



A REPORT ON BEST PRACTICE AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Johannah May Black, MA

ANTIGONISH WOMEN'S RESOURCE CENTRE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT SERVICES ASSOCIATION

WWW.AWRCSASA.CA

Table of Contents

The Context of Sexualized Violence on University and College Campuses	2
The Role of Prevention Strategies in Addressing Sexualized Violence on Campus	7
Bystander Intervention as Prevention Work	10
How Should Training be Structured?	14
When Trainings Should Occur.....	16
Administrative and Institutional Support.....	17
The Role of Students.....	19
A Survivor Centred Approach.....	21
Should Trainings be Single or Multi-Gendered?.....	25
Taking a Systemic Approach to Bystander Intervention Training.....	26
Using an Anti-Opression/Intersectional Feminist Framework for Bystander Intervention Training.....	28
Key Elements of Successful Bystander Training Programs.....	31
Skills Building.....	31
Discussion of Rape Myths and Rape Culture.....	32
A Focus on Aggressors.....	35
Linking Sexual Violence and Alcohol.....	38
Developing Communities of Accountability.....	41
What's missing from Existing Bystander Training Models?.....	46
LGBTQ Inclusion.....	46
Grounding in the Reconciliation Process	47
Conclusion.....	49
Works Cited.....	50

A Review of the Literature on Sexual Violence Prevention and Bystander Intervention Programming on University and College Campuses in Canada and the United States

Prepared by: Johannah May Black –
Bystander Project Coordinator, Antigonish
Women's Resource Centre and Sexual
Assault Services Association.



The Context of Sexualized Violence on University and College Campuses:

With the establishment of the Sexual Violence Prevention Committee, the Nova Scotia government, along with various student organizations, community groups, Nova Scotian universities, and the NSCC, have acknowledged the pressing issue of sexual violence on post-secondary campuses in the province. At the same time, there has been a growing awareness of sexual violence on campus with students, administrators, faculty, and governments across North America concluding that universities and colleges are, “a prime hunting ground for assailants” (Task Force on Misogyny, Sexism and Homophobia in Dalhousie University Faculty of Dentistry n.d., 81). Researchers have pointed to a, “widespread systemic rape culture on Canadian campuses” (Quinlan, Clarke, and Miller 2016, 40). Indeed, sexual assault is the most common violent crime reported on college and university campuses in North

America (Potter, Fountain, and Stapleton 2012). In 2015, the CBC reported that over 700 cases of sexual assault were reported at Canadian universities and colleges between 2009 and 2014 (Haiven 2017, 95).


Furthermore, while Ryerson University had the highest number of reported cases, Nova Scotia's Acadia University had the highest rate when adjusted to the student population (Haiven 2017, 95). While there are cases of sexual assault on campus that garner national media attention, such as the sexual assault charges against two members of the St. Francis Xavier football team or the stranger assault of Mount Saint Vincent student in a wooded area on campus, both of which occurred in late 2017, the vast majority of campus sexual violence against women occurs, “under a veil of silence” (Trusolino 2017, 82).

***Between 2009 and 2014,
700 cases of sexual
assault were reported at
Canadian universities
and colleges.***

While awareness of the issue seems to have increased, scholars and anti-violence advocates have noted that, “despite more than two decades of research, reports in newspapers and magazines, activism and programs on college campuses,” there is little evidence in a decline in rates of sexualized violence (Fisher, Daigle and Cullen 2010, 177). Notably victim blaming attitudes have not decreased substantially with one author and university educator stating, “Years of educating the public about these issues seem to have resulted only in the expectation that women should now know better than to let themselves get

raped” (Mardorossian 2002, 753). As some researchers note, this is often the response of Canadian campus officials who respond to student-survivors with “suspicion and blame” (Quinlan 2017A, 65). Furthermore, as many as half of all campus survivors report “institutional betrayal” in the form of, “academically punishing the survivor for reporting, covering up the report, dismissing the survivor’s experience, taking no proactive steps, or making it difficult to further report the experience” (Smith, 2014; Smith & Freyd, 2013, as quoted in Quinlan 2017A, 66). Others have contended that while campuses and classrooms represent spaces that are “imbued with the possibility of violence”, these same classrooms also hold “the potential of healing and transformation” (Rojas Durazo 2011/12, 77). What this means is that universities and colleges, as institutions of education, have the potential to create transformative pedagogies that have an impact on the social contexts that support sexual violence.

Taking a look at statistical rates of sexual violence can provide us with a foundational understanding of the issue. We know that one in three Canadian women will experience sexual assault in her lifetime (Government of Ontario, 20150). Furthermore, 20-25% of “college- and university- aged women” in Canada will experience some form of sexual assault during their time as a student (Gladu 2017, 22). It is important to be aware that many women will have already experienced sexual assault before attending post-secondary education (Senn et al., 2014). Moreover, re-victimization is also common attribute of



FOR MORE INFORMATION CALL: 1-902-863-6221 OR
VISIT: WWW.AWRCSA.CA

women in post-secondary institutions with 60% experiencing more than one assault (Fredericton Sexual Assault Centre, n.d.). Finally, some women experience sexualized violence at higher rates than others, including indigenous women, women with disabilities, and women who identify on the

trans-spectrum (METRAC 2014, 5). American statistics also demonstrate that bisexual women are at a heightened risk for sexual violence compared to both heterosexual and lesbian women (Cantor et al., 2015).

Men also experience sexual violence on campus (Potter, Fountain, and Stapleton 2012). There are no specific statistics for men on campus, but 1 in 6 Canadian men will experience sexual violence before turning 18 (Our Turn 2017, 12). Indeed, while men with rape-supportive attitudes may fear being “falsely accused”, statistics show that a man is more likely to experience sexual assault as a victim/survivor, than to be “falsely accused” of sexual assault (Weiser 2017, 55). Men who are, “[...] young, Aboriginal, living with disabilities, working in the sex industry, and/or living on the streets or in correctional facilities [...]” experience the highest rates sexual assault compared to other groups of men (Du Mont, Macdonald, White & Turner, 2013; as cited in EVA BC 2016, 24). American studies have found that 33% of multiracial and 22.6% of Black men have experienced sexual violence in their lifetimes (Black et al. 2011; cited in Tillipauigh 2017, 102). Men with “developmental disabilities” and men who identify as gay, bisexual or Queer are also more likely to report experiencing sexual violence (Tillipauigh 2017). While the vast majority of sexual assaults are perpetrated by men towards women, there is evidence that women commit sexual violence as well. Anderson and Sorenson (1999) found that half of men in their survey reported a situation where a woman attempted to have sexual contact with him because she “overestimated his level of sexual desire” (Jozkowski, Peterson, Saunders, Dennis, & Reece 2014, 905).

Other men face sexual violence from male peers in the form of “homoerotic sadism that is practised on new kids when they join [...] a college athletic team, or the school band, or a fraternity” (Kimmel 2009, 61). Hazing rituals on campus are frequently sites of sexual violence as they are meant to elicit the “sexual humiliation of presumed heterosexual males” through “homophobic taunting” (Kimmel 2009, 112). Indeed, university athletes and sexually violent hazing rituals came to the forefront of national media in Canada in 2005 when six football players at McGill University in Montreal were suspended from one game for sexually assaulting a teammate with a broom handle in front of a group of other teammates (Fogel 2017, 144-5). Similarly, in 1996 two male hockey players were cut from the University of Guelph’s hockey team after reporting sexually violent hazing rituals to their coach (Fogel 2017, 145).

The experiences of trans and nonconforming students with sexual violence on campus are also important to note. When studies do pay attention to gender identities other than cis-gendered men and women, they show that nearly one in three transgender, genderqueer, questioning, and nonconforming (TGQN) students experience sexual assault during college (Cantor et al., 2015). In particular, trans-spectrum students who are also racial minorities, experience extremely high rates of sexual violence (Grant et al. 2011; cited in Palacios and Aguilar 2017, 200). Other particularly vulnerable groups on campus include international students, racialized students and bisexual students. Studies report a higher level of vulnerability to sexual assault for international students who may have limited knowledge of Canadian laws, less confidence in English language

skills, limited social support, and/or may be perceived as having the above stated vulnerabilities by aggressors who target them intentionally (Forbes-Mewett, McCulloch, & Nyland, 2015). American-based research has demonstrated that racial minorities experience sexual assault on campus at higher rates (Krebs et al., 2016). Another group facing a high risk of sexual violence are bisexual students whose rates of experiencing sexual violence are double that of gay and lesbian students and 2.5 times higher than heterosexual students (Cantor et al., 2015).

Common sites of sexual violence on campus include campus bars or pubs and residences, as well as off-campus housing (Gladu 2017, 22). According to statistics drawn from American studies, 34% of sexual assaults and 45% of attempted sexual assaults of college women occur on campus (Martell Consulting Services Ltd. 2014, 8). 60% of these assaults and attempted assaults occur in the victim/survivors residence, with 31% occurring in another residence and 10% occurring in a fraternity house (Martell Consulting Services Ltd. 2014, 8). It also important to note that the risk of sexual assault has been found to be similar for students at colleges and universities with “heightened security measures” such as cctv cameras and fenced boundaries, as it is for students at colleges and universities that do not have these measures in place (Cass 2007, quoted in Quinlan 2017A, 5). This suggests that environmental safety measures may have less of an impact than shifting cultural norms. METRAC (2016) reports that 80% of women post-secondary students who are survivors of sexual assault or attempted assault knew the aggressor (quoted in Our Turn 2017, 12). In most cases, the aggressor is a classmate, friend,

boyfriend, or ex-boyfriend (Martell Consulting Services Ltd 2014, 8; Senn et al. 2015, 2333).

80% of sexual assault survivors on campus knew the aggressor beforehand.

“Date rape” or sexual assault perpetrated by an intimate partner, is a common form of sexual violence experienced on campus and is also the least reported type of sexual assault (Whitieside-Lantz 2003, 14). Focusing on Canadian campuses, Schwartz, DeKesseredy, Tait, and Alvi (2001) write that, “Canadian male dating partners sexually abuse an alarmingly high number of female undergraduates” (624). The Canadian National Survey (DeKesseredy and Kelly 1993) showed that 41% of women undergraduate students reported experiencing “one of several types of sexual assaults on a date since leaving high school” and 19.5% of men undergraduate students reporting having victimized a dating partner in the same way (cited in Schwartz, DeKesseredy, Tait, and Alvi 2001, 624). Within more long-term intimate relationships, sexual coercion is commonplace form of sexual violence (Senn et al. 2015). 54% of young women and 13% of young men report experiencing sexual coercion in a dating relationship, with 20% of post-secondary students indicating that they have given in to unwanted sexual intercourse “because they were overwhelmed by a man’s continual arguments and pressure” (Fredericton Sexual Assault Centre, n.d.). Indeed, when broadening the discussion of sexual assault

to sexual aggression, American studies confirm that over 50% of college aged women report experiencing sexual aggression and 25% of college aged men admit to engaging in “at least one instance of sexually aggressive behaviour”, with 8% of the men reporting behaviour that met the legal definition for rape or attempted rape (Swartout 2013, 158).

Sexual Assault is the most gendered of crimes.

Women are more at risk for experiencing sexual violence during their time as post-secondary students than at any other time in their life (Martin, Fisher, Warner, Krebs, & Lindquist, 2011). There are various claims about when students are most likely to experience sexual violence, with some arguing that students are most at risk during the first two years of school (Senn et al., 2015), their first year (EVA BC, n.d.), during the first eight weeks of school (EVA BC, n.d.; Martell Consulting Services Ltd. 2014) known as the “red zone”, or during Frosh or Orientation weeks (Gladu 2017, 22).

Sexual violence on campus is highly gendered and thus impacts men and women’s experiences on campus differently. As Canadian feminist statistician Holly Johnson (2012) writes, “Sexual assault is the most gendered of crimes” (613). Indeed, a campus safety audit completed with student participation at StFX University in 2013 found that female students felt significantly less safe on campus than male students (MacDonald, Mtetwa and Ndomo 2013, 8). American research shows that women students are more likely to be aware of

issues of sexual violence on campus than men students (Potter, Moynihan, Stapleton, & Banyard, 2009). Cisgendered women students are also more likely than cisgendered men students to view sexual violence as a problem on their campus, as are transgender, genderqueer, nonconforming, and questioning students (Cantor et al., 2015). Overall, 40% of Canadian undergraduate students consider the response and resources that their university has provided to deal with sexual violence, “moderately inadequate” or “very inadequate” (Quinlan 2017A, 68). However American research has demonstrated that heterosexual men are more likely than both heterosexual women and lesbian, gay and bisexual students to report that their university is “doing a good job” of handling sexual violence on campus (Krebs, Lindquist, Berzofsky, Shook-Sa, & Peterson, 2016). As Armstrong and Mahone (2017) conclude, “It is clear that sexual violence continues to be more of a concern to women than to men. That is not to say that men condone sexual violence, but they seem to be more passive in their opposition” (110).

Other studies point to a gendered-gap in understanding consent (Muelenhard et al. 2016). Muelenahrd et al. (2016) cite a study by Byers (1980) that found that 91% of men and women university students reported one of more experiences when “the man was surprised when the woman became angry or upset or tried to resist him in a physical or verbal way” (16). A University of Ottawa campus climate survey also found differences in gender in terms of participation in rape culture with 24% of male students stating that they would “laugh at a rape joke” compared to only 5% of

female students (University of Ottawa 2015, 16).

In terms of reporting on campuses, most studies confirm that students of all genders believe that reporting sexual assaults to campus officials is important (Cantor et al., 2015). However, American studies show that over 50% of survivors “of even the most serious incidents” do not report the assault because “they do not consider it ‘serious enough’” (Association of American Universities 2017, 4). While students often have more options in terms of access to formal supports than survivors who are not students, they are less likely to seek help than other survivors (Holtfreter and Boyd 2006; Sabina & Ho 2014). This points to a widespread culture of denial and the minimization of the harms of sexual violence on campuses and in broader North American society. Again, it is important to point out that this underreporting is gendered with cis-gendered women and TGQN-identified persons reporting that they have less faith in the benefits of the campus reporting process than cis-gendered men (Worthen and Wallace 2017, 182). In a survey of sexual assault survivors on American campuses, Holland and Cortina (2017) found that some student-survivors, “minimized the assault by interpreting the behaviour as a normal part of being a woman in college...” (56). Furthermore, intersectional feminists have pointed out that underreporting is also influenced by institutionalized racism with Black women survivors fearing micro-aggressions or overt racism from campus supports, as well as the fear of not being believed (Wooten 2017). Indeed, a study of racialized undergraduate students who were also survivors of campus sexual violence in Canadian institutions found that most of these students were

reluctant to report to campus authorities (Stermac, Horowitz, and Bance 2017). These students would often “downplay” the violence as normal, or would be aware of the violence but want to use their academic pursuits as a way to avoid facing the issue, or in other cases, would approach campus administrators with generalized concerns about sexual violence on campus without disclosing their own experiences (Stermac, Horowitz, and Bance 2017).

There are several explanations given by scholars and anti-violence activists as to why post-secondary education institutions have increased rates of sexual violence in comparison to other segments of our society. For young students who leave home a new environment with less parental supervision as well as a new local culture to adapt to and the desire to “fit in” or find one’s place can create a vulnerability to peer norms (California Coalition Against Sexual Assault 2015, 60). Kuperberg and Padgett (2015) argue that there is a “social script” that many students follow when arriving at college or university where they view their student years as a “time to experiment” with new personalities and behaviours (518). Other scholars note that there are a number of known social factors that increase violence against women that all converge on Canadian campuses, including student populations that are disproportionately “young and transient”, with “low levels of group cohesion and community attachment” as well as high rates of alcohol and drug use (Quinlan, Clarke, and Miller 2016, 41).

Indeed, many campuses have an informal culture that encourages experimentation with alcohol and drugs (California Coalition Against Sexual Assault 2015; Martell Consulting Services Ltd.

2014). However, Horseman and Cormack (2016) warn against the “moral panic” found in many popular accounts of campus party culture, arguing that many students find meaning and identity in this culture. Instead, they point to a culture of entitlement on campus where, “regardless of a student’s class origin, university campuses remain sites of the enactment of social class privilege, where students are encouraged to treat themselves as suspended from adult responsibilities and the coherent construction of self” (Horseman and Cormack 2016, 2). They argue that students experience university culture as “radically new moral territories” where their current “student self” is divorced from their visions of a future, adult self and the moral and social responsibilities that come with it (Horseman and Cormack 2016, 6-11). In this same space of experimentation, others argue that campuses are, “breeding grounds for performances of hypermasculinity” (Rich, Utley, Janke, and Moldoveanu 2010, 270). In this context, cisgendered male students are celebrated for their “kill counts” in terms of hook-ups and women students are labelled as “sluts” for taking part in the same behaviours (Horseman and Cormack 2016, 10).

26% of male post-secondary students will perpetrate at least one act of sexual violence during their time as students.

The double-standard for men and women, as well as the violent language of “kill counts” points to misogynistic culture that often permeates student hook-up

culture. While hook-up culture in and of itself is not violent or misogynistic, its current formation on campus often is. Horseman and Cormack (2016) detail the hookup culture at a small Canadian university where male students signal to other male students that the hookup they engaged in was “meaningless” by treating the woman that they hooked-up with as “meaningless”. Furthermore, surveys measuring male acts of sexual violence report that more than 26% of male students will perpetuate at least one act of sexual violence during their college years (Abbey & McAuslan, 2004; Abbey, McAuslan, & Ross, 1998). In a survey of male students “attraction to sexual aggression”, Malamuth (1989) found that 16-20 % of male students reported that they would, “commit rape if they could be certain of getting away with it” (cited in Kimmel 2009, 224). When the word “rape” was substituted for the phrase “force a woman to have sex” the response rate jumped to 36-44% of male students (Malamuth 1989; cited in Kimmel 2009, 224). Pair this misogyny and climate of “experimentation” with what Kimmel (2009) describes as a “code of silence” between “brothers”, and you have a culture where violence against women is routine and accepted (230).

It is not only student culture that is complicit in allowing sexual violence to become commonplace on campus. Campus institutions have also failed on multiple fronts. Studies have shown that on average, only 1% of campus perpetrators receive any form of disciplinary sanctions from their university (Krebs et al. 2007 in Quinlan 2017A, 66). Furthermore, the documentary *The Hunting Ground* revealed a ratio of 200 expulsions for plagiarism for every one expulsion for rape (cited in Quinlan 2017A,

66). Despite these sobering statistics there are some visionary and unique efforts by various campus and government bodies to address the issue of campus sexual violence from a pro-active rather than re-active approach. These methods are fast becoming the best-practice and gold-standard for violence prevention on campus. As Canadian scholar Elizabeth Quinlan (2017B) writes, these approaches include public reporting of all incidents of sexual assault on campus as mandated by the Ontario and British Columbia governments, legislation placing the onus on perpetrator to “prove consent” in both New York and California, and the requirement to mark perpetrators’ transcripts to prevent them from moving from campus to campus without notice in Virginia. Further best practice models include stand-alone sexual violence policies, sexual assault centres on campus with their own full-time staff, peer-to-peer sexual violence support through student run phone lines or drop-in centres, campus counselling centres without long waitlists, campus-wide awareness campaigns, and prevention education in the form of Bystander Intervention training that is institutionalized, fully funded, and sustainable (Quinlan 2017A, 71).

The Role of Prevention Strategies in Addressing Sexualized Violence on Campus

While many Universities and Colleges in Canada have made great strides in shaping and adopting stand-alone sexual violence policies, Senn et al. (2014) argue that there is, “an urgent need for effective rape prevention programs on university campuses”. Indeed, only a “small minority of women” come to university or college with previous sexual violence education or

training (Senn et al. 2014). This lack of training combined with other contextual factors detailed in the previous section, leaves students vulnerable and unprepared to challenge rape culture on campus. Studies show that prevention education works best when it is “individually tailored” to the needs and contexts of specific campuses (Association of American Universities 2017; California Coalition Against Sexual Assault 2015). A “Made in Nova Scotia” Bystander Intervention Training program will be able to address this need by tailoring the education to the Nova Scotian context as well as by working closely with students and campus groups.

Student participation and input is key to developing successful prevention efforts. Our Turn is a new student-led organization addressing rape culture on Canadian campuses. Their recent national Action Plan, which has been adopted by the Dalhousie student union, calls for “a holistic approach” that includes prevention programming as one of the three tiers of action (Our Turn 2017). Similarly, the student-run Ontario Public Interest Research Group at Queens University in Kingston ON, commissioned a review of best-practice approaches to campus violence, as well as a survey of anti-sexual violence workers across Canadian campuses called, “We Believe in a Campus Free of Sexual Violence: Lessons from Campus Sexual Violence Prevention Leaders” (Gerrits and Runyon 2015). Their report recommends widespread prevention education on campus and states that prevention programming must increase knowledge on campus about sexual violence and healthy relationships, as well as “foster the development of skills with which [students] can intervene in rape culture in their own lives” (Gerrits and Runyon 2015,

4). In the United States, Students Active for Ending Rape (SAFER) found that, “[...] an overarching theme [...] was the need for more and better prevention education.” (SAFER 2015, 6). Included in their “Campus Accountability Project” is the recommendation that campuses “Increase primary prevention efforts and create more opportunities for students to engage meaningfully with primary prevention activities” (SAFER & V-Day 2013, vi). They push for colleges and universities to “prioritize primary prevention programs [...] in order to increase students’ skills for intervening against sexual assault and decrease their acceptance of rape myths” (SAFER & V-Day 2013, 27). In other words, the push for prevention education is coming directly from students and their advocates.

However, due to chronic underfunding and a lack of initiative by Canadian campuses, prevention work often ends up “taking a back seat” to providing front-line supports or developing policy (Gerrits and Runyon 2015; Silbaugh 2015). While both support work and a strong, stand-alone policy are vital pieces of each institution’s responses to sexual violence on campus, the value of prevention education cannot be understated. Indeed, the University of Ottawa’s (2015) *Report of the Task Force on Respect and Equality*, states definitively that, “Campuses must prevent sexual violence and not simply react to it” (University of Ottawa 2015, 24). Furthermore, the same report contends that sexual violence policies are more effective when combined with prevention education initiatives (University of Ottawa 2015, 28). The Association of American Universities (AAU) (2017) argues that prevention efforts should be the “top priority” of universities

that “want to stop sexual assault and misconduct from occurring in the first place” (24). In their guidelines for campuses addressing sexual assault, the California Coalition Against Sexual Assault (2015) states that, “Campuses must provide comprehensive prevention and outreach” as a “part of every incoming student’s orientation, and should be ongoing and layered throughout a student’s time on campus” (7). Canadian scholars of campus sexual violence, Quinlan, Clarke, and Miller (2016) echo that there is a “pressing need” for Canadian post-secondary institutions to increase their funding for “prevention and intervention programming” (48). Similarly, Senn (2011) advocates for “comprehensive” prevention education that is “proven effective” through evaluation and “funded to enable widespread dissemination” (124).

In terms of what prevention efforts should look like, Casey and Lindhorst (2009) argue for an “ecological prevention strategy” that is comprehensive, incorporates community engagement, contextualizes the problem, is based in theory, focuses on strengths, and addresses structural factors (cited in Government of Nova Scotia 2017, 38). This means that prevention efforts cannot simply be “band-aid” solutions to broader structural problems. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2014) state that, “Prevention strategies that are consistent with best practices – such as being theory-based and including multiple skill-based sessions – have the greatest potential in reducing rates of sexual violence” (2). They further detail the best prevention strategies as: comprehensive; appropriately timed; including multiple sessions; administered by well-trained staff; socio-culturally relevant; based in theory of change; encouraging of positive

relationships between peers or communities; draw on multiple teaching methods; and include evaluation of outcomes (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2014; National Sexual Violence Resource Center 2013).

Focusing primarily on consent implies that rape prevention programs merely have to explain to men how to interpret women's cues.

Canadian anti-violence organizations including, the Ending Violence Association of BC write that “broad evidence-based sexual violence prevention” initiatives should include the following: an understanding of the gendered nature of sexual violence; an analysis of how sexual violence is unique from other issues that might occur on university and college campuses (i.e. plagiarism); a trauma-informed approach to the short- and long-term impacts that violence can have on survivors; an understanding of the broader impacts of rape culture and the myths about sexual violence that are perpetuated by this culture (EVA BC 2016, 41). Gerrits and Runyon (2015) in their report for OPIRG identify six interrelated characteristics of a comprehensive prevention strategy. They write that a comprehensive prevention strategy must: increase knowledge about sexual violence; increase knowledge about healthy relationships; develop positive skill sets; challenge social norms; foster student leadership; and address substance abuse (Gerrits and Runyon 2015, 8). Furthermore,

prevention education should build on the knowledge and experiences of the students who participate in it (Beres 2014, 377) and be, “grounded in an understanding of sexual assault as a normalized, socially learned behaviour” (Quinlan, Clarke, and Miller 2016, 46).

Unfortunately, Senn (2011) writes that with some exceptions, the most common approach to sexual violence prevention on Canadian University campuses is “the provision of brochures in health or student centre offices” (123). A recent symposium on sexual violence on Canadian campuses found that “prevention and advocacy services on campuses are woefully inadequate” (Quinlan, Clarke and Miller 2016, 48). Similar to the evaluation of rape education programs reviewed by Carmody (2009), these prevention efforts are based on, “the faulty assumption that individual ‘awareness’ would prevent rape” (cited in Senn 2011, 130). Moreover, in their review of prevention education efforts on Canadian campuses, Sharp, Weiser, Lavigne and Kelly (2017) are critical of the majority of sexual assault programs offered because of the ways that these programs, “obscured the gendered context of sexual assault, put the onus on women, and focused primarily on issues of consent...” (77). They argue that these, “Campus Life interventions have lacked both empirical evaluation and feminist theorizing” (Sharp, Weiser, Lavigne, and Kelly 2017, 77). While consent education is important, focusing primarily or even solely on consent, “implies that rape-prevention programs need merely to explain how to interpret women’s cues” (Muelenhard, Humphreys, Jozkowski, and Peterson 2016, 477). This is inconsistent with research that demonstrates that both young men and young women are able to

understand and interpret complicated and context-driven cues to sexual consent (Beres 2010), as well as the predatory and planned behaviour exhibited by the majority of aggressors in campus sexual assaults (Armstrong et al. 2006; Lisak & Miller 2002). Other prevention education efforts have been criticized as “victim blaming” or as focusing too narrowly on individuals and small groups instead of “wider social change” (Potter, Fountain and Stapleton 2012, 202). As Quinlan (2017A) argues, “...if sexual violence was recognized as a social problem, the nature and extend of the programs would necessarily be different from those presently being adopted...” (63). It is important that in developing the Made In Nova Scotia Bystander Intervention training program that we take these criticisms seriously and work to avoid the same mistakes.

Bystander Intervention as Prevention Work

While there are many forms of prevention education, Bystander Intervention training is particularly promising (EVA BC 2016; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2014; Association of American Universities 2017; California Coalition Against Sexual Assault 2015; McQueeny 2016; Senn et al. 2014; Quinlan, Clarke, and Miller 2016). In Nova Scotia, the *Preventing Violence Against Women at StFX* project, led by the Antigonish Women’s Resource Centre and Sexual Assault Services Association, was responsible for introducing *Bringing in the Bystander* trainings to Nova Scotia campuses (Martell Consulting Ltd. 2014b). This program has been widely adopted across the province. Most recently, the Nova Scotia Sexual Violence Prevention

Committee has recommended that “the universities collaborate in developing a Nova Scotia specific bystander education program. Once developed and evaluated, this program should be recognized as a best practice for use at Nova Scotia university campuses” (Government of Nova Scotia 2017, 7). The development of this new “made in Nova Scotia Bystander training program” is once again being led by the Antigonish Women’s Resource Centre and Sexual Assault Services Association. A wide range of anti-violence organizations and scholars have similarly recommend adopting Bystander Intervention training initiatives (EVA BC 2016; Our Turn 2017). In the United States, the Obama administration mandated primary prevention programming for all incoming students and employees of post-secondary institutions (SAFER & V-DAY 2013). This is also in-line with recommendations found in the reports responding to sexual violence at various Canadian post-secondary institutions (St. Mary’s University President’s Council 2013; University of Ottawa 2015).

Student organizations and advocates similarly recommend Bystander Intervention training. The Our Turn (2017) action plan recommends “peer-to-peer” sexual violence prevention training that includes, “tools for bystanders to identify sexual violence and respond” (26). In their national study of student anti-rape activists, SAFER found that in response to a question on “the most effective way to end sexual assault/rape on campus,” the most popular response was “Bystander intervention/education” with 31.7% of respondents selecting this answer (SAFER 2013, 18). Similarly, in their report OPIRG recommends “comprehensive & ongoing anti-sexual violence educational programming in the form of peer education,”

specifically pointing to Bystander Intervention Training as a promising approach (Gerriets and Runyon 2015). A campus climate survey at the University of Ottawa (2015) showed that many students believed that, “a robust prevention program (following the bystander model) [...] would be more effective means to combat sexual violence” than overly punitive measures (22). Students Nova Scotia (Students NS) also recommended in both their (Martell Consulting Ltd. 2014a) report on reducing the harmful effects of alcohol overconsumption as well as their (Martell Consulting Ltd. 2014b) report on preventing sexual violence that Bystander intervention training be offered to all student leadership on an annual basis.

Bystander Intervention training programs work towards preventing sexual violence by teaching participants how to “interrupt” sexually violent encounters either before they occur when warning signs are present, or while they are occurring, as well as how to “speak out” against rape culture (Banyard, Moynihan & Plante 2007; cited in Government of Nova Scotia 2017, 41). The Ending Violence Association of BC (EVA BC) writes that, “The bystander approach is centred on the idea that everyone has a role to play in challenging and interrupting violent behaviour and that in each peer culture, individuals should be upholding social norms that condemn violent behaviour” (EVA BC 2016, 77). One of the strengths of the Bystander Model is that it makes the subject of sexual violence relevant, “to people who otherwise feel that they are not impacted by the problem” (California Coalition Against Sexual Assault 2015, 64). This is accomplished by giving all members of the community a “specific role, which they can identify with and adopt

in preventing the community problem of sexual violence” (Banyard, Moynihan, and Plante 2007, 464), and can be further enhanced by using recent and local statistics (Senn et al. 2014), and by portraying “scenes” or case studies that are “true to their life experiences” (Mitchell and Freitag 2011, 1003).

The bystander approach is centered on the idea that everyone has a role to play in ending sexual violence.

Straatman (2013) argues that the bystander approach to sexual violence prevention is important because, “bystander attitudes have been identified as aspects of society that condone interpersonal violence. Bystanders can perpetuate these attitudes and community norms...” (3). Indeed, as Kimmel (2008) points out many aggressors are able to commit sexual assault because of “the silence of other men” and thus campuses need to work to empower these “silent men” to be active bystanders (as cited in Jozkowski and Wiersma-Mosely 2017, 99). When students and community members of all genders are approached as “partners” in ending violence, “connectivity is fostered, defensiveness is minimized, and everyone becomes part of the solution” (Mitchell and Freitag 2011, 1002). The Bystander approach can also deflect victim-blaming by encouraging participants to focus on their own responsibilities as bystanders instead of the actions of victims/survivors (Mitchell and Freitag 2011, 1002).

There are numerous positive benefits that come from providing Bystander Training on campus that have been proven in evaluation studies. For example, studies have demonstrated that rates of sexual violence are lower on campuses after providing bystander training compared to similar campuses that did not provide training (Coker et al 2016 cited in Government of Nova Scotia 2017, 41). Other studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of Bystander Intervention training in “shifting attitudes and social norms on the issue of gender-based violence” (Banyard et al. 2007; Palm Reed et al 2015; as cited in EVA BC 2016, 42); increasing bystander confidence, and decreasing beliefs in rape myths and victim blaming attitudes (U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women 2014, 2). Bystander intervention training has also demonstrated an effectiveness in increasing participants’ intent to intervene as well as their perceived benefits of intervention (U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women 2014, 2).

Students already witness sexual violence on a regular basis and are looking for ways to create change. A campus climate survey at UNB Fredericton found that 15% of students have witnessed an incident of sexual assault, and that 68% took some form of action to intervene (cited in Government of Nova Scotia 2017, 29). A campus climate survey at the University of Ottawa (2015) produced similar results. This demonstrates that while many acts of sexual assault occur in private, there is still a significant number of cases where bystanders are present, up to one-third according to some research (Planty 2002 cited in Bennett, Banyard, and Garnhart 2014). Students are clearly able to

recognize the situations as problematic and are already taking steps to intervene.

Bystander Intervention training is useful in teaching students ways to intervene that are both safe and effective.

However, Bystander Intervention training is limited in its effectiveness if it is the only method addressing sexual violence on campus. In particular, it is necessary for post-secondary institutions to first raise awareness of the issue as it relates to their particular campus context (Government of Nova Scotia 2017, 41). Indeed, research demonstrates that Bystander Intervention training is most successful when there is “broad community support” for the training (Powell 2010 cited in Rentschler 2017, 571). The U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women (2014) states that an effective Bystander Training program will have the following components: increase awareness of sexual violence; increase a “sense of responsibility” in participants; create a positive shift in peer norms; teach bystanders to weigh the pros and cons of different approaches to intervention; and increase participants’ confidence in their ability to help (1). Students NS recommends that effective Bystander Intervention Trainings: teach intervention techniques; encourage men to get involved in preventing sexual violence; address the connections between alcohol and sexual violence; explicitly address acquaintance sexual violence; and dispel rape myths (Martell Consulting Ltd. 2014b, 37). Straatman (2013) writes that promising strategies for Bystander Training will: identify sexual violence as a “gender-based crime”; frame sexual violence as a continuum of harmful behaviour; address barriers to bystander intervention; include examples of how to respond proactively and

appropriately to sexual violence; and identify common situations where individuals may find themselves to be bystanders (6). It is important in developing a “Made in Nova Scotia” approach to address as many of this components as possible.

Bystander Intervention trainings should encourage interventions that are positive, creative and non-violent.

It is further recommended that Bystander Intervention training adopt an explicitly feminist lens (Sharp, Weiser, Lavigne, and Kelly 2017). This is especially necessary in order to avoid positioning male bystanders as “white knights,” thereby reinforcing “patriarchal rescue narratives” (Haaken 2017, 24) and sexist notions that position women as “helpless ladies” (Rich, Utley, Janke, and Moldoveanu 2010, 284) that “need men as protectors from other men” (Fredericton Sexual Assault Crisis Centre n.d., 561). A feminist analysis must include discussion of survivor agency to avoid perpetuating the idea that, “women are too weak to defend themselves” (Haaken 2017, 26). Furthermore, these trainings should work to counter the popular beliefs that the only two choices bystanders have are to intervene physically or do nothing, encouraging interventions that are “positive, creative, nonviolent and carry little or no risk of physical confrontation” (Fredericton Sexual Assault Crisis Centre n.d., 562). Realistic models will also explicitly address potential challenges and fears of participants including, “fear of retaliation”, loss of

friendship or social standing, and uncertainty over the “seriousness” of the situation (Fredericton Sexual Assault Crisis Centre n.d., 562), as well as their own and others’ perception of masculinity for men who are bystanders (Mitchell and Freitag 2011, 997).

An intersectional feminist approach to Bystander Intervention training should be grounded in models of community accountability. Anti-racist feminist organization Creative Interventions, points out that Bystander Intervention models grounded in the notion of community accountability have the potential to break the isolation of victims/survivors and to distribute the responsibility for responding to violence, “from the shoulders of the victim/survivor to the broader community” (2012, 1-16). They argue that communities who want to end violence must take the responsibility for becoming more knowledgeable about sexual violence, as well as more willing to take action to intervene, and to “support social norms and conditions that prevent violence from happening in the first place” (Creative Interventions 2012, 1-32). They write that community accountability means that, “intervention expands beyond thinking and talking about what to do about violence – and moves into actions that can actually interrupt violence” (Creative Interventions 2012, 2-5). Furthermore, “a feminist transformative justice model” of bystander intervention training positions bystanders as “social change agents” (Rentschler 2017, 565-566). In order to accomplish this, it is important that Bystander Intervention trainings do not “minimize the difficult work of challenging institutions that support violence” (Chief Elk and Deveraux 2014 cited in Rentschler 2017, 569), replicate

victim blaming attitudes, promote “individual white masculinist models of heroism”, or place more responsibility on witnesses to violence than on those who perpetrate it (Rentschler 2017, 569).

Indeed, creating the social change necessary to foster community accountability means changing our culture. The first step to taking that change is empowering people to speak out against sexual violence, sexism, and sexual harassment. Feminist scholar Sara Ahmed (2017) writes, “... I have learnt from working on sexual harassment that nothing is louder than silence...” Bystander Intervention training takes aim at this culture of silence. Indeed, Bystander Intervention training’s biggest potential is the ability to “interrupt and counter [...] rape-supportive culture” (Hong 2017, 29).

How Should Training be Structured?

Consistent throughout the literature is the conclusion that longer and more detailed, in-depth programs produce more effective results (Banyard, Moynihan, and Plante 2007; Gerrits and Runyon 2015), and are more effective in changing attitudes toward sexual violence (Anderson and Whitson 2005) as well as bystander behaviours (Teten Tharp et al. 2012; Hong 2017). As the Fredericton Sexual Assault Crisis Centre (n.d.) notes, “change takes time”. Repeatedly, the literature stresses that “short, single session prevention tools” are ineffective in changing behaviours and attitudes of participants in the long-term (U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women 2014a; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2014; University of Ottawa 2015; California

Coalition Against Sexual Assault 2015), and are even less effective in reducing the frequency of sexual assault on campus (Gerrits and Runyon 2015). As the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention write, “brief programs may increase awareness of the issue” but, “it is unlikely that such programs are sufficient to change behavioural patterns that are developed and continually reinforced across the lifespan” (2014, 8).

Thus, most of the literature recommends multiple sessions (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2014; Association of American Universities 2017; Kirby et al. 2007; Beres 2014; Mitchell and Freitag 2011) that recur throughout a student’s time on campus (Gerrits and Runyon 2015; Quinlan, Clarke, and Miller 2016; Hong 2017) with semester-long courses being the most effective (Anderson et al. 2005; Banyard, Moynihan, and Plante 2007). The Association of American Universities (2017) writes, “It’s difficult for most people to absorb and retain large amounts of information at one time. And sometimes what doesn’t seem pertinent initially resonates later [...] students can benefit from information being presented at different stages and in different ways...” (27). Similarly, the (2017) Status of Women Canada report on Ending Violence Against Women and Girls notes the importance of on-going education programs and initiatives on campus that “extend beyond the first weeks of an academic year” (Gladu 2017, 26). Expanding on this sentiment, the U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women writes that, “first year students may be best able to engage with prevention that emphasises knowing how to help a friend who discloses a sexual assault, while more complex bystander intervention

actions are better taught later, once students have experience on campus (2014a, 2).

Research also indicates that training is most effective when conducted in person rather than online (EVA BC 2016; U.S. Department of Justice Office on Violence Against Women 2014b; University of Ottawa 2015; California Coalition Against Sexual Assault 2015). As the California Coalition Against Sexual Assault (2015) argues, “Face-to-face learning fosters these relationships; such dynamism may be minimized or lost when training is undertaken on a distance or virtual format” (59-60). Furthermore, trainings are most effective when they are interactive (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2014; National Sexual Violence Resource Center 2013; Senn et al. 2015), are integrated into the student experience (Gerrits and Runyon 2015), include varied teaching methods that reach all types of learners (National Sexual Violence Resource Center 2013; Hong 2017), and include the opportunity for skills building (U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women 2014; Teten Tharp et al. 2012; Senn et al. 2015; Mitchell and Freitag 2011). Trainings that focus on specific content distributed across multiple sessions are more effective than one-time sexual violence 101 trainings (Anderson et al. 2005). These sessions should be complimentary, layering information throughout (California Coalition Against Sexual Assault 2015). Furthermore, follow-up or booster sessions are recommended to increase the effectiveness of the training since much of the literature shows that “the effects of preventative interventions tend to gradually decay over time” (National Sexual Violence Resource Center 2013, 453)

Even if individuals change their beliefs and behaviours after a single-session training, there is sustained pressure on to accept rape-supportive beliefs from broader rape culture. Trainings must be ongoing in order to counter this pressure.

There are many legitimate barriers to bystander intervention that single session programs cannot adequately address including: fears of triggering further violence, fears for personal safety, fears of making someone angry (Tabachnick 2009), the aversion to believing that “nice guys” can be sexually violent (Whiteside-Lantz 2003); as well as the general complexity of the issue of sexual violence (Teten Tharp et al. 2012; Whiteside-Lantz 2003; Hong 2017). Furthermore, even if individuals change their behaviours and ideas after a single session program, there is still sustained pressure on these individuals to accept rape-supportive attitudes and behaviours from peer groups and broader rape culture (Swartout 2013). Programs must be ongoing in order to counter these pressures. Opportunities to build and practice intervention skills are also a particularly important aspect of training that cannot be left out due to time constraints. As Haaken (2017) writes, “...bystanders bring their own anxieties and defences to scenes involving threat” (25) and time will be needed to work with and through these

anxieties and defences and build confidence. Furthermore, while some situations are easy and quick to intervene into, more often than not the reality will include the possibility of escalation and/or aggressor perseverance (Senn et al. 2015). Adequate training must spend time addressing these more complex intervention scenarios.

Bystander Intervention trainings must also take to time to address complex social categories and power structures. Research has shown that “simplistic educational approaches are inherently limited” (Beres et al 2014; Senn 2011; as cited in Sharp, Weiser, Lavigne, and Kelly 2017, 84). For example, Haaken (2017) warns against Bystander Intervention training programs that “substitute moralizing slogans – ‘It’s on us!’ – for genuine analysis of the dynamics of group life on college campuses” (24). Students should be invited and challenged to think critically and to engage thoughtfully with the social and political issues that make up their world (Sharp, Weiser, Lavigne, and Kelly 2017, 84). As Muelenhard, Humphreys, Joskowski and Peterson (2016) argue, “... the norms of one’s own culture can seem natural and inevitable” (466). In particular, “acquaintance rape” is so difficult to recognize because “it is built on a foundation of socially accepted norms and beliefs regarding female and male sexuality and relationships (Gavey, 2005; Kelly, 1987; cited in Senn 2011, 127). Thus adequate training programs will take time and critical discussion to address these cultural norms and gendered categories, norms and categories that are “seeded in childhood and adolescence” and cannot easily be reversed (Hong 2017, 30). Time is also needed to counter the resistance response of participants who are uncomfortable moving

beyond “concern for victims” to seeing sexual violence as “both pervasive and linked to other forms of marginalization” (Bertram and Crowley 2012, 63-65). In particular, male participants need to be “redirected” away from patriarchal norms of bystander behaviour, including reacting violently towards aggressors, to “more helpful roles” (Rich, Utley, Janke and Moldoveanu 2010). The best trainings will be structured around Paolo Friere’s (1970) problem-posing pedagogy, recognizing the diverse experiences and knowledges that participants bring to the room (Mitchell and Freitag 2011, 1000).

When Trainings Should Occur:

The Nova Scotia Government (2017) recommends that some Sexual Violence prevention occur during regularly scheduled trainings for Residence Assistants and other student leaders (7), as well as during the first week of orientation for new students and continuing throughout the year (12). Orientation week is particularly singled out (Gerrits and Runyon 2015; California Coalition Against Sexual Assault 2015) as it is often replete with sexually explicit activities (Government of Nova Scotia 2017; Martell Consulting Ltd. 2014b; University of Ottawa 2015) and because it sets the tone for the rest of the year (St. Mary’s University President’s Council 2013). Furthermore, students new to the university are eager to make friends and to adapt to a new culture and are less likely to speak out against sexual violence in order to avoid looking “difficult” (Martell Consulting Ltd. 2014b; St. Mary’s University President’s Council 2013). Others argue that the first two months of school constitute a “red zone” where a high number of sexual assaults are reported and that prevention education

should be prioritized during this time (California Coalition Against Sexual Assault 2015; Senn et al. 2014; DeGue 2014; Palacios and Aguilar 2017).

Administrative and Institutional Support:

Campus Administrators have an important role to play in supporting sexual violence prevention efforts. The Nova Scotia Government report (2017) stresses that, "... it is very important for institutions to show support by developing policies and practices that are centred on believing" (27). Quinlan (2017a) stresses that "believing survivors" is not at odds with "safeguarding the rights of suspects", although it is often positioned this way in polarizing debates on the issue (67). Believing survivors and taking their experiences seriously includes taking a "stronger stance" against forms of sexualized violence that are viewed as less damaging (Holland and Cortina 2017, 61). A lack of institutional support sends the message that "sexual violence is not the institution's problem" (Government of Nova Scotia 2017, 38), or that addressing sexual violence on campus is not a priority (Palacios and Aguilar 2017). Furthermore, a measurable shift in campus culture requires commitment from the most senior levels university administration amongst other groups and individuals on campus (Martell Consulting Ltd. 2014b; University of Ottawa 2015). A strong level of institutional commitment is also required to insure longevity, continuity and quality program delivery (Gerrits and Runyon 2015). More seriously, as noted in the METRAC report on Campus sexual assault policy, "institutions that fail to fulfill their responsibilities in preventing and addressing cases of sexual violence commit an institutional breach of trust" (4). By

committing to violence prevention through Bystander Intervention training, and by engaging in training themselves, administration also role-model what a caring community looks like (Tabachnick 2009).

A measurable shift in campus culture requires commitment from the most senior levels of university administration.

Much of the literature on sexual violence on campus is highly critical of institutional responses to violence that silence or ignore student and survivor perspectives in order to protect a perceived reputation (Ahmed 2017; Quinlan, Clarke and Miller 2016). When campus administrators are not proactive and visible in their efforts to prevent sexual violence, the result is that students, in particular those who are most vulnerable, feel the need to press the university to "follow through on commitments and make these issues ongoing priorities" (University of Ottawa 2015, 6). In addition, students across Canada report that administrators are "reluctant to work with students" and respond to student calls for action on sexual violence with "inaction or outright opposition" (Our Turn 2017, 4). This leads to a climate of distrust towards administration and a perceived "antagonistic division" (SAFER 2015; Quinlan 2017b). As one student leader quoted in the Students' Nova Scotia report on sexual violence on campus stated, "We need to talk about sexual violence; and challenge the university administration as well. Ask what they are going to do about it?" (Martell Consulting Ltd. 2014b, 17). A (2013) Focus

Group on sexual violence and safety on campus as St.FX noted that, "... there is no current means of having student input in any decision-making that occurs at the administrative level" (MacDonald, Mtetwa, and Ndomo 2013, 9). Furthermore, the Task Force on Misogyny, Sexism and Homophobia in Dalhousie Faculty of Dentistry (2015) described a climate of "distrust and suspicion" toward the University administration's responses to discrimination (3). Scott, Singh, and Harris (2017) point out this mistrust is particularly pronounced for students who are women of color, as they have likely experienced the ways that institutions systemically privilege students who are white and male (129). Moreover, Queer students and other survivor-activist students are often dismissed and labelled by administrators as "rabble rousers" who need to be "managed" rather than valuable members of the campus community with legitimate concerns (Linder and Myers 2017, 177). A student survivor-activist in SAFER's "Students Speak Out! A Nationwide Talk Back About Sexual Violence on Campus" states that, "It's easier to get expelled for being an activist for sexual assault [prevention] than it is for being a rapist" (SAFER 2015, 6). As a result, students often feel that their voices and concerns are being "stifled" (SAFER 2015, 11). American anti-violence student-activist Wagatwe Wanjuki (2017) writes, "Academic administrators have an incredible amount of control over the life paths of their students" (ix). Students are highly cognizant of this control and the power relations that inform it, and so it is important for administrators to be mindful of, and knowledgeable about, the interconnected oppressions, including racism, sexism, heteronormativity, and

ableism, that shape students interactions with the institution. More than anything else "transparency" when it comes to campus responses to sexual violence and prevention efforts, is necessary in order to counter the prevailing climate of suspicion and distrust (Quinlan 2017b, 12).

"Academic administrators have an incredible amount of control over the life paths of their students" – Wagatwe Wanjuki, survivor-activist

In order to address student concerns from an anti-oppressive framework, it is important that administrators reach out to diverse student groups on campus. As the University of Ottawa (2015) *Report on Respect and Equality* points out, without ongoing dialogue between students and administrators, as well as a shared commitment to violence prevention, there will be an increase in distrust towards campus administration (19). Even the perception of conflict and antagonism between administration and students is enough to "undermine trust and prevent the creation of positive change" (SAFER 2015, 10). Students across Canada are calling for administrators to support their work, to collaborate and partner with them in addressing sexual violence on campus, and to move beyond mere consultation (Our Turn 2017, 10). Quinlan (2017a) warns that without change to the status-quo on Canadian campuses, the "sense of betrayal" felt by students will only increase (70). In

order to demonstrate the value of student engagement campuses must “compensate the work appropriately” and be willing to engage in long-term dialogue (University of Ottawa 2015, 24). Indeed, university campuses in Canada should be willing to create more opportunities for students to develop “critical capacities for active citizenship” through engaging them in conversations about and programs to prevent sexual violence on campus (Quinlan 2017a, 63). By addressing students’ needs directly, university and college administrators, “stand to win the respect of their current and prospective students, as well as the respect of staff, faculty, and parents (Quinlan, Clarke, and Miller 2016, 50). As Linder and Myers (2017) point out, students are already addressing sexual violence from “a complex, critical and nuanced perspective” (199), but they should not remain the only voice on campus to do so. Administrators and students can learn from each other in collaborating on this work.

The Role of Students:

It is important to acknowledge and recognize the work of student survivor-activists who have pushed the issue of sexual violence on campus to the forefront of public attention.

It is important that anti-sexual violence work center the experience and perspectives of students themselves. As Our

Turn (2017) writes, “This is our campus that we live, study and move through every day. This is our culture that must shift...” (5). Students as a group may have a better idea of what sexual violence on campus looks like as survivors are more likely to disclose to their peers and friends than they are to campus administrators, counsellors, or security personnel (Creative Interventions 2012; Kleinsasser, Jouriles, McDonald, and Rosenfield 2015). The most practical reason for centring student experiences is that students are the “target audience” of most prevention education programming and developing effective programming means knowing this audience, their strengths, and their needs (Tabachnick 2009, 24). Prevention education that positions students as passive audience members, by design, leaves students unengaged with the issues that are relevant to their own lives on campus (Mitchell and Freitag 2011). Typically, campus research on sexual violence as well as sexual violence prevention efforts, position students as “objects of study”, as potential perpetrators or potential victims (Krause, Miedema, Woofter, and Yount 2017). However, a more effective and empowering approach is to relate to students as knowledgeable and active participants in the campus community and culture, and to include them in program design and delivery. It is also important to acknowledge and recognize the work of student survivor-activists who have pushed the issue of sexual violence to the forefront of public culture through the skillful and tireless work organizing, educating and promoting awareness (Wanjuki 2017). While faculty, administrators, parents and alumni, have all be instrumental in addressing sexual violence on Canadian

campuses, “it is students who have led the recent charge” (Quinlan 2017b, 7).

The provincial (2015-2019) Memorandum of Understanding between universities and the provincial government on the issue of addressing sexual violence on campus details that, “Universities will engage with elected student representatives to ensure student involvement” (Government of Nova Scotia 2017, 12). Furthermore, the (2017) report by the Sexual Violence Prevention Committee to the Department of Labour and Advanced Education states that, “The involvement of student unions in sexual violence prevention on university campuses is important to both represent student perspectives of prevention strategies and to promote these strategies” (Government of Nova Scotia 2017, 37). Thus, universities in the province should already have established a working relationship with students in regards to this issue. However, universities and colleges should not limit their involvement with students to elected student leaders alone. In particular, a survivor-centric approach means hearing and addressing the concerns of survivors themselves. Survivors are often those who take up the role as activists against violence on campus, driven by their own experiences even if they are not yet ready to speak openly about these experiences (Clark and Pino 2016; Linder and Myers 2016; Linder 2017; Stermac, Horowitz, and Bance 2017; MacKay, Wolfe, and Rutherford 2017). These survivor-activists are addressing sexual violence on the “front lines” (Krause, Miedema, Woofter, and Yount 2017). As SAFER contends, university and college Administrators and educators should be “nurturing and responsive” to survivor-activists; thus, “encouraging students to

work towards positive change” (SAFER 2015, 11), and “supporting” these same students in their efforts (Krause, Miedema, Woofter, and Yount 2017; Our Turn 2017).

The creation of campus Sexual Assault Support Centres and peer-to-peer support through phone-lines and drop-ins, are particularly effective means for fostering long-term student engagement.

Gerrits and Runyon (2015) identify “fostering youth leadership” as one of six indispensable strategies necessary for a comprehensive approach to sexual violence prevention. Indeed, fostering leadership means going beyond consultation alone (Our Turn 2017). Students must be incorporated into all levels of violence prevention from curriculum development, to messaging, to program delivery, to evaluation (Worthen and Wallace 2017; Our Turn 2017). The creation of campus Sexual Assault Support Centres and peer-to-peer support through phone-lines and drop-ins, are particularly effective in fostering long-term student engagement (Quinlan 2017a; MacKay, Wolfe, and Rutherford 2017). In regards to prevention education, it is particularly important for students to be involved in curriculum development and messaging because as Tabachnick (2009) notes, details including “clothing and dialogue” used in programming matter (25). Images or text that do not seem relevant to students will be disregarded by those same students (Tabachnick 2009, 25). Other research

confirms that students respond most positively to material that is “true to their life experiences” (Mitchell and Freitag 2011, 1003). This broad student engagement increases the “overall effectiveness” of programming (Worthen and Wallace 2017). Moreover, in their interviews with Canadian campus anti-violence professionals, Gerrits and Runyon (2015) frequently heard of “missed opportunities” on campus where students were “eager to get involved” but a lack of resources prevented real student engagement (21). Student engagement in all levels of prevention programming inspires “social agency” in students and empowers them as agents of social change (Rojas Durazo 2011/12; Christensen 2015; Horsman and Cormack 2016).

In terms of program delivery, some of the literature recommends professionally facilitated programs over peer-facilitation (Government of Nova Scotia 2017; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2014; National Sexual Violence Resource Center 2013). However, other research points to the benefits of peer-facilitation in role-modeling and changing attitudes about violence (Mitchell and Freitag 2011; Jozkowski et al. 2015; St. Mary’s University President’s Council 2013; University of Ottawa 2015; Krause, Miedema, Woofter, and Yount 2017; Armstrong and Mahone 2017; Our Turn 2017). Peer leadership is also beneficial in developing a “healthy community” where “peers look out for each other and provide support, referrals, and advocacy” (St. Mary’s University President’s Council 2013, 34). Other research has demonstrated that even male students who are resistant to sexual violence prevention education, still look favourably on other male students who act as peer facilitators in this same programming (Rich,

Utle, Janke, and Moldoveanu 2010). As Gerrits and Runyon (2015) point out, a mix of professional and student peer leadership is the best approach to prevention education as it both ensures high quality and ongoing programming, as well as student leadership and development. Where peer educators are used, it is essential that they receive thorough and extensive training, opportunities for professional development, and performance reviews (Gerrits and Runyon 2015, 21; Palacios and Aguilar 2017). Others contend that student peer learning is most effective when students are given broad support and the autonomy to create and organize their own programming and prevention visions (Sharp, Weiser, Lavigne, and Kelly 2017). Furthermore, a “shared leadership” framework where student input is both valued and encouraged is a feminist approach to leadership (Christensen 2011).

A Survivor Centred Approach

Consistently throughout the literature, experts advocate for a survivor-centred approach to addressing sexual violence on campus. However, little in-depth discussion is given to what exactly a survivor-centric approach looks like beyond believing survivors and acknowledging their existence on campus. Of all the reports and policy-documents reviewed in this literature review, only Our Turn (2017) went into any depth about what a survivor-centric approach looks like in practice. This section will endeavor to tease out what a survivor-centered approach to prevention education might look like in practice.

A survivor-centered approach starts with believing and supporting survivors (MacKay, Wolfe, and Rutherford 2017). Our

A survivor-centered approach begins with believing survivors.

Turn (2017) draws on the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women) to define a survivor-centric approach as programming that empowers survivors by prioritizing their “rights, needs, and wishes” and avoids re-traumatizing them (8). The first and most important step to creating survivor-centered prevention education is to assume that there will be survivors present in any group that participates. Facilitators must be careful not to “other” survivors by referring to them as “they” or as a specially marked group (Krause, Miedema, Woofar, and Yount 2017). Rather, sexual violence should be framed as an issue that affects everyone, as well as an issue that is pervasive in our society and one that has become normalized. When sexual violence is presented as something that is unusual, survivors get the message that *they* are unusual (Bertram and Crowley 2012). This message reinforces the invisibility of the issue and the silence of survivors, and allows students who are not survivors to continue believing that this issue is not one that affects anyone that they know personally (Bertram and Crowley 2012).

It is also imperative that a survivor-centered approach to prevention education takes the time to address victim-blaming myths in detail as these myths are not only pervasive but often internalized by survivors themselves (Government of Nova Scotia 2017; Whiteside-Lantz 2003; Holland and Cortina 2017; Johnson 2012; Krakauer

2015). Bystander Intervention training should specifically centre “believing survivors” as a positive pro-social action that all community members can potentially participate in (Government of Nova Scotia 2017, 27). Bystander Intervention training should encourage all community members to take responsibility for addressing violence, creating a community where that responsibility is shared rather than being placed on the survivor’s shoulders alone (Creative Interventions 2012). Indeed, social isolation is a common experience for survivors of sexual violence (Bordere 2017; Bertram and Crowley 2012; Krakauer 2015). In bringing together groups of people dedicated to addressing sexual violence and in promoting a broader culture of community accountability, Bystander Intervention training acts to address this isolation. It also acts to empower survivors by allowing them to see and to join a community of people who are taking action to end violence (Bertram and Crowley 2012). The Our Turn (2017) action plan goes even further recommending a peer-to-peer survivor support network on each campus where survivors can come together and share in supporting one another and advocating for survivor’s rights. Bystander Intervention training is one avenue where survivors can be directed to this network.

A survivor-centered approach also means that survivors should be empowered as much as possible to make their own decisions when addressing sexual violence (Bierra et al. 2006; Linder 2017; Marine 2017; Our Turn 2017). This includes the decision to name what happened as “sexual violence” (Holland and Cortina 2017; Our Turn 2017). It is imperative that survivors are able to access avenues for support outside of formal institutions. Furthermore,

A University of Ottawa's (2015) campus climate survey demonstrated that the police are "consistently rated as not supportive of survivors of sexual violence" (25). Because of this widely held perception, it is important that police are not visibly involved in prevention education efforts. Given the high numbers of survivors of university and college campuses, it is important that prevention trainings are free of police presence which survivors might find triggering. Furthermore, students who are already marginalized in campus culture, such as racialized or low-income students, might not feel comfortable turning to university or college institutions for support (Our Turn 2017). This is why alternative third-party supports should also be linked to campus, and why peer-to-peer support is also so valuable (MacKay, Wolfe, and Rutherford 2017; Lalonde 2017). Therefore, the laws concerning sexual violence and the option of involving police should be discussed in trainings while acknowledging that the law doesn't always work to hold aggressors accountable, the court process can be both empowering and traumatizing for survivors, and that there are other options for addressing sexual violence and perpetrator accountability. Similarly, the campus reporting procedure should be discussed and campus counselling services offered, while also acknowledging that there are other options for students who would feel more comfortable seeking help off-campus.

It is important to acknowledge and to make students aware of the complexities of survivor experiences. They should be made aware of various responses to trauma beyond the obvious, including freezing up or appearing calm and collected (Fredericton Sexual Assault Crisis Centre n.d.; Holland

and Cortina 2017). Students should also be encouraged not to judge the harm or impact of an act of sexual violence by a survivor's response to that violence (Fredericton Sexual Assault Crisis Centre n.d.). This is particularly important where the survivor's experience intersects with other forms of structural oppression including racism, ableism, and poverty. By teaching a feminist, Black feminist, and anti-oppression approach to the issue of sexual violence, a nuanced survivor-centered understanding can be conveyed (Government of Nova Scotia 2017, 8). Furthermore, a survivor-centered approach necessarily addresses sexual violence as a systemic issue (Bordere 2017). Survivors do not want justice or healing for themselves alone, they often act in collective groups that call for broader social change in response to what they see as a systemic issue (Clark and Pino 2016; Krause, Miedema, Woofter, and Yount 2017; MacKay, Wolfe, and Rutherford 2017). By taking a systemic approach to the issue, the culture that encourages and supports violence is seen as the problem in need of fixing, rather than the survivor's psychological responses to the trauma, which is so often the target of traditional intervention methodologies (Bertram and Crowley 2012).

Educators should also be mindful that prevention education does not overly focus on the trauma experienced by survivors, thus pathologizing them (Bertram and Crowley 2012) and painting a picture of survivors as "irremediably and unidirectionally shaped by the traumatic experience" (Mardorossian 2002). Effort should be made to highlight the resiliency and power of survivor communities who are often the driving force behind successful anti-sexual violence programming

(Witeside-Lantz 2003; Senn 2011; McQueeney 2016; Scott, Singh, and Harris 2017; Linder and Myers 2017). This means also responding positively to survivor disclosures during trainings. While disclosures should never be sought out, they often surface during Bystander Training sessions. There are many reasons for this but one reason is that survivors are often afraid to talk “too much” about what has happened to them (Bordere 2017), either because they have been shut down when they have tried to speak or they self-sensor for fear of their story harming others (Cross 2017), and are thus often relieved to discover a space where sexual violence is discussed openly and frankly. Sharing their story can be incredibly empowering (Bordere 2017; Marine 2017) and can also be seen as a political act of “breaking the silence” (Krakauer 2015). What has been described as a “shroud of silence” often surrounds women’s experiences with violence (Johnson 2012), and one of the reasons for encouraging prevention education is to lift this shroud rather than to reinforce it. These disclosures can also generate solidarity amongst participants. As Jen Cross (2017) writes, “... when we share these stories with our communities, we are no longer alone with the many secrets we’ve carried for so long.” (viii). Good peer facilitators will be trained in supporting survivors and will know not to respond in ways that can have negative effects, including feeling sorry for the survivor, trying to shut the survivor down and move on, asking probing questions beyond what the survivor has already shared, and telling or implying to the survivor that their experience is not relevant to the discussion. Traditionally and historically women were “understood as unreliable witnesses to their own lives”,

their knowledge of the world around them dismissed and denied (Ahmed 2017). Thus, survivor disclosures should be treated as valuable and carrying experiential knowledge (Tillipauagh 2017). Survivors should be thanked for their contribution, invited after the session to provide feedback on what they think about the training if appropriate, and also provided with information on peer-to-peer survivor support groups on or off campus.

Survivor-centered approaches to campus sexual violence should strive as much as possible to amplify survivors’ voices and experiential knowledge with the goal of empowering survivors always in the forefront.

Finally, a survivor-centered approach also includes room for emotions, especially anger. This is a topic of discussion that does and should make people angry. Anger should not be feared, shut down, seen as divisive or negative. Anger can be a powerful way of learning and of conveying knowledge. Survivors, particularly women survivors, are often pressed to deny or swallow their anger through gendered-norms and cultural expectations (Jozkowski and Wiersma-Mosely 2017; Ahmed 2017). As a result, many women survivors turn their anger inwards towards themselves (Jozkowski and Wiersma-Mosely 2017), further amplifying internalized self-blame and negative self-talk. Facilitators should be trained to carefully respond to this survivor

anger, should it be articulated, in a way that does not cause further harm. Facilitators should recognize the validity of the survivor's anger and should pick up on the underlying knowledge or point that the survivor is expressing and re-articulate this point for other participants who might be unable to see past the anger alone. Survivor-centric programming should strive as much as possible to amplify survivor voices and knowledges with the goal of survivor empowerment always in the forefront (Our Turn 2017).

Should Trainings be Single or Multi-Gendered?

There is much debate in the literature about whether or not trainings should be done in single-gendered groups as the University of New Hampshire's Bringing in the Bystander has done, or in multi-gendered and inclusive groups. Much of the existing Bystander Intervention training programs are delivered to single-gender groups (Banyard, Moynihan, and Plante 2007). Advocates for single-gendered trainings point to research that demonstrates that men are more likely to intervene if they believe that other men would also do so (Martell Consulting Services Ltd 2014). Furthermore, research has demonstrated that many men misperceive the norms of male peers, as well as other men's support for sexually violent behaviour (Fabiano, Perkins, Berkowitz, Linkenbach, and Stark 2003, 106). Others argue that all-male trainings will assist men in understanding the "commonalities of male socialization" and encourage them to "challenge other men" (Fabiano, Perkins, Berkowitz, Linkenbach and Stark 2003, 105). It has also been suggested that all-male trainings will allow men to express honest sentiments that are not hindered by a fear of

offending anyone (Mitchell and Freitag 2011). However, research has also suggested that targeting specific groups by gender "can create a barrier between presenters and audience members and hinder constructive dialogue" (Mitchell and Freitag 2011, 1002). In their discussions with male students about a proposed single-gendered, compulsory rape prevention program, Rich, Utley, Janke, and Moldoveanu (2010) found that most of the men questioned felt "general disdain" towards the program because they felt singled out (278).

Others advocate just as convincingly for multi-gendered trainings (Edwards 2009; Gerritts and Runyon 2015). A multi-gendered approach encourages men and women students to "work collaboratively" to address sexual violence (Rich, Utley, Janke, and Moldoveanu 2010, 283). While single-gender training advocates have pointed to peer attitudes in men's willingness to intervene, other research has demonstrated that simply being part of a male dominated peer group increases one's likelihood of sexually aggressive behaviour (Swartout 2013). Thus, it may be potentially beneficial to increase opportunities for multi-gendered socialization through Bystander Training. This would allow men who socialize primarily with other men to benefit from hearing women's opinions on sexual violence and understand better women's experiences (Rich, Utley, Janke, and Moldoveanu 2010). Indeed, the same research that shows that men misperceive their male peers' support for sexual violence also shows that they also misperceive their female peers' norms (Fabiano, Perkins, Berkowitz, Linkenbach, and Stark 2003). Moreover, men are more likely to see consent as important when they believe that the women in their peer groups also value

consent (Fabiano, Perkins, Berkowitz, Linkenbach, and Stark 2003). The words of their female peers may contrast with the portrayal of women in mainstream media and pornography as submissive and enjoying violence, and thus may cause men to re-evaluate their own ideas. Indeed, research has shown that male students would prefer multi-gendered groups and the opportunity to hear women's opinions on the issue (Rich, Utley, Janke, and Moldoveanu 2010).

Gender-Sensitive –
recognizing that sexual
violence is part of a
broad spectrum of
gender-based violence
primarily targeting
women and girls.

Gender-Inclusive –
recognizing the full
continuum of gendered
identities and
acknowledging that
sexual violence can be
experienced by anyone of
any gender.

It is also important to note that gender-segregated trainings leave trans-spectrum students vulnerable and marginalized. This type of training ends up reproducing a narrow and binary understanding of gender by design. The best approach to trainings would be to have various options including single-gendered trainings and multi-gendered trainings at

different times and geared to different groups throughout the school year. It is important that all trainings are “gender-sensitive” and “gender-inclusive” (Our Turn 2017). Gender-sensitive means that trainings recognize that sexual violence is part of a broad spectrum of gender-based violence and violence against women and girls (Our Turn 2017), addressing this reality directly and openly. At the same time, a gender-inclusive approach recognizes the full continuum of gender identities and acknowledges that sexual violence is experienced by people along the gender spectrum (Our Turn 2017). Language used in training should not be gender-neutral, but should address the gendered reality of sexual violence, and should also include a range of gender identities and experiences of sexual violence in the examples and case studies.

Taking a Systemic Approach to Bystander Intervention Training:

Traditional Bystander Intervention programs have tended to frame the issue of sexual violence as power neutral, often taking an ahistoric approach (Harris and Linder 2017). Rarely, is there any discussion or analysis of the complex structures of social, political, and economic power that allow for sexual violence to be perpetrated (Teten Tharp et al. 2012; Carmody 2009; Potter, Fountain, and Stapleton 2012). Furthermore, social and cultural identities are often erased in these trainings. Discussions of sexual assault tend to be strictly heteronormative and the role of the bystander is often left as a gender-neutral, race-neutral category, effectively ignoring social power structures that can have a major impact on decisions to intervene and the effectiveness of intervention (Baily, Dunn and Msosa forthcoming). It is important for

Bystander Intervention training curriculums to go beyond the traditional, individualistic discussion of intervention and to provide analysis and discussion of the systemic factors that contribute to sexual violence in our society (Gerrits and Runyon 2015; Task Force on Misogyny, Sexism and Homophobia in Dalhousie University Faculty of Dentistry 2015; Creative Interventions 2012; Bordere 2017; Wooten 2017). As the Government of Nova Scotia (2017) notes, “An individualistic assumption about social inequalities ignores the social construction of such inequalities” and “... silence is another method of maintaining inequalities” (18). This is because social inequalities in one’s own culture often appear as natural or inevitable (Muelenhard, Humphreys, Jozkowski, and Peterson 2016) until they are questioned explicitly. Thus, it is important to explicitly name and address these inequalities in Bystander Intervention training programs. Addressing these systemic issues allows us to address the “root causes” of sexual violence (McQueeny 2016).

The goal of Bystander Intervention training programs is often to encourage or facilitate cultural change (EVA BC 2016; Gerrits and Runyon 2015). However, it is impossible to change something as deeply engrained in social structures as “culture” without addressing the power relations that inform and make up that same society. As the Province of Nova Scotia (2015) writes in the *Breaking the Silence* report, “Sexual violence is entrenched in our society to the point that actions and even the harms associated with it have become tolerated and accepted.” Furthermore, Bertram and Crowley (2012) note that although sexual violence is discussed more openly than in past decades, this open discussion has not

been enough to effect real cultural change (64). Clearly, traditional approaches are not creating a strong enough impact. Other researchers have pointed out that while Bystander Intervention training may be successful in increasing pro-social interventions into individual acts of violence, the broader rape culture means that a rapist can feel supported in his violent actions even when his immediate peers explicitly disagree with him (Schwartz, DeKeseredy, Tait and Alvi 2001). Thus, while pro-social bystander interventions are a good start, students must be empowered and encouraged to promote cultural change (Hong 2017).

Taking a systemic approach means moving the discussion beyond criminalization, as the criminal justice approach tends to position the perpetrator as “the sole, sick, isolated problem [...] an aberration in an otherwise ‘nonviolent’ normative society” (Rojas Durazo 2011/12, 78). The criminal just lens means that aggressors are imagined as “dangerous (usually dark-skinned) strangers” and as “driven by sadistic impulses” (Bumiller 2008). By focusing on individual aggressors in this way, the broader violence of our society continues to be normalized and made invisible. Similarly, an over-reliance on victim/survivor psychology and self-help/care strategies also obscures the “whole system of institutional, cultural, and economic practices and social inequalities” that require political and cultural transformation to end sexual violence (Mardorossian 2002, 756-8). By discussing sexual assault as an inter-personal action between two people, we fail to understand the ways that sexual violence is, “an embodied expression of power, control and violence” (Christensen 2011, 266). As Rojas

Durazo (2011/12) writes, “Violence is never just personal” (96). Both the causes and the effects of violence expand beyond the victim/perpetrator dyad into broader community and cultural relations (Bertram and Crowley 2012).

Importantly, a structural approach will move beyond a gender-lens to address the ways that sexual violence is a form of oppression. As Harris (2017) writes, “Educators must also improve prevention strategies with the knowledge that sexual violence is about domination, colonization, and power, and not solely, if ever, about sex” (49). This means paying attention to the history of sexual violence as a tool of colonization, as well as the ways that, “... sexual violence continues to be used as a tool to confer power and privilege on white men, while subordinating and terrorizing, mentally and physically, minoritized populations” (Harris and Linder 2017, 10). Thus, Bystander Intervention trainings need to take on what Linder (2017) calls, “a historic, power-conscious perspective” (74). This approach is also survivor-centric in that it demonstrates the way sexual violence is used as a tool of oppression to “forcefully disempower survivors” (Marine 2017, 95-96). Historicizing sexual violence is also of vital importance as it demonstrates that sexual violence is not a new phenomenon and also addresses the roots of our current rape culture (Linder and Harris 2017). Most importantly, it is often students and survivor-activists who are pushing for this very systemic approach (Linder and Myers 2017; MacKay, Wolfe and Rutherford 2017).

Using an Anti-Oppression/Intersectional Feminist Framework for Bystander Intervention Training

One of the most frequent critiques of existing Bystander Intervention Programming found throughout the literature is that it fails to approach the issue of sexual violence from an Anti-Oppression and/or intersectional feminist framework (Wooten 2017; Rentschler 2017; Harris and Linder 2017). We know that sexual violence is a complex issue, one that is imbedded within cultural norms, structures of power, interpersonal as well as broader social relations, and individual attitudes and behaviours (Government of Nova Scotia

*The Nova Scotia
Government Department
of Labour and Advanced
Education has committed
to an intersectional and
Black feminist approach
to addressing sexual
violence on university
and college campuses.*

2017; EVA BC n.d.; Johnson and Colpitts 2013). Furthermore, rape culture itself is shaped by other forms of oppression including racism, homophobia, transphobia, ableism, and economic inequality (University of Ottawa 2015; Scott, Singh, and Harris 2017). By only addressing individual or interpersonal relationships, traditional Bystander Intervention trainings fall short of what is needed to create change in our society (Wooten 2017). Indeed, the Government of Nova Scotia recognizes the importance of taking an anti-oppressive and Black feminist approach, that includes intersectionality, stating that, “... all recommendations in this report are based on

feminist, Black feminist and anti-oppressive frameworks [...] It is suggested that when implementing these recommendations, Nova Scotia universities continue to use these frameworks” (2017, 6). The report similarly recommends that Anti-Oppression and Black feminist approaches to addressing sexual violence be accepted as best practices for preventing and understanding sexual violence (Government of Nova Scotia 2017, 11). Other anti-violence organizations, educators and researchers affirm that an Anti-Oppression/Intersectional framework is imperative to prevention education (Gerrits and Runyon 2015; Bay-Cheng and Burns 2016; Our Turn 2017).

An “identity-neutral” approach is not effective in truly addressing the realities of sexual violence (McQueeney 2016; Harris and Linder 2017; Worthen and Wallace 2017). Marginalized populations experience sexual violence at disproportionately high rates (Government of Nova Scotia 2017; Belknap 2010; Loya 2014; Weiser 2017; Gross et al. 2006; Harris and Linder 2017; Tillipauagh 2017; Our Turn 2017). Marginalized people are also far more likely to be “discredited” as victims or witnesses to sexual assault (Weiser 2017; McQueeney 2016; Johnson 2012; Wooten 2017; Donovan and Williams 2002; Bertram and Crowley 2012; George and Martinez 2002; Scott, Singh, and Harris 2017; Our Turn 2017), and report more difficulty in finding help on campus (Potter 2016; McQueeney 2016; Solokoff and Dupont 2005; Kaukinen 2004; Rentschler 2017; Stermac, Horowitz, and Bance 2017). For training to be effective, a diverse range of participants must be able to see themselves reflected in the curriculum material (U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women 2014; Tabachnick 2009; Potter and

Stapleton, 2011; Worthen and Wallace 2017; Palacios and Aguilar 2017). In particular, LGBTQ students are often critical of the heteronormative bias of most Bystander Intervention curriculums, and report feeling disconnected from the trainings and marginalized (Worthen and Wallace 2017). At the same time, LGB and TGQN students are more likely than heterosexual and cis-gendered students to see sexual violence as a problem on their campuses (Worthen and Wallace 2017; Cantor et al. 2015). Thus, Bystander Training programs are missing a group of students on campus most likely to see the need for Bystander Training. When an intersectional approach is not adopted, the re-traumatization of survivors from marginalized groups is more likely (Baily, Dunn, and Msosa forthcoming).

An Anti-Oppression framework for addressing sexual violence begins with the understanding that, “At the most basic level sexual violence happens because society values some people more than others” (Whiteside-Lantz 2003, 146). Anti-Oppression education is defined by the Government of Nova Scotia (2017) as education which acts to, “change oppressive attitudes and behaviours which contribute to inequalities in society. Sexual violence, as an act of gendered oppression, will not end until all systems of power, privilege, and oppression” are eliminated (8). Furthermore, an Anti-Oppressive approach to addressing sexual violence is one that acknowledges the impacts of power, privilege, and systemic oppression on violence (Government of Nova Scotia 2017; Harris and Linder 2017; Palacios and Aguilar 2017). In particular this means addressing economic inequality, ongoing settler colonialism, racism, and sexism, as well as, deeply entrenched

attitudes and biases (Johnson and Colpitts 2013). The intersectional framework comes out of Black Feminist thought and practice (Government of Nova Scotia 2017). This framework understands that all systemic oppressions in our society (e.g. sexism, racism, economic inequalities, etc...) are interconnected (Government of Nova Scotia 2017) and thus cannot be divided in our analysis or our prevention work (Gerrits and Runyon 2015). Black Feminist scholar Kimberle Crenshaw introduced Intersectional analysis when she challenged both white feminism and sexism in the Black community to demonstrate how sexism and racism are not separate forms of oppression for most Black women (Crenshaw 1989). Her main point was not that oppressions are “additive” (ie. Racism + sexism = Black women’s experiences), but rather to understand the ways that Black Women’s experiences of sexual violence are qualitatively different from non-Black women (Crenshaw 1989). An intersectional approach to sexual violence allows us a more complete understanding of the issue and its causes (Worthen and Wallace 2017). This is why feminists who adopt an intersectional approach urge us not to “downplay differences” (McQueeny 2016). Indeed, by attending specifically to our differences and the systems of oppression that create those differences, we can see the multitude of ways that sexual violence operates.

What does an Anti-Oppression/Intersectional approach to Bystander Intervention look like in practice? One key element of this type of training is to challenge sexism, homo and transphobia, racism, and other forms of oppression that intersect with sexual violence (SAFER & V-Day 2013; Gerrits and Runyon 2015). The

Government of Nova Scotia (2017) recommends that, ‘...participants should explore and understand the role of privileged groups and systems of power in creating and maintaining social norms...’ (40). It is also necessary to examine and critically analyze the hierarchies of power within our society that reproduce sexual violence as a norm (Government of Nova Scotia 2017, 42). These power dynamics must be intentionally named and discussed within historic context (Linder 2017). Participants should be given a framework, through the Anti-Oppression approach, to understand themselves and their communities within hierarchies of power (Government of Nova Scotia 2017). This will allow them to address different experiences of sexual violence and strategize different methods of intervention (Centers

In order to counter feelings of hopelessness in the face of ongoing sexual violence, it is important to give students the skills for social change.

for Disease Control and Prevention 2014; Harris and Linder 2017). It is imperative that an Anti-Oppression approach empower participants with strategies for social change as well as the tools to challenge social inequalities (Government of Nova Scotia 2017; Garcia and Melendez 1997). This will reduce feelings of hopelessness and the sense of being overwhelmed in the face of ongoing violence (Government of Nova Scotia 2017).

One key element of any Anti-Oppression/Intersectional framework is an analysis and discussion of the ways that racism shapes the realities of sexual violence in our society (Linder 2017). Victim blaming myths need to be discussed and disproved in detail with a specific focus on racist victim-blaming statements that hold women of colour more responsible for their own assaults than white women (Wooten 2017). Furthermore, an Anti-Oppression approach should directly challenge racist, classist and Islamophobic myths that sexual violence is more prominent in some cultures, religious groups, or socio-economic classes (Fredericton Sexual Assault Crisis Centre n.d.; Linder 2017; Harris and Hanchey 2014; Iverson 2017) When addressing bystanders, research has demonstrated that while Black students and LGB students report being more likely to intervene into situations involving sexual violence these students are often subject to racist or homophobic backlash when they do (Baily, Dunn and Msosa forthcoming). For example, student reporter at the University of Ottawa Yasmine Mehdi, received messages accusing her of trying to implement Sharia Law on campus, as well as threats of violence, when she exposed a pub crawl held by student leaders that involved elements of sexually violent and sexually coercive behaviour (Schnurr 2016). Thus, participants should be encouraged to discuss and think about the multiple risks of intervention and should be given tools for intervention that are applicable to other forms of problematic behaviour such as racist comments, homophobic taunting, and violence directed at trans people.

Key Elements of Successful Bystander Training Programs:

Skills Building

Research consistently demonstrates that the best Bystander Intervention training programs offer opportunities for skills building (EVA BC n.d.; U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women 2014b; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2014; Gerrits and Runyon 2015; Christensen 2013; Mitchell and Freitag 2011; Quinlan, Clarke, and Miller 2016; Palacios and Aguilar 2017; Nation et al. 2003). Skills building should be a component of “active learning experiences” embedded into bystander training programs (EVA BC n.d.; U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women 2014a). Possibilities for active learning include: role-playing; interactive theatre; focused dialogue and other like methods. Students feel more confident when they have had a chance to practice their skills as bystanders and increased confidence means that they are more likely to actually intervene (U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women 2014b; Tabachnick 2009; Quinlan, Clarke, and Miller 2016). Indeed one of the biggest reported barriers to intervention is that people are unsure of how to best intervene and lack confidence in their ability to help (U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women 2014b; Bennett, Banyard, and Garnhart 2014). Research has demonstrated that programs based on “information alone” are ineffective (Gerrits and Runyon 2015). In generating discussion, these interactive learning experiences work best when they allow students to speak freely and honestly about their experiences (Berkowitz 2004).

The active learning methods that are used during skills building sessions are also useful in reaching learners who do not respond as well to traditional teaching methods, reaching a broader audience, and increasing knowledge retention (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2014; Gerrits and Runyon 2015). The ability to engage learners in the process of learning, rather than leaving them as passive spectators (as in lectures or films) is associated with more positive outcomes and changes in behaviour (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2014; Gerrits and Runyon 2015; Mitchell and Freitag 2011). Skills building is most successful when it allows students to engage actively with examples that are true to their life experiences (Mitchell and Freitag 2011; Gerrits and Runyon 2015). Skills building sessions that are peer-facilitated create a

Activists, academics and researchers all agree that rape culture is pervasive on Canadian post-secondary campuses.

pedagogical environment that fosters transformative learning (Gerrits and Runyon 2015). Furthermore, skills building exercises allow students to reflect on their safety and boundaries in intervening (Banyard, Moynihan, and Plante 2007). This also allows students to become comfortable drawing on “helping scripts” that provide practical ways to approach vulnerable persons and to hold those who harm accountable (Bennett, Banyard and Edwards, 2017). These “helping scripts” are particularly useful in interrupting patriarchal

narratives of how men should intervene through violence or chivalry, instead offering men new behaviours to role model (Rich, Utley, Janke, and Moldoveanu 2010, 281).

Discussion of Rape Myths and Rape Culture

The best Bystander Intervention training programs are those that specifically and explicitly discuss and deconstruct key rape myths and other elements of rape culture (Government of Nova Scotia 2017; Gerrits and Runyon 2015; California Coalition Against Sexual Assault 2015; Hong 2017). The general consensus of activists, academics, researchers and students is that rape culture is pervasive on post-secondary campuses (Gladu 2017; METRAC 2014; Martell Consulting Service Ltd 2014b; University of Ottawa 2015; Quinlan, Clarke and Miller 2016; Clark and Pino 2016). Rape myths are more commonly reported as believable by male students and all-male groups such as fraternities and sports teams (McMahon 2010; Harris and Linder 2017). For example, the St. Mary’s University (2013) report into sexual violence on campus found that many students felt uncomfortable with the “macho vibe” emanating from the “jock culture” at SMU (St. Mary’s University President’s Council 2013). However, even when campuses are actively addressing rape culture on campus, these interventions must be ongoing and in-depth since rape culture is continuously and insidiously reproduced and disseminated in broader culture. Indeed, approaches that criticize or blame student or youth culture alone are missing the major influence of broader social norms (St. Mary’s University President’s Council 2013; Harris and Linder 2017). Broader Canadian culture is replete

with victim blaming attitudes, hypersexualization and the objectification of women and girls, and a broad tolerance for violence (St. Mary's University President's Council 2013; Quinlan 2017b).

There are many reasons why addressing rape myths directly and deconstructing them is important (Gerrits and Runyon 2015; Weiser 2017). First of all, as Ikeda and Rosser (2009) explain, "Rape is not accidental, and it is not isolated. It thrives in a culture that is tolerant of violence, especially violence against women" (40). Moreover, research has demonstrated that the negative effects of trauma are greater when a survivor has internalized rape myths as fact engaging in self-blame (Government of Nova Scotia 2017, 27). These survivors are also less likely to seek help or to define what happened to them as assault (Johnson 2012, 623-4). In addition, people who do not believe in rape myths have been shown to be more likely to want to help victims (Armstrong and Mahone 2017). On the other hand, people who do believe in rape myths are more likely to see victims as dangerously naïve and are often unable to empathize with victims (Rich, Utley, Janke and Moldoveanu 2010). Deconstructing rape myths is an important way of facilitating support for survivors (Weiser 2017).

Secondly, rape myths that excuse perpetrator behaviour allow aggressors to "side step" responsibility (Fredericton Sexual Assault Crisis Centre, n.d.; Johnson 2012; Schwartz, DeKesseredy, Tait, and Alvi 2001). Men who believe in rape myths are more likely to report that they would be sexually violent or coercive (Johnson 2012, 6123-4). Furthermore, men who believe in rape myths are also more likely to view

themselves as victims of vengeful women (Rich, Utley, Janke, and Moldoveanu 2010). Research demonstrates that those who have a high level of belief in rape myths are less likely to believe that rape is an important social problem, and are also more likely to blame survivors and downplay the trauma of rape (Worthen and Wallace 2017, 182). The widespread acceptance of rape myths fosters a "male-dominated ideology" that excuses and normalizes the actions of aggressors (Bannon et al. 2013, 75). Indeed, Rape Myths "help men individually and as a class to rationalize their sexual abuses or to distinguish their own 'natural' sexual aggression or ordinary sexual opportunism from the really culpable and injurious kind practiced by those aberrant, truly violent, genuinely scary men the criminal law is meant to isolate and jail" (Johnson 2012, 625). Within rape culture there are numerous scripts that excuse the actions of sexually aggressive men allowing them to claim that their actions do not constitute rape (Schwartz, DeKesseredy, Tait, and Alvi 2001). Aggressors actively draw upon these myths to excuse their behaviours. For example, Daniel Katsnelson, who along with another man broke into the dorm rooms of students at York University in 2007 and sexually assaulted two separate women, stated after his trial that he hoped the women had learned to "lock their doors," deploying the myth that the victims were partially to blame for their own assault (Trusolino 2017). Indeed, the most common of all defenses that aggressors can draw upon is to blame the victim (Curtis 1997). The culture of victim blaming creates a "shroud of silence" (Johnson 2012, 614) around survivors who must contend with cultural depictions of sexual violence as something that victims cause, as well as their own