ISSN (Online) 2162-9161

Cultivating Partnerships: A Case Study for Moving Beyond Campus-Centric Approaches to Sexual Violence Prevention

Wm. Michael Fleming and H. Alan Heisterkamp
University of Northern Iowa

Author Note

Wm. Michael Fleming, School of Applied Human Sciences, and Center for Violence Prevention, University of Northern Iowa; H. Alan Heisterkamp, Director, Center for Violence Prevention, University of Northern Iowa.

Correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to Wm. Michael Fleming, Associate Professor of Family Studies and Director of Assessment, Center for Violence Prevention, 1227 West 27th Street, Cedar Falls, IA 50614. Phone: (319) 273-6301. Fax: (319) 273-7096. E-mail: michael.fleming@uni.edu

Abstract

The prevalence of sexual violence on college campuses and in secondary schools requires institutional action. Yet the responsibility for preventing sexual violence does not rest on college campus communities or secondary schools alone. This study reports on one midwestern university's efforts to develop partnerships for building institutional capacity to prevent sexual violence within colleges and universities, as well as secondary schools, in collaboration with community sexual violence prevention specialists utilizing the Mentors in Violence Prevention model. Findings from this study offer preliminary evidence that these partnerships are facilitating attitudinal change and increasing perceptions of efficacy in bystander behavior and programming potential. The findings also reveal significant differences between secondary school personnel and university personnel and community stakeholders regarding the attitudinal and self-efficacy dimensions. Such differences support the need for university-secondary school collaborative work and partnerships to increase respective institutional capacities for sexual violence education and prevention.

Keywords: Bystander, Violence Prevention, Community Collaboration, Secondary Schools, Universities

Over the past decade, colleges and universities have increasingly come under pressure to adequately and efficiently investigate reports of sexual assault on campus or within the campus community. Most recently, efforts to adopt and infuse campus-wide strategies to prevent such assaults from occurring in the first place are now mandated with the passage of the Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act (Campus SaVE) and the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. While the majority of sexual violence prevention programming has been focused on college and university populations (DeGue et al., 2014), a growing number of educators and prevention specialists advocate for more developmentally appropriate prevention strategies that target students in secondary schools (Banyard, 2014). This article examines one university's efforts to balance the institutional expectations of preventing sexual violence while recognizing that effective prevention programming will require collaborative initiatives with the broader community of nearby secondary schools and domestic and sexual violence community agencies.

The Issue of Sexual Violence

According to the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (Black et al., 2011), approximately 20% of women report having been raped at some time in their life. Most female victims (80%) experience their first rape before the age of 25—with 42% of these women experiencing their first rape before the age of 18. Being sexually victimized as a child increases a woman's risk of being victimized as an adult (Black et al., 2011). Williams et al. (2014) found in a survey of approximately 18,000 high school students that one in four females and one in 10 males reported at least one incident of unwanted sexual activity in the previous 12 months.

Studies consistently document the short- and long-term consequences of sexual violence that go beyond the violation of a woman's rights. Though the scope of this article does not allow for an exploration of these consequences, they include significant physical, emotional, psychological, relational, and academic challenges (Basile, Black, Simon, Brener, & Saltzman, 2006; Brener, McMahon, Warren, & Douglas, 2006; Dartnell & Jewkes, 2013; Jina & Thomas, 2013; Johnson, & Johnson, 2013; Mason, & Lodrick, 2013; Santaularia, Johnson, Hart, Haskett, Welsh, & Faseru, 2014).

Empirical efforts to understand why sexual assault and coercion exist are extensive. In general, research suggests that specific issues associated with offenders, victims, and contextual or environmental circumstances can increase the likelihood of offenses occurring. For example, studies indicate that male offenders are likely to have (a) rape-supporting attitudes and beliefs (e.g., Lonsway & Fitsgerald, 1995), (b) social relationships that support sexual coercion or don't challenge such behavior (e.g., DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 2013), (c) hostile and controlling definitions of masculinity (e.g., Dean & Malamuth, 1997; White & Kowalksi,1998), and (d) patterns associated with sexual promiscuity (i.e., seeking frequent sexual encounters and gratification removed from any emotional connection) (Kanin, 1985). Studies have also revealed that female victims are likely to be individuals who (a) experienced childhood sexual abuse (Banyard, Arnold, & Smith, 2000; Koss & Dinero, 1989), (b) were engaged in frequent dating and had a number of sexual partners—in essence increasing their odds of encountering offenders (Abbey, 2002; Koss & Dinero, 1989), and (c) engaged in social interactions that involved heavy alcohol consumption, thus increasing the likelihood of exposure to male offenders who had attributes previously noted and/or utilized alcohol as a predatory tool for sexual assault (Abbey, 2002; Abbey, Zawacki, Buck, Clinton, & McAusland, 2001; Lisak & Miller, 2002; Schwartz & DesKeseredy, 1997).

Contextual factors have also been shown to increase the likelihood of sexual coercion and violence. In general, research has shown that contexts in which large quantities of alcohol are consumed, accompanied by little oversight or sanctions for inappropriate use, increase the likelihood of sexual victimization (e.g., Abbey, 2002). Contexts in which enactment of gender role stereotypes go unchallenged or examined can create tolerance of, if not support for, coercive behavior (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997). Contexts in which sexual offenses are perceived as condoned or unsanctioned by organizational or administrative authorities, or law enforcement, are likely to create norms of acceptance—as well as norms of non-disclosure by victims of sexual assault (Karjane, Fisher, & Cullen, 2005; Walsh, Banyard, Moynihan, Ward, & Cohn, 2010).

University and Secondary School Settings

University and college campuses have long been recognized as settings in which the risks of victimization are increased. Research estimates that 20-25% of females experience attempted or completed rape during their undergraduate years

(Fisher, Cullen & Turner, 2000; Krebs, Lindquist, Warner, Fisher, & Martin, 2007, 2009). A variety of factors may contribute to such victimization, including (a) college environments where large numbers of students experience the new freedoms associated with leaving their family/community; (b) students living in settings in which accountability for their time, social interactions, and lifestyle choices is minimal; (c) students exploring multiple social and relational life choices; and (d) a context in which the consumption of alcohol is normative and often occurs in problematic ways (Abbey, Zawacki, Buck, Clinton & McAuslan, 2001).

While secondary schools are more controlled environments than college campuses (e.g., structured classes, administrative oversight of student behavior and attendance), they may also create contexts in which sexual coercion exists. It is the setting in which romantic relationships often occur for the first time—usually with little input from adults about issues of sexual intimacy, consent and unhealthy relationships. It is also the context in which many adolescents are likely to first experiment with alcohol and other drugs. Developmentally, adolescents are addressing identity and peer relationship issues, placing increased importance on approval by peers and membership in socially approved peer networks. They are also individuating from parental figures. Such issues are likely to occur in secondary school contexts, in which faculty and staff are increasingly specialized in content-specific areas (e.g., mathematics, sciences) and have minimal training in the dynamics of sexual violence, the prevention, intervention, and services for such violence, associated internal and external resources, or associated policies and laws.

Calls for Action and Accountability

More and more, secondary and post-secondary systems are being called upon to assess— and be held accountable for—what is happening within their institutions. In 2011, Vice-President Joe Biden, and U.S. Department of Education (DOE) Secretary Arne Duncan called for increased efforts by secondary schools and college administration to address gender violence and acknowledge that sexual violence interferes with a student's right to receive an education free from discrimination and thus is criminal in nature. In 2011 Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights Russlynn Ali issued a "Dear Colleague" letter to college campus leadership addressing these issues (Ali, 2011). Similarly, in 2013, Secretary Duncan challenged chief state school officers to consider how

their respective schools and communities are reducing gender violence (Duncan, 2013). In 2014, President Barack Obama established a White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault, which calls for greater accountability by college and university campuses to how they address, prevent, and respond to sexual violence on their respective campuses. The DOE's release of a list of over 100 institutions whose handling of sexual violence cases are being investigated, along with findings like Yung's (2015) that many such institutions undercount incidents of sexual assault on their campus—unless they are being audited—suggest that such calls are warranted. Moving forward, college and university campuses will be safer and more supportive for all students when secondary schools that surround those campuses are fully engaged in awareness, education, and implementation of violence prevention strategies.

Silos within Communities

While calls for action within secondary schools and college campuses are critical for increasing awareness, they are limited by a lack of recognition that the risks and ownership of the issue of sexual violence crosses disciplines, units, and divisions within institutions, and is interconnected within the broader community and systems in which the institution rests (DeGue et al., 2012). Although campus-based conversations about sexual violence may integrate domestic and sexual violence victim advocates and prevention specialists, along with similar campus-based professionals when and where they exist, such dialogues rarely include area secondary schools that are likely to be sending students to the institution. Historically, such prevention conversations have often been limited to special event planning (e.g., sexual assault awareness month) or classroom presentations with little integration across sectors of the campus. Seldom are they integrated into multiple aspects of a student's life on campus or infused into college curricula (Banyard, 2014; Karjane, Fisher, & Cullen, 2005).

Secondary schools that do take action against sexual violence often limit their focus within their respective school systems and utilize expertise found only within the school district to address such issues. Professional staff often do not have the training around sexual and dating violence that high school students may be experiencing (e.g., Khubchandani et al., 2012). Involving community experts such as domestic and sexual assault advocates and prevention specialists often does not go beyond one-time classroom visits or school-wide assemblies. Many secondary schools are hesitant for external agencies to come within the school

system to address issues associated with sexuality in general and sexual violence specifically. Conversations with high school students preparing to transition to college settings rarely include discussion of risks of sexual violence on college campuses.

Secondary schools, college campuses, and sexual and domestic violence prevention specialists all share a core concern for ensuring the safety and healthy development of adolescents and young adults. The actions or steps to create contexts in which this can occur vary considerably and, more often than not, are taken in isolation of one another. Secondary schools that focus on creating contexts in which students are informed and empowered to prevent sexual violence ultimately serve college campuses by better preparing their future students. In return, colleges with faculty expertise and experience addressing sexual violence through prevention efforts, victim services, and program and policy development can serve as resources for secondary schools. Sexual and domestic violence prevention specialists are content experts that can be resources for both institutions. As critical partners in prevention, community professionals often are charged with reaching out to adolescents and young adults but struggle to access such populations.

Models of Prevention

The prevention of sexual violence within communities warrants a multi-prong approach that focuses not only on enhancing individual awareness, knowledge, and skills associated with sexual violence, but also on changing social norms, organizational practices, and policies (Banyard, 2011; Casey & Lindhorst, 2009). The "spectrum of prevention" framework is one approach for fostering an ecological perspective on prevention (Davis, Parks & Cohen, 2006). The framework comprises six levels of increasing scope. These include (1) strengthening individual knowledge and skills, (2) promoting community education, (3) educating providers, (4) fostering coalitions and networks, (5) changing organizational practices, and (6) influencing policy and legislation. Sustainable and effective efforts are most likely to result from the synergy and interrelatedness of this multi-level approach to prevention.

Emergence of the Bystander Approach

The bystander approach has emerged as an effective primary strategy for increasing skills and knowledge to prevent sexual violence (Banyard, Plante, &

Moynihan, 2005; Cissner, 2009; Coker et al. 2011). The bystander model calls for a broader range of community members to become involved in the prevention of sexual violence. As members of a community, they too have a role in ensuring that their respective community is safe—not only for themselves but for those with whom they share the community. The approach gives each member of a community a potential role in preventing violence and creates norms of healthy relationships. The rise in popularity of the bystander education model to engage broader audiences in violence prevention in secondary schools, colleges, and universities can be attributed to the increase of bystander programming and research, social media campaigns, and public awareness through film documentaries such as *BULLY*, *The Invisible Wars*, and *The Hunting Ground*. Moreover, as a result of Campus SaVE, the bystander model has now become incorporated into programming that college settings must undertake.

Mentors in Violence Prevention Bystander Model Approach

In the early 1990s, the Mentors in Violence Prevention (MVP) program emerged as the first bystander approach in the field. MVP is a peer leadership model that emphasizes the role of the "bystander," who may witness abusive and violent behaviors or behaviors that are potentially hurtful and harmful to others (Katz, Heisterkamp, & Fleming, 2011). Historically, domestic and sexual violence has been perceived as a woman's issue which only a few good men concern themselves. Research on the topic of men's engagement and leadership in challenging rape-supporting attitudes and beliefs indicates effective approaches, including men giving permission and support to other men to think and behave differently (Berkowitz, 1992, 1994; Crooks, 2007; Gidycz, Orchowski, & Berkowitz, 2011). The MVP model seeks to empower those (typically men) who might otherwise be silent observers of situations in which violence is unfolding. The MVP approach provides a safe platform for men and women to speak openly and honestly about their feelings and attitudes on the impact of violence and abuse in their lives or in the lives of family, friends, co-workers, and loved ones. It has been implemented in high school settings, college settings, the U.S. military, and within professional sports.

The primary goals of the MVP approach include increasing awareness of the verbal, emotional, psychological, and sexual abuse women and some men experience; challenging messages that exist within a social setting (e.g., school) about gender stereotypes and relationships and how these play into violence and

abuse; and inspiring leadership among students and adults by empowering them with concrete options to effect social norm change. The MVP program's goals and pedagogical approach are consistent with recommendations by scholars and practitioners alike, for effective programming (Banyard, 2014; Vladutiu, Martin, & Macy, 2011). Within the MVP train-the-trainer workshops, specially designed educational units—on intimate partner abuse, gender stereotypes, sexual harassment, media literacy, and alcohol and consent—work together to provide a foundation and framework for participants to formulate safe and efficient bystander responses to challenging social situations that may occur among peers, friends, classmates and teammates.

Leadership is the foundation from which all MVP training and implementation occurs. Using the analogy of a leaky faucet, MVP bystander modules and messages are incorporated like "steady drips" among student populations throughout the course of an academic year. This approach avoids the traditional "one shot" assembly experience that many secondary school and college administrators adopt, given limited resources of both time and money. Incorporating gender violence prevention strategies among students over several weeks or months communicates commitment on the part of the educational organization to institutionalize efforts to reduce violence and abuse in a systemic way.

Additionally, MVP actively identifies society's construction of gender roles and stereotypes and addresses the ways in which narrow definitions of what it means to be a man or woman can lead to and support the root causes of violence and abuse. Specifically, MVP confronts media's and society's proclivity to objectify women—a precursor to domestic and sexual violence. By examining gender role construction throughout the training, participants are able to challenge themselves and each other to form healthier, more respectful attitudes and perceptions of victims of violence. Exercises in empathy-building go a long way toward disrupting attitudes of dominance and privilege that some men and boys adopt in an effort to seek acceptance. During MVP trainings, participants engage in activities specifically designed to create safe and open dialogue that encourages multiple perspectives on "difficult issues" facing adults and young adults alike such as alcohol and consent, victim blaming, and sexual assault. The MVP model addresses these issues directly within the curriculum to allow participants to

safely explore and discuss healthy and respectful ways to challenge abusive thinking and behavior when it arises.

From our experiences, what makes the MVP model such a powerful intervention within educational institutions and with other youth and family-focused community organizations is its emphasis on awareness, education, and implementation strategies surrounding gender violence prevention. MVP has effectively engaged and supported female and increasingly more male student leaders in challenging and confronting social norms that accept abuse, harassment, and sexual violence among peers (Cissner, 2009; Katz, Heisterkamp, & Fleming, 2011).

Cultivating Partnerships with the MVP Model

The University of Northern Iowa (UNI) has a long history of proactively addressing gender violence. In 2000 and 2003, UNI received U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) campus grants to reduce sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking; in 2007, the university received a DOJ "flagship" grant to continue this work at UNI and to work with the University of Iowa and Iowa State University to develop and/or refine programs, services, and policies at the three institutions. A core element of the prevention work involved the MVP program (Lynch & Fleming, 2005). Concurrent with this work, the MVP model was also infused into secondary schools within a large Iowa school district (Heisterkamp, Fleming, & Waitt, 2011). From these concurrent initiatives, an understanding and vision of how the collective efforts can have larger impacts on reducing gender violence began to emerge. Through institutional and private foundation support, the Center for Violence Prevention (CVP) was launched in 2011 as a culmination of these efforts.

Utilizing the MVP platform, a cornerstone of the work of the CVP has been incorporating a multi-systemic approach to building capacity and collaboration for sexual violence prevention involving colleges, secondary schools, and community partners. While providing education and increasing awareness about sexual violence is a critical first step toward prevention, effective and systemic change must occur on multiple levels (Davis, Parks, & Cohen, 2006). The CVP has incorporated this perspective on several levels.

At the individual level, the CVP-MVP initiative at UNI is integrated into curricula associated with a number of majors on campus (e.g., family studies, women and gender studies, education, educational leadership, criminology). MVP modules are presented in classes in gender-specific groups. Students are challenged to examine their attitudes and actions as they relate to gender violence and bystander behavior. MVP modules and discussions bring a reality to the challenges and experiences students may encounter in their social life. The modules also build upon the online training they received as incoming students to UNI, as well as the exposure to gender violence they gained through the forum theater program offered in their oral composition classes (Mitchell & Freitag, 2011). Enhancing students' knowledge, awareness, and skills associated with bystander behavior and gender violence is an important outcome. The MVP infusion into curricula works from, and builds upon, the first level of the spectrum of prevention.

Cultivating Partnerships within the Campus

Interconnected with this first level is the CVP's effort to build capacity at UNI to discuss the importance of the bystander approach within divisions and departments on campus and through interdisciplinary and interdivision work. To this end, each semester for the past three years, the CVP has provided MVP train-the-trainer workshops, each usually involving 30-35 participants. These two- to three-day workshops bring together faculty, student leaders, administration, and professional staff from across campus to collaboratively examine and discuss issues associated with gender violence and the MVP program. In such settings, all are valued as equal participants with their own knowledge, awareness, and skill set. Participants gain knowledge and skills to implement and/or integrate MVP within their respective areas of work. CVP provides ongoing technical support. This approach increases the campus community's understanding of gender violence and the bystander approach, while building capacity for broader dissemination on campus. This approach speaks to the second level of the spectrum—providing community education.

By inviting and encouraging key "providers" on campus to attend the workshops and to join with other members of the campus community, the approach also addresses the "educating providers" level of the spectrum. Ensuring that representatives of units like health care systems, counseling, academic advising, residential life, and student affairs divisions have received

MVP training helps to establish the model across the campus. At a minimum, the model provides a common core of understanding, expectations, and language for the entire campus community. As previously noted, this approach helps to break down the barriers that commonly exist in post-secondary institutions.

Cultivating Partnerships beyond the Campus

The CVP-MVP model has been implemented around Iowa and in the Midwest. Central to the trainings is the importance of developing partnerships and collaborations within and across institutions of higher education, secondary schools, and community partners. A core component of the trainings is the inclusion of representatives from the institutions and other community stakeholders. The responsibility for the prevention of sexual violence does not fall solely to those professionals who have dedicated themselves to these issues; rather, the CVP believes that the responsibility lies within all of us and that the most effective way to move forward is to have all institutional systems working together (Casey, & Lindhorts, 2009; DeGue et al., 2012). Building capacity within secondary schools to address gender violence in a multi-tier manner is critical to helping to ensure that high schools are safe environments and that students are better prepared to walk from their high schools into their communities and onto college campuses. The collaboration of representatives from the campus community and the secondary schools, and the prevention specialists, in the MVP workshops helps to foster secondary school-campus-community partnerships, coalitions, and networks—the third level of the spectrum of prevention.

Results of the CVP Implementation Efforts

Evaluation of the CVP-MVP approach is ongoing and sequential in nature. To date, these efforts have been primarily formative and limited to post-session evaluations or pre/post-test training evaluations. In the coming year, longer term outcome evaluations will be utilized. While acknowledging the limitations commonly associated with early evaluation efforts, the feedback received thus far about the CVP-MVP approach encourages optimism that these efforts to prevent sexual violence on multiple levels of the spectrum are making a difference.

Classroom modules

At the individual level, between 2011 and 2015, the CVP-MVP model has been delivered to approximately 3,800 students at UNI. MVP modules have been infused into curricula associated with approximately 10 courses (some with

multiple sections) representing three of the four colleges at the university. Courses range from the liberal arts core to those required for specific majors. The particular module (or modules) can vary depending on the class, the number of classes allotted to the MVP program, and the depth of awareness, knowledge, and conversations that have occurred within the classroom. Central to any conversation is the importance of students engaging in safe, prosocial, bystander interventions. In light of time constraints, current evaluation efforts involve the administration of a brief survey at the end of the session. Consistently, the surveys have revealed that the MVP program was well received. On average, 92% of survey respondents believed the time in the program was well spent, 95% felt the information was important for them to know, 84% felt the program raised their awareness, and 85% felt they gained new skills and were better prepared to intervene when confronted with scenarios associated with gender violence. The consistency of these findings over time, with various presenters and across a range of classes, suggests the MVP program has merit.

MVP train the trainer

The CVP-MVP train-the-trainer workshop approach has occurred each semester for approximately three years. To date, approximately 240 individuals have completed the training, and the results shared here pertain to these 240 participants. The workshop has been delivered to a cross-spectrum of the campus community (e.g., administration, residential life, professional staff, undergraduates, ROTC leadership, and faculty). These individuals most often represent those within the campus who are in leadership, educational, or supervisory positions and thus have the potential to influence a broader array of students and staff on campus. Participants were given a survey at the beginning of the program that included four items that addressed beliefs commonly associated with rape myths, and eight items that asked about bystander behaviors (see Table 1 for the specific items). The post-training workshop contained these 12 items along with items that asked about participants' satisfaction with the workshop on several dimensions.

Paired sample t-tests were conducted on the various items to examine changes that occurred from the pre- and post-surveys. The results suggest that, overall, the workshop was effective in changing attitudes associated with rape myths, increasing perceived abilities to engage in prosocial bystander behavior,

and enhancing abilities to integrate the content into participants' social and work settings (see Table 1).

The CVP-MVP train-the-trainer model has now been introduced and supported in 40 high schools and colleges in Iowa representing 32 different communities. In each of these trainings, the community's sexual violence and domestic violence prevention specialists have played the role of co-facilitator or provided resources to the participants about services offered by their respective agencies. Utilizing one-way between-groups ANOVAs with post-hoc comparisons, Table 2 provides a comparison between college/university, secondary school, and other participants regarding individual items on their pre-test surveys, and subsequently compares the three groups in relation to their post-test surveys by items. On the pre-test surveys, significant differences emerged with respect to: beliefs about staying in abusive relationships, F (2, 228) = 12.46, p = .000, ^{2} = .09; clothing and harassment, F (2, 229) = 25.42, p = .000, ^{2} = .18; responsibility for harassment, F (2, 229) = 9.47, p = .000, ^{2} = .08; resistance to sex, F (2, 228) = 3.59, p = .02, ^{2} = .03; having skills to educate, F (2, 229) = 5.41, p = .005, ^{2} = .04; how to integrate into work, F (2, 229) = 4.56, p = .01, ^{2} = .04; work flexibility, F (2, 226) = 5.58, p = .004, ^{2}= .05; skills to educate in social circles, F (2, 229) = 8.53, p = .000, ^{2} = .07; skills to integrate knowledge into social circles, F (2, 228) = 4.45, p = .013, ^{2} = .04. These results suggest that these groups are starting off in significantly different places in their beliefs and bystander perceptions.

On the post-surveys, significant differences emerged with respect to: beliefs about staying in abusive relationships, F (2, 224) = 20.69, p = .000, ^{2} = .15; clothing and harassment, F (2, 224) = 16.41, p = .000, ^{2} = .12; responsibility for harassment, F (2, 224) = 9.76, p = .000, ^{2} = .08; having skills to educate, F (2, 225) = 5.35, p = .005, ^{2} = .04; how to integrate into work, F (2, 223) = 4.18, p = .01, ^{2} = .04; work flexibility, F (2, 223) = 7.72, p = .001, ^{2} = .06; skills to educate in social circles, F (2, 225) = 15.27, p = .000, ^{2} = .12; skills to integrate knowledge into social circles, F (2, 224) = 8.26, p = .000, ^{2} = .07. These findings suggest that for all groups the MVP training facilitated positive shifts in their beliefs and bystander perceptions. With respect to where significant changes emerged around bystander perceptions, a pattern became evident between secondary schools and others, which might be expected, given the nature of the work and work settings. No significant differences were found

across the groups with respect to their perceptions of the usefulness of the workshop, feeling prepared to utilize the content, and making recommendations to others. The findings also indicate that the lowest average (5=strongly agree, Likert scale) on any items was 4.60.

Table 3 provides findings from paired sample t-tests to compare pre-post scores for the groups, individually collapsing across the variables to create composite variables (mean score). Results indicate that although the groups began at different points, overall each group had significant changes in attitudes and bystander behaviors by the end of the workshop.

Discussion of the CVP Implementation Efforts

The findings of this study offer preliminary evidence that the CVP-MVP initiative is facilitating increases in knowledge and beliefs about the efficacy of prosocial bystander behaviors and actions. The findings suggest that there are differences among secondary school personnel, university personnel, and community stakeholders on a number of dimensions. Such differences support the need for university-secondary school collaborative work and partnerships to increase respective institutional capacities for sexual violence education and prevention.

Collectively, these efforts have sought to prevent sexual violence on several levels. The implementation of the MVP program in, for example, classroom settings, student life events (e.g., residential halls, Greek systems), and student employment settings (e.g., dining halls), strengthens individual students' knowledge and skills. However, moving beyond prevention efforts that focus on individual-level change is critical for sustainable change (Casey & Lindhorst, 2009; DeGue et al., 2014). Thus, the MVP train-the-trainer model builds capacity within divisions of college communities to offer MVP sessions on an ongoing basis to their respective student stakeholders.

The success of the CVP-MVP model to engage secondary schools to join with UNI and sexual and domestic violence prevention specialists to help prevent gender violence is noteworthy. Institutional support from colleges, secondary schools, and community stakeholders to come together to address issues such as sexual violence is consistent with calls from a variety of constituents that sexual violence must end.

The CVP-MVP has received institutional support through funding from the deans of the College of Social and Behavioral Studies and the College of Education at UNI, and from the provost's office. The CVP-MVP approach of working with secondary schools in partnership with the sexual and domestic violence prevention specialists serving Iowa has received ongoing financial and logistical support from the Iowa Department of Public Health (IDPH) and from private foundations. Indeed, the model is consistent with, and integrated into, the IDPH strategic plan to address sexual violence in the state of Iowa.

A cautionary note is no doubt warranted given the limitations of the methodology currently being utilized to evaluate the program. As the CVP-MVP model has now become more established and implemented in more contexts in the state, stronger evaluation designs are possible and will be incorporated in the coming year. Utilization of longitudinal designs, evaluation of dissemination efforts of the MVP model, and multi-systems analyses will be undertaken. To this end, the CVP has developed a multi-systemic readiness assessment tool for secondary schools to examine the degree to which they are addressing gender violence. Trainings on the model have occurred across the state of Iowa and at state and national conferences (Fleming & Heisterkamp, 2015; Heisterkamp & Fleming, 2014a, 2014b).

While colleges and universities continue to make progress on increasing students' knowledge, skills, and awareness regarding sexual assault, and integrating the bystander approach to prevent incidents of sexual violence, promote healthy behaviors and relationships throughout campus culture, increase services for victims of assault, and revise respective institution's protocols for responding to reports of victimizations, we propose that a model like the CVP-MVP approach is one from which many post-secondary institutions would benefit in significant ways. Young men's and women's attitudes and behaviors that minimize risk factors and maximize protective factors related to sexual violence do not magically appear during the summer between their senior year of high school and their freshman year of college. Thus, including collaborative partnerships with local secondary schools and domestic and sexual assault prevention specialists within the overall strategy and approach to address these challenging issues for the purpose of creating healthy and safe campuses and communities for all students is in everyone's best interest.

References

Abbey, A. (2002). Alcohol-related sexual assault: A common problem among college students. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 14*, 118-128.

Abbey, A., Zawacki, T., Buck, P. O., Clinton, A. M., & McAuslan, P. (2001). Alcohol and sexual assault. *Alcohol Research and Health, 25*(1)*,* 43-51.

Ali, R. (2011, April 4). Dear Colleague. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-201104.pdf

Banyard, V. L. (2011). Who will help prevent sexual violence: Creating an ecological model of bystander intervention. *Psychology of Violence, 1*(3)*,* 216-229.

Banyard, V. L. (2014). Improving college campus-based prevention of violence against women: A strategic plan for research built on multipronged practices and policies. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 15,* 339-351. doi:10.1177/1524838014521027

Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. (2004). Bystander education: Bringing a broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention. *Journal of Community Psychology, 32*(1)*,* 69-79. doi:10.1002/jcop.20159

Banyard, V. L., Arnold, S., & Smith, J. (2000). Childhood sexual abuse and dating experiences of undergraduate women. *Child Maltreatment, 5,* 39-48. doi:10.1177/1077559500005001005

Basile, K. C., Black, M. C., Simon, T. R., Arias, I., Brener, N. D., & Saltzman, L. E. (2006). The association between self-reported lifetime history of forced sexual intercourse and recent health risk behaviors: Findings from the 2003 National Youth Risk Behavior Survey. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 39*, 752.e1-752.e7. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2006.06.001

Berkowitz, A.D. (1992). College men as perpetrators of acquaintance rape and sexual assault: A review. *Journal of American College Health*, *40*, 175-181. doi:10.1080/07448481.1992.9936279

Berkowitz, A. D. (1994). A model acquaintance rape prevention program for men. In A.D. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Men and rape: Theory, research and prevention programs in higher education* (pp. 35-42). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Black, M. C., Basile, K. C., Breiding, M. J., Smith, S. G., Walters, M. L., Merrick, M. T. Chen, J., & Stevens, M. R. (2011). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVIS): 2010 summary report.* Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Brener. N. D., McMcahon, P. M., Warren, C. W., & Douglas, K. A. (1999). Forced sexual intercourse and associated health-risk behaviors among female college students in the United States. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 67*, 252-259.

Casey, E. A., & Lindhorst, T. P. (2009). Toward a multi-level, ecological approach to the primary prevention of sexual assault: Prevention in peer and community contexts. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse. 10,* 91-114.

Cissner, A. B. (2009). *Evaluating the Mentors in Violence Prevention program*. New York: Center for Court Innovation.

Coker, A. L., Cook-Craig, P. G., Williams, C. M., Fisher, B. S., Clear, E. R., Garcia, L. S., & Hegge, L. M. (2011). Evaluation of green dot: An active bystander intervention to reduce sexual violence on college campuses. *Violence Against Women, 17,* 777-796.

Crooks, C. V., Goodall, G. R., Hughes, R., Jaffe, P., & Baler, L. L. (2007). Engaging men and boys in preventing violence against women: Applying a cognitive-behavioral model. *Violence Against Women, 13,* 217-239.

Dartnall, E., & Jewkes, R. (2013). Sexual violence against women: The scope of the problem. *Best Practice & Research Clinical Obstetrics and Gynaecology, 27,* 3-13.

Davis, R., Parks, L. F., & Cohen, L. (2006). *Sexual violence and the spectrum of prevention: Towards a community solution.* Enola, PA: National Sexual Violence Resource Center.

Dean, K. E., & Malamuth, N. M. (1997). Characteristics of men who aggress sexually and men who imagine aggressing: Risk and moderating variables. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72,* 449-455.

DeGue, S., Valle, L. A., Holt, M. K., Massetti, G. M., Matjasko, J. L., & Tharp, A. T. (2014). A systematic review of primary prevention strategies for

sexual violence prevention. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 19,* 346-262.

DeGue, S., Valle, L. A., Holt, M. K., Massetti, G. M., Matjasko, J. L., Tharp, A. T., & Valle, L. A. (2012). Looking ahead toward community-level strategies to prevent sexual violence. *Journal of Women's Health, 21*, 1-3. doi:10.1089/jwh.2011.3263

DeKeseredy, W., & Scwhartz, M. D. (2013). *Male peer support and violence against women: The history and verification of a theory*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Duncan, A. (2013, February 28). Key policy letters from Education Secretary and Deputy Secretary. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/secletter/130228.html

Gidycz, C., Orchowski, L. M., & Berkowitz, A. D. (2011). Preventing sexual aggression among college men: An evaluation of a social norms and bystander intervention program. *Violence Against Women, 17*, 720-742.

Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). *The sexual victimization of college women: Findings from two national-level studies* (NIJ182369). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Fleming, W. M., & Heisterkamp, A. (2015, February). Engaging secondary schools in gender violence prevention: The use and application of the Domestic/Sexual Assault Agency and Secondary School Systems Readiness Assessment Tool. Presented at the Kansas Coalition Against Sexual and Domestic Violence Conference, Topeka, KS.

Heisterkamp, A., & Fleming, W. M. (2013). Hearing the voices: Engaging in sexual violence prevention utilizing the spectrum of prevention model. National Sexual Assault Conference, Los Angeles, CA.

Heisterkamp, A., & Fleming, W. M. (2014a). Hearing the voices of all stakeholders: Engaging in sexual violence prevention utilizing the spectrum of prevention model with secondary schools. Presented at the Wyoming Sexual Assault Summit XIII, Riverton, WY.

Heisterkamp, A., & Fleming, W. M. (2014b). Collaborative voices: Facilitating discussion with the Sexual Assault Agency and Secondary School

Readiness Assessment Tool. Presented at the National Sexual Assault Conference, Pittsburgh, PA.

Heisterkamp, A., Fleming, W., & Waitt, C. (2011). *The Sioux City project: Preventing violence and bullying: A school district and community in motion.* Sioux City, IA: Waitt Institute for Violence Prevention.

Johnson, N. L., & Johnson, D. M. (2013). Factors influencing the relationship between sexual trauma and risky sexual behavior in college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 28,* 2315-2331. doi:10.1177/0886260512475318

Jina, R., & Thomas, L. S. (2013). Health consequences of sexual violence against women. *Best Practice & Research Clinical Obstetrics and Gynaecology. 27*, 15-26. doi:10.1016/j.bpobgyn.2012.08.012

Katz, J., Heisterkamp, A., & Fleming, W. (2011). The social justice roots of the Mentors in Violence Prevention model and its application in a high school setting. *Violence Against Women*, *17*, 684-702. doi:10.1177/1077801211409725

Kanin, E. J. (1985). Date rapists: Differential sexual socialization and relative deprivation. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 14*, 219-231.

Karjane, H. M., Fisher, B. S., & Cullen, F. T. (2005) *Sexual assault on campus: What colleges and universities are doing about it.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Koss, M. P., & Dinero, T. E. (1989). Discriminant analysis of risk factors for sexual victimization among a national sample of college women. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57*, 242-250. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.57.2.242

Khubchandani, J., Price, J. H., Thompson, A., Dake, J. A., Wiblishauser, M., & Telljohann, S. K. (2012). Adolescent dating violence: A national assessment of school counselors' perceptions and practices. *Pediatrics*, *130*, 202-210. doi:10.1542/peds.2011-3130

Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C. H., Warner, T. D., Fisher, B. S., & Martin, S. L. (2007). *The Campus Sexual Assault (CSA) study.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C. H., Warner, T. D., Fisher, B. S., & Martin, S. L. (2009). College women's experiences with physically forced, alcohol-or other drug enabled and drug-facilitated sexual assault before and since entering college. *Journal of American College Health, 57*(6)*,* 639-647. doi:10.3200/JACH.57.6.639-649

Lisak, D., & Miller, P. M. (2002). Repeat rape and multiple offending among undetected rapists. *Violence and Victims, 17*, 73-84.

Lonsway, K. A., Banyard, V. L., Berkowitz, A. D., Gidycz, C. A., Katz, J. T., Koss, M. P., Ullman, S. E. (2009). Rape prevention and risk reduction: Review of the research literature for practitioners. Harrisburg, PA: VAWnet, a project of the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence/ Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence. Retrieved from: http://www.vawnet.org

Lynch, A., & Fleming, W. (2005). Bystander approaches: Empowering students to model ethical sexual behavior. *Journal of Family & Consumer Sciences, 97*, 27-33.

Mason, F., & Lodrick, Z. (2013). Psychological consequences of sexual assault. *Best Practice & Research Clinical Obstetrics and Gynaecology. 27*, 27-37. doi:10.1016/j.bpobgyn.2012.08.015

Mitchell, K. S., & Freitag, J. L. (2011). Forum theatre for bystanders: A new model for gender violence prevention. *Violence Against Women, 17*, 90-1013. doi:10.1177/1077801211417152

Santaularia, J., Johnson, M., Hart, L., Haskett, L., Welsh, E., & Faseru, B. (2014). Relationships between sexual violence and chronic disease: A cross-sectional study. *BMC Public Health, 14*, 1286-1289. doi:10.1186/14712458141286

Schwartz, M. D., & DeKeseredy, W. S. (1997). *Sexual assault on the college campus: The role of male peer support*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Vladutiu, C. J., Martin, S. L., & Macy, R. J. College or university based sexual assault prevention programs: A review of program outcomes, characteristics, and recommendations. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 12*, 67-86. doi:10.1177/1524838010390708

Walsh, W. A., Banyard, V. L, Moynihan, M. M., Ward, S., & Cohn, E. S. (2010). Disclosure and service use on a college campus after an unwanted sexual experience. *Journal of Trauma and Dissociation, 11,*(2), 134-151. doi:10.1891/0886-6708. VV-D-12-00154

White, J. W., & Kowalski, R. M. (1998). Male violence toward women: An integrated perspective. In *Human Aggression: Theories, research and implications for social policy* (pp. 203-228). New York: Academic Press.

Williams, C. M., Cook-Craig, P. G., Bush, H. M., Clear, E. R., Lewis, A. M., Garcia, L. S., Coker, A. L, & Fisher, B. S. (2014). Victimization and perpetration of unwanted sexual activities among high school students: Frequency and correlates. *Violence Against Women, 20*, 1239-1257.

Yung, C. R. (2015). Concealing campus sexual assault: An empirical examination. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 21*, 1-9.

Appendix

Table 1

Attitudes and Perceptions of Bystander Behavior—All Participants (n=240)

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	*t*	*df*
Attitudes				
Someone who stays in an abusive relationship is partially responsible for their abuse	2.14 (1.17)	1.73 (1.04)	6.12***	200
A woman who wears tight or revealing clothing deserves some of the blame if she is sexually harassed.	1.78 (1.04)	1.62 (.96)	3.67**	200
Someone who is sexually harassed usually has done something to bring on the harassment.	1.48 (.69)	1.28 (.55)	4.29***	200
When a person resists sex, they often really want it and just need to be talked into it.	1.31 (.69)	1.19 (.48)	3.01**	199
Bystander Behaviors				
There are several ways for a bystander to prevent or stop someone from behaving abusively toward their partner	4.06 (.85)	4.68 (.62)	-9.25***	201
Regardless if I know them or not, if I see someone behaving abusively toward their partner, I can prevent it	3.77 (.83)	4.40 (.64)	-10.74***	201
I would likely speak up or take action if I saw someone I don't know threatening to harm their partner	3.85 (.82)	4.39 (.62)	-9.05***	201
I have skills to educate others about sexual harassment, dating violence and sexual assault in my work.	3.26 (1.02)	4.46 (.56)	-17.07***	201
I have a good idea of how to integrate	3.38	4.43	-15.45***	200

knowledge about gender violence into my work.	(1.01)	(.54)		
I believe I have the flexibility and support from my employer to find ways to integrate information about gender violence at work.	3.93 (.89)	4.31 (.76)	-6.67***	198
I have the necessary skills to educate others about sexual harassment, dating violence and sexual assault in my social circles.	3.49 (1.02)	4.47 (.61)	-14.49***	201
I have a good idea of how to integrate knowledge about gender violence into my social circles.	3.54 (.91)	4.44 (.59)	-14.43***	201

Note ** = $p \leq .001$ *** = $p \leq .000$. Standard deviations appear in parentheses below means. 5-point scale with 1=strongly disagree, and 5=strongly agree

Table 2

Attitudes and Perceptions of Bystander Behavior by Employment Setting

	Pre			Post		
	College	K-12	Other	College	K-12	Other
Attitudes						
Someone who stays in an abusive relationship…	1.89_{b} (1.04)	2.79_{ac} (1.32)	2.13_{b} (1.17)	1.42_{b} (.80)	2.52_{ac} (1.26)	1.66_{b} (1.00)
A woman who wears revealing clothing deserves…harassed.	1.43_{b} (.68)	2.48_{ac} (1.25)	1.72_{b} (1.97)	1.38_{b} (.68)	2.26_{ac} (1.19)	1.50_{b} (.94)
Someone who is sexually harassed usually has done…	1.33_{b} (.56)	1.78_{ac} (.87)	1.45_{b} (.56)	1.13_{b} (.34)	1.58_{a} (.67)	1.34 (1.17)
When a person resists sex… just need to be talked into it.	1.21_{c} (.49)	1.41 (.69)	1.50_{a} (1.02)	1.11 (1.17)	1.30 (1.17)	1.24 (1.17)
Bystander Behaviors						
There are several ways for a bystander stop someone …	4.13 (.79)	3.94 (.88)	3.96 (.95)	4.70 (1.17)	4.68 (1.17)	4.60 (1.17)
If I see someone abusive …I can prevent it	3.79 (.80)	3.70 (.89)	3.83 (.78)	4.41 (1.17)	4.34 (1.17)	4.49 (1.17)
I would likely speak… if I saw someone … threatening to harm their partner	3.85 (.76)	3.86 (.86)	3.88 (.88)	4.43 (1.17)	4.22_{c} (1.17)	4.49_{b} (1.17)
I have skills to educate …in my work.	3.28_{b} (1.04)	2.91_{ac} (.89)	3.50_{c} (1.15)	4.52_{b} (1.17)	4.26_{ac} (1.17)	4.59_{c} (1.17)
I have a good idea of how to integrate knowledge …in my work.	3.34 (1.08)	3.10_{c} (.89)	3.65_{b} (.78)	4.45 (1.17)	4.28_{c} (1.17)	4.56_{b} (1.17)
I have the flexibility and support … to integrate information… about	4.08_{b} (.89)	3.65_{ac} (.78)	4.05 (.88)	4.39_{b} (1.17)	4.02_{ac} (1.17)	4.54_{c} (1.17)

gender violence at work.						
I have the necessary skills to educate others about sexual harassment, dating violence and sexual assault in my social circles.	3.61_{ab} (1.03)	3.05_{ac} (.91)	3.72_{b} (1.05)	4.57_{b} (1.17)	4.13_{ac} (1.17)	4.67_{b} (1.17)
I have a good idea of how to integrate knowledge about gender violence into my social circles.	3.63_{b} (1.00)	3.27_{ac} (.79)	3.71_{b} (.86)	4.54_{b} (1.17)	4.16_{ac} (1.17)	4.57_{b} (1.17)

Note $^{**}= p \leq .001$ $^{***}= p \leq .000$. Standard deviations appear in parentheses below means. 5-point scale with 1=strongly disagree, and 5=strongly agree

Table 3

Attitudes and Perceptions of Bystander Behavior—Collapsed

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	*t*	*df*	95% Confidence Interval LL	UL	Cohens *d*
Attitudes							
College/University	1.44 (.52)	1.26 (.39)	4.91***	96	.11	.26	0.39
K-12	2.12 (.79)	1.91 (73)	2.81**	49	.09	.36	0.27
Other Community	1.67 (.74)	1.37 (.63)	4.94**	52	.17	.42	0.43
Bystander Behaviors							
College/University	3.72 (.58)	4.50 (.41)	-15.19***	97	-.88	-.68	-1.55
K-12	3.43 (.50)	4.26 (.47)	-10.53***	49	-.99	-.68	-1.71
Other Community	3.76 (.65)	4.52 (.43)	-8.20***	50	-.94	-.56	-1.37

Note ** = $p \leq .001$ *** = $p \leq .000$. Standard deviations appear in parentheses below means. 5-point scale with 1=strongly disagree, and 5=strongly agree

Author Biographies

Wm. Michael Fleming PhD, CFLE, is an Associate Professor of Family Studies at the University of Northern Iowa and currently serves as Director of Assessment for the Center for Violence Prevention. His scholarship and teaching focus on the dynamics associated with interpersonal violence, models of prevention and early intervention in secondary and higher education schools, and education and training of domestic/sexual assault educators and advocates. His community engagement includes serving on boards for domestic/sexual agencies, serving on regional and statewide task forces and coalitions focusing on domestic/sexual assault, as well as working with non-profits providing program and evaluation consultation. michael.fleming@uni.edu

H. Alan Heisterkamp, EdD, is the Director of the Center for Violence Prevention at the University of Northern Iowa. Dr. Heisterkamp served as a consultant with the Waitt Institute for Violence Prevention from 2007 to 2011 and served as the principal investigator on a four-year case study entitled *The Sioux City Project*. He was the education consultant on the award-winning film documentary, *BULLY* and co-facilitated research on the *Coaching Boys into Men* program in 2007. Dr. Heisterkamp serves on local and statewide domestic assault and sexual violence community coalition boards and task forces and continues to instruct school and community leaders in bystander prevention education using the MVP model. alan.heisterkamp@uni.edu