), 220-232.

Jennings, W. G., Gover, A. R. & Pudrzynska, D. (2007). Are Institutions of Higher Learning Safe? A Descriptive Study of Campus Safety Issues and Self-Reported Campus Victimization among Male and Female College Students. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*. 18 (2), 191-20.

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). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

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

Koss, M.P., Gidycz, C.A. & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The Scope of Rape: Incidence And Prevalence of Sexual Aggression and Victimization in a National Sample of Higher Education Students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 55, 162-170.

Krebs, C., Lindquist, C. H., Warner, T. D., Fisher, B., & Martin, S. L. (2009). College Women's Experiences with Sexual Assault Before and Since Entering College. *Journal of American College Health*. 57, 639-649.

McNeish, D. and Scott, S. (2015). *An Independent Evaluation of Rape Crisis Scotland's Sexual Violence Project: Final Report* [Online]. Available at: <http://www.rapecrisisscotland.org.uk/campaigns/prevention-work/> (Accessed: 23 September 2015).

Messner, M.A., Greenberg, M.A. and Peretz, T. (2015). *Some Men: Feminist Allies in the Movement to End Violence against Women*. New York: OUP.

Miller, E., Tancredi, D. J., McCauley, H. L., Decker, M. R., Virata, M. C. D., Anderson, H. A., & Silverman, J. G. (2012). 'Coaching Boys into Men': A Cluster-Randomized Controlled Trial of a Dating Violence Prevention Program. *Journal of Adolescent Health*. 51(5), 431-438.

Moynihan, M. M., Banyard, V. L., Cares, A. C., Potter, S. J., Williams, L. M. & Stapleton, J. G. (2015). Encouraging Responses in Sexual and Relationship Violence Prevention What Program Effects Remain One Year Later? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 30 (1), 110-132.

Moynihan, M. M., Banyard, V. L., Arnold, J. S., Eckstein, R. P. & Stapleton, J. G. (2010). Engaging Intercollegiate Athletes in Preventing and Intervening in Sexual and Intimate Partner Violence, *Journal of American College Health*. 59 (3), 197-204.

National Union of Students (2010). *Hidden Marks: A Study Of Women Students' Experiences of Harassment, Stalking, Violence and Sexual Assault* [Online]. London, UK: NUS. Available at:  
[http://www.nus.org.uk/Global/NUS\\_hidden\\_marks\\_report\\_2nd\\_edition\\_web.pdf](http://www.nus.org.uk/Global/NUS_hidden_marks_report_2nd_edition_web.pdf)  
(Accessed: 24 September 2015).

Orchowski, L.M., Gidycz, C.A. & Raffle, H. (2008). Evaluation of a Sexual Assault Risk Reduction and Self-Defense Program: A Prospective Analysis of a Revised Protocol. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 32, 204-218.

Pasky-McMahon, P. (2008). Sexual Violence on the College Campus: A Template for Compliance With Federal Policy. *Journal of American College Health*. 57 (3), 361-366.

Potter, R.H., Krider, J.E. and McMahon, P.M. (2000). Examining Elements of Campus Sexual Violence Policies Is Deterrence or Health Promotion Favored? *Violence Against Women*. 6 (12), 1345-1362.

Potter, S. J. (2012). Using a Multimedia Social Marketing Campaign to Increase Active Bystanders on the College Campus. *Journal of American College Health*. 60:4, 282-295

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., Moynihan, M.M., Stapleton, J.G. & Banyard, V.L. (2009). Empowering Bystanders to Prevent Campus Violence Against Women A Preliminary Evaluation of a Poster Campaign. *Violence Against Women*. 15 (1), 106-121.

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(1-2), 39-55.

Rothman, E. and Silverman, J. (2007). The Effect of a College Sexual Assault Prevention Program on First-year Students' Victimization Rates. *Journal of American College Health*. 55 (5), 283-290.

Schwartz, J.P., Griffin, L.D., Russell, M.M. & Frontaura-Duck, S. (2006). Prevention of Dating Violence on College Campuses: An Innovative Program. *Journal of College Counseling*. 9 (1), 90-96.

Scottish Women's Aid (2015). *Get Savi: An Active Bystander Programme for Over 16 Year Olds* [Online]. Available at: <http://www.scottishwomensaid.org.uk/node/3999> (Accessed: 23 September 2015).

Stand Together (2015). #standtogetherul [Online]. Available at: <https://standtogether.blogs.lincoln.ac.uk> (Accessed: 23 September 2015).

Tharp, A. T., DeGue, S., Lang, K., Valle, L. A., Massetti, G., Holt, M. & Matjasko, J. (2011). Commentary on Foubert, Godin & Tatum (2010): The evolution of sexual violence prevention and the urgency of effectiveness, *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 26 (16), 3393-3402.

The Guardian (2015a). *Top Universities Fail to Record Sexual Violence Against Students* [Online]. 24 May 2015. Available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/education/2015/may/24/top-universities-fail-record-sexual-violence-against-students-russell-group> (Accessed: 14 July 2015).

The Guardian (2015b). *Government Orders Inquiry Over Violence Against Women at Universities* [Online]. 6 September 2015. Available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/education/2015/sep/06/government-inquiry-violence-against-women-at-universities> (Accessed: 24 September 2015).

The Stoke Sentinel (2015). *Keele University Student 'Killed Herself' After Alleged Rape*. 7 September 2015. Available at: <http://www.stokesentinel.co.uk/Keele-University-student-killed-alleged-rape/story-27750742-detail/story.html> (Accessed: 24 September 2015).

Vladutiu, C.J., Martin, S.L. & Macy, R.J. (2011). College- or University-Based Sexual Assault Prevention Programs: A Review of Program Outcomes, Characteristics, and Recommendations. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*. 12 (2), 67-86.

Ward, S. K., Chapman, K., Cohn, E., White, S., & Williams, K. (1991). Acquaintance Rape and the College Social Scene. *Family Relations*. 40, 65-71.

White House Council on Women and Girls (2014). *Rape and Sexual Assault: A Renewed Call to Action* [Online]. Available at: [https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/sexual\\_assault\\_report\\_1-21-14.pdf](https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/sexual_assault_report_1-21-14.pdf) (Accessed: 23 September 2015).

Walsh, W. A., Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., Ward, S. & Ellen S. Cohn, E. S. (2010). Disclosure and Service Use on a College Campus After an Unwanted Sexual Experience. *Journal of Trauma and Dissociation*. 11 (2): 134-51.

Whitfield, L. and Dustin, H. (2015) *Spotted: Obligations to Protect Women Students' Safety and Equality* [Online]. Available at: [http://www.endviolenceagainstwomen.org.uk/data/files/Spotted\\_-\\_Obligations\\_to\\_Protect\\_Women\\_Students\\_Safety\\_Equality.pdf](http://www.endviolenceagainstwomen.org.uk/data/files/Spotted_-_Obligations_to_Protect_Women_Students_Safety_Equality.pdf) (Accessed: 23 September 2015).