

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Evaluation of USVReact: a staff training program to counter sexual violence at university

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1764206> since 2020-12-12T18:12:18Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1177/1090198120939487

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

Health Education & Behavior

EVALUATION OF USVreact: A STAFF TRAINING PROGRAM TO PREVENT SEXUAL VIOLENCE AT UNIVERSITY

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Journal: | <i>Health Education & Behavior</i> |
| Manuscript ID | HEB-18-0381.R5 |
| Manuscript Type: | Original Manuscript |
| Topics: | Violent Behavior & Prevention, Formative Evaluation < EVALUATION, Worksite Health Promotion < PLACE, College Health < PLACE, Quantitative Methods |
| Research Methods: | Quantitative Methods |
| Abstract: | <p>Interventions addressing the endemic of sexual violence at European universities are scarce, particularly those that take a bystander focus to sexual violence prevention and involve university staff. Evidence-based data on their effectiveness are also lacking. This paper reports the description of a pilot evaluation study of the USVreact Italian training program addressed to university staff for counteracting sexual violence. We assessed initial (T1) representations of gender-based violence, rape myth acceptance, and attitudes to bystander intervention (172 participants), and evaluated the effectiveness of the course by comparing via paired sample T-tests the responses before and after (T2) training (66 participants). Comparison between pre- (T1) and post-training (T2) responses indicated that the participants' ability to recognize subtle forms of violence and reduce rape myth acceptance was increased after training. Relatively few training programs based on the bystander approach to prevent gender-based violence at university have been performed to date in Europe and data on their effectiveness are scarce. Several limitations notwithstanding, the present pilot evaluation study provides suggestions for a more systematic evaluation of training interventions that address cultural legitimization of gender-based violence and that sustain bystander interventions in sexual assault prevention.</p> |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

EVALUATION OF USVreact:
A STAFF TRAINING PROGRAM TO PREVENT SEXUAL VIOLENCE AT
UNIVERSITY

Abstract

Interventions addressing the endemic of sexual violence at European universities are scarce, particularly those that take a bystander focus to sexual violence prevention and involve university staff. Evidence-based data on their effectiveness are also lacking. This paper reports the description of a pilot evaluation study of the USVreact Italian training program addressed to university staff for counteracting sexual violence.

We assessed initial (T1) representations of gender-based violence, rape myth acceptance, and attitudes to bystander intervention (172 participants), and evaluated the effectiveness of the course by comparing via paired sample T-tests the responses before and after (T2) training (66 participants). Comparison between pre- (T1) and post-training (T2) responses indicated that the participants' ability to recognize subtle forms of violence and reduce rape myth acceptance was increased after training. Relatively few training programs based on the bystander approach to prevent gender-based violence at university have been performed to date in Europe and data on their effectiveness are scarce. Several limitations notwithstanding, the present pilot evaluation study provides suggestions for a more systematic evaluation of training interventions that address cultural legitimization of gender-based violence and that sustain bystander interventions in sexual assault prevention.

Impact statement: training program evaluation, countering sexual violence, bystander intervention, university, staff training.

Introduction

Sexual violence can be defined as “any sexual act or an attempt to obtain a sexual act, unwanted sexual comments, or advances, acts to traffic or otherwise directed, against a person's sexuality using coercion, by any person regardless of their relationship to the victim in any setting, including but not limited to home and work.” (WHO, 2002).

According to the World Health Organization (WHO, 2016) about 35% of women worldwide have suffered physical or sexual violence from partners or non-partners at some point during their lives. According to Eurostat, the statistical office of the European Union (EU), about 215,000 violent sexual crimes were reported to the police in the EU in 2015 alone. In Italy, the National Institute of Statistics (ISTAT- Istituto Nazionale di Statistica, 2015) reported that 31% of women aged between 16 and 70 years have experienced some form of violence during their lives: physical violence in 20%, sexual violence in 21%, and sexual harassment in 74% of cases. As Kelly (1987) underlined, sexual violence can assume several forms, from the most serious, such as rape, to the more subtle, such as verbal harassment. These different behaviors need specific interventions. The World Health Organization (WHO) specifies the three prevention levels to counteract forms of sexual violence: primary, secondary, and tertiary (WHO, 2010; Banyard, 2015). Secondary, focalized prevention actions should be activated in specific risky situations, and tertiary prevention is necessary after a violent episode. Primary prevention should act as extensively as possible to reduce the occurrence of any form of violence. The aims of primary prevention are to remove the

1
2
3 conditions that allow episodes of violence from happening, i.e., to promote a cultural
4
5 change towards stigmatizing sexual dominance and violence, in any form. In the
6
7 United States, bystander interventions are often proposed to counteract sexual violence
8
9 (focused on primary and secondary prevention). As clearly exposed by Banyard
10
11 (2015), bystander-based intervention can be useful in counteracting violence.
12
13 Bystanders can be proactive in supporting the victim of a violent episode and can
14
15 stigmatize the action of the perpetrator: in this way, the bystander can contribute
16
17 to enhance a culture of respect.
18
19

20
21 To prevent sexual violence, the European Commission finances international projects
22
23 with targeted actions addressed to the different forms of violence, to various different
24
25 social contexts (workplace environment, schools, universities) and social stakeholders
26
27 (e.g., healthcare personnel, law enforcement agencies, teachers, etc.) with the aim to
28
29 both support victims of violence and reduce sexist and discriminatory behavior (see
30
31 Daphne Funding Programme and Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme –
32
33 European Commission).
34
35

36
37 The training program presented and evaluated here is part of the European project
38
39 entitled "USVreact: University Supporting Victims of Sexual Violence"
40
41 (www.usvreact.eu) [1]. Why the university context? Because sexual violence is an
42
43 entrenched problem in higher education institutions, especially in the United States
44
45 and northern European countries: 68% of female students in the UK (NUS, 2010)
46
47 declared having experienced at least one episode of harassment or sexual violence on
48
49 campus (Perkins & Warner, 2017). While the prevalence in Italy is far lower - 30%
50
51 according to the Eu-Project *Gender-based Violence, Stalking and Fear of Crime*
52
53 (2012) - there are worrying signals of a culture that seriously underrates many forms
54
55 of sexual violence in society at large and in university settings. Newspaper reports,
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 television programs, and posts on social networks show that sexual violence is often
4 treated as a joke or attributed to provocations by the victim (Maass, Cadinu, Guarnieri,
5 & Grasselli, 2003; Ward, 2016; Krongard, & Tsay-Vogel, 2018).
6
7

8
9
10 Our project was entitled “USVreact” to emphasize the need to avoid stigmatizing the
11 victim of sexual violence and to change a culture that tends to justify violence,
12 perpetuate shame and self-stereotyping. The goal was to foster a culture of supportive
13 reaction: people should no longer be passive observers but rather active and reactive
14 subjects. The project title underscores the need to involve local and higher education
15 institutional communities so that they can react to behaviors that harm or risk harming
16 an individual’s dignity. Indeed, the moral responsibility of violent acts resides with the
17 whole community. Unfortunately, very few projects contradict cultural legitimization of
18 sexual violence in the university setting or involve higher education organizations
19 (students, faculty, administrative staff) in Europe or in Italy in particular (Fenton &
20 Mott, 2017).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 A project designed to bring about cultural change in the university setting should be
36 addressed **to students (or their representatives) and staff alike**. Staff can contribute to
37 the construction of an organizational and educational environment conducive to
38 building respect. Moreover, because they belong to the organization longer than
39 students do, staff can maintain and foster a respectful culture over time. These are the
40 main reasons why our work presents a pilot test for the implementation and evaluation
41 of a training program targeted chiefly to administrative staff.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 ***Theoretical basis of the intervention***

54
55 Training and education interventions to contrast sexual violence aim to change gender
56 stereotype, to raise awareness about the different forms that sexual violence can
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 assume and to sensitize people to be active subject to react to it (see, for example, the
4 role that a bystander could have). Despite national and international legislation against
5 sexual violence and despite the numerous initiatives to prevent it, sexual violence is
6 still justified and underestimated. Undervaluing the problem or attributing it to actions
7 by minority groups or isolated cases maintains the status quo and justifies the system,
8 particularly as regards gender relations, and reiterates gender inequality (Stahl, Eek, &
9 Kazemi, 2010; Chapleau & Oswald, 2013; 2014).

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 Jost & Banaji (1994) advanced the System Justification Theory to explain that the
20 consequence of "identification" with the culture to which subjects belong is the
21 "defense" of the status quo and the affirmation that differences between groups are
22 right. This theoretical model has been used to account for attitudes towards gender
23 differences (*Gender System justification*). For many studies on System Justification
24 Theory this belief underlies different forms of discrimination and sexual violence
25 against women. Jost & Kay (2005) showed a relationship between system justification,
26 gender stereotypes, and sexism. Chapleau & Oswald (2014) found that system
27 justification is related to moral outrage and stated that the phenomenon reiterates a
28 system of sexual violence. Other scholars (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995; Payne,
29 Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999) focused on a specific form of sexual violence - rape -
30 and analyzed so-called "rape myths": shared attitudes and beliefs that tend to justify
31 violence, to underestimate the brutality of a violent act, or to deny male sexual assault
32 to the detriment of a woman. Underestimating and justifying any form of violence
33 (including rape) are expressions of a cultural attitude that maintains, or does not
34 perceive, gender inequality (Payne et al., 1999). Research underlines the strong link
35 between *gender system justification*, rape myth acceptance (e.g., Chapleau & Oswald,
36 2014) and their relationship with the efficacy of intervention. Joseph, Gray, & Mayer
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (2013) defined **gender system justification** as a “barrier” that in a college campus
4 culture can reduce the effectiveness of prevention actions against sexual assault. A
5 change of perspective is needed to change behavior at the individual and the social
6 level.
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 ***Training at the Universities of Turin***

15
16 The training program on **sexual** violence prevention involved mainly university staff,
17 some faculty members, student dormitory directors, and student representatives of the
18 University of Turin and the Polytechnic of Turin.
19
20
21
22

23 While bystander interventions in the United States have usually been developed with
24 students, we chose to involve primarily administrative staff because:
25
26
27

- 28 (1) staff are already involved in operating direct-contact services for students; if
29 they are adequately trained, they can be observers of inappropriate behaviors, either
30 being themselves references for students directly or by signposting to the appropriate
31 services at the university and in the community
32
- 33 (2) once appropriately trained, staff can become a guarantor of "good practices" in
34 the workplace, contributing to the dissemination of a culture of respect at all
35 organizational levels
36
- 37 (3) staff turnover is low, whereas students complete their studies within 3 to 5
38 years, graduate, and leave the institution.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Participation in the program was voluntary and recognized as on-the-job training for
49 university staff, in agreement with the administration of the two universities and the
50 human resource departments. The staff of the University of Turin was informed of the
51 training course by the University General Direction; an invitation to participate was
52 sent by e-mail to all staff members, and voluntary enrollment in the training program
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 was collected. We had planned to involve 80 participants per university, but since we
4 received 90 registration requests from the University of Turin alone, we raised the
5 number of participants to 90 for the University of Turin and 80 for the Polytechnic of
6 Turin. The participants attended the training course during working hours without loss
7 of salary. They signed an attendance sheet at each training session.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14 The course ran for a total of 16 hours: two plenary sessions (one at the beginning and
15 one at the end of the course) and two small group meetings (about 10-15 participants
16 per group). In order to involve all participants, the small groups met 13 times. Overall,
17 the training program lasted 4 months from the initial to the final plenary session. The
18 first plenary session introduced the project and presented the university- and
19 community-based services currently operating against abuse and discrimination.
20
21 Course participants then met in small groups (2 half days, for a total of 8 hours of
22 training) to discuss: gender equality/inequality in society and at the University; what
23 sexual violence is; how to recognize behaviors that express discrimination; how to
24 intervene in case of violence disclosure; laws and policies concerning sexual violence,
25 stalking, and harassment. The groups reviewed case studies and vignettes, viewed
26 movies, and received theoretical input about gender stereotypes and sexism. At the
27 concluding plenary session, data on rape myth acceptance and sexual violence
28 perception in the University context, involving students, were presented and
29 commented with the participants. Finally, a post-training evaluation (T2) was
30 conducted.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 53 ***Training evaluation*** 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

1
2
3 The present paper describes the process and reports the results of the pilot evaluation
4 study of the training course addressed to university staff within the USVreact project.
5
6

7
8 The study had two main objectives:
9

10 O1) to describe, at the beginning of the program (T1), participants'
11 representations of sexual violence, their attitude to intervention as a "bystander" to
12 counter sexual violence, and their acceptance of rape myths. In line with Jost & Banaji
13 (1994), Chapleau & Oswald (2013) and Stahl, Eek, & Kazemi (2010), we expected
14 that, also for the course participants, higher gender system justification corresponds to
15 higher rape myth acceptance; also, we expected an inverse correlation between rape
16 myth acceptance and attitude to intervene to counter violence (coherently with
17 McMahon, 2010).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 O2) to compare participants' representations and attitudes before and after the
29 course and to highlight pre- and post-training differences and check for training
30 effectiveness.
31
32
33

34 We hypothesized that gender system justification and rape myth acceptance scores
35 would be lower at post-training assessment; participants would show greater
36 awareness of different forms of sexual violence and greater intention to intervene as a
37 bystander if a witness to such acts.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 **Material and method**

48 *Procedure*

49
50 At the beginning of the first plenary session, after registration, participants received a
51 copy of the questionnaire along with a short description of the evaluation procedure
52 and information on the processing of personal data. They were asked to complete the
53 questionnaire anonymously and to leave it in a box in the hallway outside the room
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 before the start of the training presentation. The questionnaire took about 20 minutes
4
5 to complete.
6

7
8 In order to compare participant answers before (T1) and after (T2) the training course,
9
10 the participants completed the same questionnaire at the final plenary session. The
11
12 procedure for completing the second questionnaire and providing information on
13
14 processing of personal data were the same as at T1. Participants were told to write the
15
16 same self-generated ID code on the T1 and the T2 questionnaire to permit matching
17
18 T1 and T2 answers, while allowing the participants to remain anonymous. The self-
19
20 generated ID code was composed of a simple data combination (e.g., a birthday)
21
22 familiar to the respondent.
23
24
25
26
27

28 *Measures*

29
30 The questionnaire, approved by the University Bioethics Committee (Approval No.
31
32 234687, 20th October 2016), consisted of a brief socio-demographic section and the
33
34 following scales:
35
36

- 37 • *System Justification – Gender* (Jost & Kay, 2005): 8 items (e.g., “In general,
38
39 relations between men and women are fair”) on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 9
40
41 (strongly agree);
42
43
- 44 • *Identification of Sexual Violence Experience*: adaptation of the 8 items that
45
46 Konik & Cortina (2008) selected from Fitzgerald et al. (1988; 1995): participants had
47
48 to choose which behaviours they felt are forms of sexual violence (multiple choice
49
50 scale; e.g., “Someone stares or leers at you in a way that made you feel
51
52 uncomfortable”);
53
54
- 55 • *Updated Measure for Assessing Subtle Rape Myth* proposed by McMahon &
56
57 Farmer (2011) in its Italian adaptation (SRMA-IT) by Martini, Tartaglia, & De Piccoli
58
59
60

1
2
3 **(in press)**: 20 items on a Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).
4

5 The scale is made up of four factors that express different rape myths: “She asked for
6 it”, 6 items (e.g., “When girls go to parties wearing slutty clothes, they are asking for
7 trouble”); “He didn’t mean to”, 4 items (e.g., “When guys rape, it is usually because of
8 their strong desire for sex”); “It wasn’t really rape”, 5 items (e.g., “A rape probably
9 didn’t happen if the girl has no bruises or marks”); “She lied”, 5 items (e.g., “Rape
10 accusations are often used as a way of getting back at guys”);
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 • *Bystander intention to intervene scale* (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2002;
20 2005): Likert scale from 0 (not at all confident to act) to 10 (completely confident to
21 act); participants had to state how confident they felt as a bystander about undertaking
22 the 14 actions to counter sexual violence (e.g., “Express my discomfort if someone
23 makes a joke about a woman’s body”).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 ***Participants***

34 *At T1*

35
36
37 At the beginning of the course (T1) (first plenary session), 177 people received the
38 questionnaire and 172 completed it adequately: 88 from the University, 80 from the
39 Polytechnic, and 4 from student dormitory directors or workers. In detail, 81.7% were
40 staff, 8.9% student representatives, 7.1% faculty, 2.4% student dormitory directors or
41 workers; 89.3% were women, 10.1% men, 0.6% declared “other”; the average age was
42 44.46 years (SD 9.81).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 *At T2*

54
55
56 The T2 questionnaire was completed by 98 participants: all trainees who were present
57 at the final session completed it appropriately. Because about 70 T1 participants did
58
59
60

1
2
3 not attend the final plenary session and because some participants did not indicate
4 correctly their self-generated ID code, as they did not remember the data they had
5 chosen to use at T1, we were able to match the T1 and the T2 questionnaires for only
6
7
8
9
10 66 participants. As the T1 sample was composed of 172 respondents, the attrition rate
11
12 (U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences - IES) was
13
14 unfortunately high (62%).

15
16 Of the 66 matching respondents, 36 were from the University and 30 from the
17
18 Polytechnic: 87.5% were staff, 9.4% faculty, 1.6% student representatives, and 1.6%
19
20 dormitory directors or workers; 92.4% were women and 7.56% were men; the average
21
22 age was 45.67 years (SD 7.87).
23
24
25

26
27
28 As the attrition rate between the T1 and the T2 sample was quite high, we checked if
29
30 the attrition rate had an effect on the characteristics of the sample at T1 and at T2 by
31
32 comparing via the independent samples t-test the group of the 66 matching
33
34 respondents and the group of the 106 T1-only respondents.
35
36

37
38 No statistically significant differences in socio-demographics between the group of the
39
40 66 matching respondents and the group of the 106 T1-only respondents were found.
41
42 The chi-square test showed no differences in percentages: between women and men (p
43
44 = .49); between respondents from the University and the Polytechnic (p = .73);
45
46 between staff/faculty/students (p = .06). The independent samples T-test showed no
47
48 differences in average age (p = .14).
49
50
51

52 53 **Data analysis**

54
55 Data analysis was performed using IBM-SPSS Statistics version 24. After exploratory
56
57 factor analysis via eigenvalues greater than 1, the internal consistency of each scale
58
59
60

1
2
3 and subscale was calculated using Cronbach's alpha coefficient to verify the structure
4
5 of the scales.
6

7
8 In order to fulfil objective 1 of the present study, descriptive analyses (mean – M – and
9
10 standard deviation – SD) for summed score of each scale were carried out to show
11
12 respondents' system justification – gender level, rape myth acceptance, and bystander
13
14 intention to intervene. Relationships between the concepts were then analysed by
15
16 bivariate correlations. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to check for
17
18 differences in constructs between groups. Specifically, we compared via independent
19
20 samples t-test the responses from the participants from the University and from the
21
22 Polytechnic and via one-way ANOVA the participants by their roles (staff, student
23
24 representatives, faculty, and student dormitory directors/workers) at the two
25
26 universities.
27
28
29

30
31 In order to highlight pre- and post-training differences in participants' representations
32
33 and attitudes (objective 2), we used a paired sample t-test to compare the questionnaire
34
35 responses at T1 and T2 and to check whether, after participation on the course, there
36
37 were changes in the representation of sexual violence, in **gender system justification**,
38
39 in rape myth acceptance, and in bystander intention to intervene. The effect of the
40
41 attrition rate was also checked.
42
43
44
45

46 **Results**

47 ***T1 Sample***

48 *Participants' representations and attitude*

49
50
51 In order to evaluate participant representations and attitudes at the beginning of the
52
53 program (T1), we analysed **gender system justification**, i.e., the degree to which
54
55 respondents judge the system of gender relationships as being fair. As higher values
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 express agreement with equity of the system, the media of answers (Table 1) means
4
5 that participants at T1 were slightly critical of the fairness of relationships between
6
7 genders.
8
9

10
11
12 PLEASE INSERT TABLE 1
13
14
15
16

17 To understand respondents' representations of sexual violence, we asked them to
18
19 select from a list of behaviours which ones they considered violent and to express their
20
21 agreement with statements that express rape myths (rape myth acceptance). At the
22
23 beginning of the training course (T1; Table 2), the majority of participants (83.3%)
24
25 defined violence as the act of someone who "attempted to establish a romantic or
26
27 sexual relationship despite the other person's efforts to discourage it", but very few
28
29 (23.7%) considered violence as the act of someone "telling sexually coloured stories or
30
31 offensive jokes". Surprisingly, less than half of respondents (45.5%) defined "Being
32
33 stared or leered at in a way that makes you feel uncomfortable" as violence.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Rape myth acceptance was not very high; lower values express refusal of myths (Table
41
42 1) though higher acceptance was noted for the myth "He didn't mean to" ($M 1.87$) that
43
44 justifies assault by a man, affirming that he did not really intend to commit rape.
45
46 Regarding bystander intention to intervene, respondents stated they would act to
47
48 counter the assault ($M 8.43$).
49
50
51
52

53 As Table 1 shows, **gender system justification** was related strongly to acceptance of
54
55 the two rape myths "It was not really rape" and "She lied" acceptance and quite
56
57 strongly with acceptance of the rape myth "He didn't mean to": perceiving fairness in
58
59
60

1
2
3 relationships between genders was associated with higher acquiescence with
4 stereotypes and false beliefs about sexual violence. A strong inverse relation was
5 evident between acceptance of the rape myth “She asked for it” and bystander
6 intention to intervene: if respondents believed that the woman provoked the rape, they
7 would be less disposed to intervene to help her.
8
9

10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 *Differences between groups*

18
19 The independent samples t-test showed no differences between participants from the
20 University and those from the Polytechnic. One-way ANOVA showed no differences
21 between work roles.
22
23
24
25

26 27 28 **Sample 1 and Sample 2**

29 30 *Effect of the attrition rate*

31
32 As the attrition rate between the T1 and the T2 sample was quite high, we checked the
33 effect of the attrition rate by comparing via the independent samples t-test the group of
34 the 66 matching respondents and the group of the 106 T1-only respondents.
35
36
37

38 No statistically significant differences were found at the beginning of the training
39 program between the two groups in gender system justification, acceptance of the four
40 rape myths or bystander intention to intervene (Table 2; Independent samples t-test).
41
42
43

44
45
46 We can state confidently that the data at T1 and at T2 can be compared, despite the
47 substantially smaller sample at T2.
48
49
50

51
52
53 PLEASE INSERT TABLE 2
54
55

56 57 58 *Evaluation of Training Program Effects* 59 60

1
2
3 Comparison between the T1 and the T2 data showed that the number of respondents
4 who labelled different forms of behaviours as “violent” increased between T1 and T2
5
6 (Table 3): post-training identification of subtle forms of violence was higher.
7
8
9

10
11
12 PLEASE INSERT TABLE 3
13

14 **gender system justification**

15
16 The post-training data showed lower **gender system justification** and lower acceptance
17 of the rape myths “She asked for it” and “She lied” (Table 2: Paired samples t-test).
18
19 No significant pre- and post-training differences were found for the acceptance of the
20 myths “He didn’t mean to” and “It wasn’t really rape”. There were no significant
21 differences in bystander intention to intervene to prevent or counter a sexual assault.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **Discussion**

31
32 The present paper reports the process and main results **of a pilot evaluation study** of
33 the Italian training program of the USVreact European project for university staff,
34 faculty, and student representatives to **prevent** sexual violence inside universities. We
35 wanted to show the process of the evaluation and the first evidence of effectiveness of
36 the training intervention in promoting cultural change and bystander willingness to
37 intervene in a university setting. Assessment of participants’ representations of sexual
38 violence, **gender system justification**, rape myth acceptance, and bystander intention to
39 intervene was performed at the beginning of the training course. Effectiveness of the
40 course was then measured by comparing participants’ responses pre- and post-training
41 to determine whether changes had occurred.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 Results of the evaluation study showed that participants at the beginning of the
56 training expressed quite a low acceptance of rape myths and a reasonable degree of
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 willingness to intervene to counter sexual violence. This observation is coherent with
4
5 the fact that participation on the course was voluntary, that participants were probably
6
7 already quite aware of sexual violence before starting the course, and that the training
8
9 course attracted mostly women. As reported in previous studies (Martini, Tartaglia, &
10
11 De Piccoli, *in press*; Papp & Erchull, 2017), women showed lower system justification
12
13 and rape myth acceptance and higher intention to intervene. Although the participants
14
15 were already aware of the seriousness of sexual violence, pre-training responses
16
17 showed they were less able to recognize the more subtle forms of violence. This
18
19 finding suggests the need to develop sensitivity to recognize violence also in its subtle
20
21 and hidden forms. Finally, consistent with previous work (McMahon, 2010), high
22
23 inverse correlations emerged between rape myth acceptance and bystander intention to
24
25 intervene.
26
27
28
29

30
31 The present results suggest that a training course designed to raise recognition of
32
33 stereotypes of sexual violence and of more subtle forms of violence (e.g., harassment)
34
35 could be helpful to foster attitudes to counter sexual violence in university settings. As
36
37 suggested by Banyard (2015), to prevent the occurrence of violent and discriminatory
38
39 situations, it is necessary to change the representations and attitudes towards sexual
40
41 violence. The perpetuation of gender-based violence is fueled by false beliefs and
42
43 stereotypes related to violence itself and to gender relationships. These attitudes help
44
45 to justify the abuse or the individuals who act on them and affect the identification of a
46
47 situation as risky or violent (Burn, 2009; Bennet, Banyard, & Garnhart, 2014;
48
49 Banyard, 2015). That said, in order to activate bystander intervention, the first step is
50
51 to enable an individual to recognize a situation as violent or risky and then to make the
52
53 individual feel responsible for intervening (Banyard, 2015). Comparison of pre- and
54
55 post-training responses revealed some differences. Paired sample t-test analysis
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 showed a significant increase in participants' ability to identify more subtle kinds of
4 violence and a reduction in **gender system justification** and in acceptance of the two
5 rape myths "She asked for it" and "She lied". This change suggests an impact of the
6 training course.
7
8
9

10
11 Summarizing, we can state that by the end of the training program, the participants
12 were more aware of what violence is and were better able to identify its subtle forms
13 and that they were less disposed to blaming the victim, as the attitude of attributing
14 responsibility for violence to the victim was considerably reduced. Reflection on the
15 subtle shades of violence and false beliefs about sexual assault probably helped raise
16 participants' awareness of the pervasiveness of a culture that legitimizes violence and
17 their ability to recognize it. No significant changes were observed for the other
18 dimensions in part because the participants were already quite aware of the problem of
19 violence against women and in part because deep cultural change probably takes
20 longer to manifest than the few months of a course program. Moreover, it is also
21 possible that the instrument we used to measure the intention to intervene, originally
22 designed for students, needs to be adapted **for faculty and staff or, generally, for**
23 **workers**. In future studies, we plan to develop a scale that captures situations more
24 relevant to the lifestyle of staff and/or teachers.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **This pilot study, like the evaluation design**, has several limitations. First, it has no
45 control group. This weakness needs to be addressed when planning future training
46 courses. Second, the sample of respondents who completed both questionnaires was
47 small, also due to a problem with the coding process; greater attention will be paid to
48 avoiding errors in the identification coding process on future courses: **a possible**
49 **solution is to indicate clearly which data are to be reported to generate the ID code**
50 **(e.g., first letter of mother's surname; month of father's birth; third letter of her/his**
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **name**). After the plenary introduction to the program, some participants did not
4
5 participate in the training and did not fill in the T2 questionnaire. The attrition rate
6
7 (i.e., matching the respondents to the T1 and T2 questionnaires) was quite high, which
8
9 is a serious weakness of the present study. For this reason, the results for the
10
11 effectiveness of the training course cannot be generalized as we had intended. In future
12
13 training courses, it would be interesting to ask participants why they did not attend the
14
15 course; it could be useful to try to foster attendance to the entire program. Third,
16
17 though women make up 68% of the administrative staff at the University of Turin and
18
19 60% at the Polytechnic of Turin, women accounted for more than 90% of the training
20
21 course participants, whereas men were strongly underrepresented. A further limitation
22
23 is that we did not administer a follow-up post-training questionnaire to analyse the
24
25 stability of changes over time; this step will be included in future research designs.
26
27
28
29

30 These limitations notwithstanding, **the pilot evaluation study** suggests several thematic
31
32 areas that would be appropriate to develop in a training course on combating gender-
33
34 based violence. For example, two future areas of focus could be on contrasting the
35
36 tendency to blame the victim of sexual violence and on assessing the different forms
37
38 that violence can take. The data collected at T1 show that acceptance of the myth “She
39
40 asked for it” was inversely related to the bystander intervention attitude. The same
41
42 significant negative relationship between acceptance of the myth “She asked for it”
43
44 and the bystander intervention attitude was found by a previous study (Martini & De
45
46 Piccoli, 2020), with a sample of about 3000 university students. Moreover, because the
47
48 intention to intervene hinges on recognizing a potentially harmful situation for the
49
50 victim (Darley & Latané, 1968), a program designed to **prevent sexual** violence needs
51
52 to sustain the ability to recognize the different faces of violence.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Other variables may certainly come into play in motivating a bystander to intervene
4 against any form of violence; we believe that the present study findings provide a
5 preliminary basis on which to develop training courses. Keeping in mind critical issues
6 and some weaknesses in the design, this work can offer some suggestions to
7 implement evaluation of bystander-based interventions. Very few projects to date have
8 tested the effectiveness of bystander-based intervention involving university staff. This
9 specific approach, which originated in the United States (Banyard, 2015) but is not yet
10 common in Europe, may promote adequate first response to sexual assault and
11 prevention of more subtle violence. Bystander intervention can be fostered by
12 promoting cultural change, countering false beliefs such as rape myth acceptance, and
13 helping to identify violence. To reach this goal it is necessary to involve more men. In
14 Italy, gender-based violence is often considered a female issue. But as previous studies
15 have shown (Navarro & Tewksbury, 2017; Russell & Hand, 2017), because men and
16 women express different attitudes towards these problems, men cannot remain passive
17 spectators in counteracting sexual violence. A cultural change can be more effective
18 the more both men and women cooperate as active subjects in counteracting all forms
19 of violence and discrimination. Along this line, university management should include
20 among the compulsory courses for all administrative staff and, in perspective, for all
21 teachers, a program like USVreact which is aimed at preventing sexual violence in the
22 academic setting. In this way, more men would be involved in the reflection (and in
23 the action) on this topic and would contribute to spreading a culture of respect and
24 non-abuse, which is the basis of the primary prevention as indicated by the World
25 Health Organization (WHO, 2010).

Conflict of Interests Statement

The author(s) declare no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this paper.

References

- Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Toward the Next Generation of Bystander Prevention of Sexual and Relationship Violence, Action Coils to Engage Communities*. Cham: Springer.
- Banyard, V. L., Plante, E., & Moynihan, M. M. (2002). *Unpublished measures*.
- Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2005). *Rape prevention through bystander education: Final report to NIJ for grant 2002-WG-BX-0009*, <http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/grants/0208701.pdf> (last checked by the authors June 2018).
- Bennett, S., Banyard, V. L., & Garnhart, L. (2014). To Act or Not to Act, That Is the Question? Barriers and Facilitators of Bystander Intervention. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 29*(3), 476-496. doi: 10.1177/0886260513505210
- Burn, S. (2009). A situational model of sexual assault prevention through bystander intervention. *Sex Roles, 60*, 779-792.
- Chapleau, K. M., & Oswald, D. L. (2013). Status, Threat, and Stereotypes: Understanding the Function of Rape Myth Acceptance. *Social Justice Research, 26*(1), 18-41. doi: 10.1007/s11211-013-0177-z.
- Chapleau, K. M., & Oswald, D. L. (2014). A System Justification View of Sexual Violence: Legitimizing Gender Inequality and Reduced Moral Outrage Are Connected to Greater Rape Myth Acceptance. *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation, 15*(2), 204-18. doi: 10.1080/15299732.2014.867573.

- 1
2
3 Darley, J. M., & Latané, B. (1968). Bystanders Intervention in Emergencies, Diffusion
4 of Responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 8, 377-383.
5
6 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0025589>.
7
8
9
10 EU-project 2009-2011 – JLS/2007/ISEC/415, *Gender-based Violence, Stalking and*
11
12 *Fear of Crime*. (2012). Accessed 24 February 2018.
13
14 http://www.gendercrime.eu/pdf/gendercrime_final_report_smaller_version.pdf
15
16
17 Eurostat, *Violent sexual crimes recorded in the EU*. Accessed 24 February 2018
18
19 [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-eurostat-news/-/EDN-20171123-](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-eurostat-news/-/EDN-20171123-1?inheritRedirect=true)
20
21 [1?inheritRedirect=true](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-eurostat-news/-/EDN-20171123-1?inheritRedirect=true)
22
23
24 Fenton, R. A., & Mott, H. L. (2017). The bystander approach to violence prevention:
25
26 Considerations for implementation in Europe. *Psychology of Violence*, 7(3), 450-458.
27
28 doi: 10.1037/vio0000104
29
30
31 Fitzgerald, L. F., Gelfand, M. J., & Drasgow, F. (1995). Measuring Sexual
32
33 Harassment: Theoretical and Psychometric Advances. *Basic and Applied Social*
34
35 *Psychology*, 17, 425–427. doi: 10.1207/s15324834basp1704_2.
36
37
38 Fitzgerald, L. F., Shullman, S. L., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, Y.,
39
40 Ormerod, A. J., & Weitzman, L. (1988). The Dimensions and Extent of Sexual
41
42 Harassment in Higher Education and The Workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*,
43
44 32, 152-175. doi: 10.1016/0001-8791(88)90012-7.
45
46
47 Kelly, L. (1987). The Continuum of Sexual Violence. In: Hanmer J., Maynard M.
48
49 (eds) *Women, Violence and Social Control*. Explorations in Sociology (British
50
51 Sociological Association Conference Volume series). Palgrave Macmillan, London
52
53 (p. 46-60).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Konik, J., & Cortina, L. M. (2008). Policing Gender at Work: Intersections of
4 Harassment Based on Sex and Sexuality. *Social Justice Research, 21*, 313–337. doi:
5
6 10.1007/s11211-008-0074-z.
7
8

9
10 Krongard, S., & Tsay-Vogel, M. (2018). Online Original TV Series: Examining
11 Portrayals of Violence in Popular Binge-Watched Programs and Social Reality
12 Perceptions. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture*. Advance online publication. doi:
13
14 10.1037/ppm0000224
15
16
17

18
19 ISTAT - Istituto Nazionale di Statistica [National Institute of Statistics] (2015). *La*
20 *violenza contro le donne*. Accessed 20 February 2018.
21
22 <https://www.istat.it/it/archivio/161716>
23
24

25
26 Joseph, J. S., Gray, M. J., and Mayer, J. (2013). Addressing Sexual Assault within
27 Social Systems: System Justification as a Barrier to College Prevention
28 Efforts. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 22*(5), 493-509. doi:
29
30 10.1080/10926771.2013.785460
31
32
33

34
35 Jost, J. T., & Kay, A. C. (2005). Exposure to Benevolent Sexism and Complementary
36 Gender Stereotypes: Consequences for Specific and Diffuse Forms of System
37 Justification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*(3), 498-509. doi:
38
39 10.1037/0022-3514.88.3.498.
40
41
42

43
44 Jost, J. T., & Banaji, M. R. (1994). The Role of Stereotyping in System-Justification
45 and the Production of False Consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 33*
46
47 (1), 1–27. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8309.1994.tb01008.x.
48
49

50
51 Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1995). Attitudinal Antecedents of Rape Myth
52 Acceptance: A Theoretical and Empirical Reexamination. *Journal of Personality and*
53
54 *Social Psychology, 68*(4), 704-711. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.68.4.704.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Maass, A., Cadinu, M., Guarnieri, G., & Grasselli, A. (2003). Sexual harassment under
4 social identity threat: The computer harassment paradigm. *Journal of Personality and*
5 *Social Psychology*, 85, 853–870. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.85.5.853.

6
7
8
9
10 Martini, M., & De Piccoli, N. (2020). Predicting bystander intention to intervene: The
11 role of gender-specific system justification and rape myth acceptance for men and
12 women. *Frontiers in Psychology, section Gender, Sex and Sexualities*, 11, 326.
13
14
15
16
17 doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00326

18
19 Martini, M., Tartaglia, S., & De Piccoli, N. (in press) Assessing Rape Myth
20 Acceptance: A Contribution to Italian validation of the Measure for Assessing Subtle
21 Rape Myth (SRMA-IT). *Sexual abuse* (accepted April, the 6th 2020).

22
23
24
25
26 McMahon, S. (2010). Rape Myth Beliefs and Bystander Attitudes among Incoming
27 College Students. *Journal of American college health*, 59(1), 3-11.
28
29
30
31
32 doi:10.1080/07448481.2010.483715.

33
34 McMahon, S., & Farmer, L. G. (2011). An Updated Measure for Assessing Subtle
35 Rape Myths. *Social Work Research*, 35(2), 71-81. doi: 10.1093/swr/35.2.71.

36
37 Navarro, J. C., & Tewksbury, R. (2017). Mythbusters: Examining Rape Myth
38 Acceptance Among U.S. University Students. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and*
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3 Payne, D. L., Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1999). Rape Myth Acceptance:
4 Exploration of its Structure and its Measurement Using the Illinois Rape Myth
5 Acceptance Scale. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 33, 27-68. doi:
6 10.1006/jrpe.1998.2238.
7
8
9

10
11 Perkins, W., & Warner, J. (2017). Sexual Violence Response and Prevention: Studies
12 of Campus Policies and Practices, *Journal of School Violence*, 16(3), 237-242, doi:
13 10.1080/15388220.2017.1318569
14
15
16

17
18 Russell, K. J., & Hand, C. J. (2017). Rape myth acceptance, victim blame attribution
19 and Just World Beliefs: A rapid evidence assessment. *Aggression and Violent*
20 *Behavior*, 37, 153–160. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2017.10.008
21
22
23

24
25 Stahl, T., Eek, D., & Kazemi, A. (2010). Rape Victim Blaming as System
26 Justification: The Role of Gender and Activation of Complementary Stereotypes.
27 *Social Justice Research*, 23, 239-258. doi: 10.1007/s11211-010-0117-0.
28
29
30

31
32 U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences (IES). *What Works*
33 *Clearinghouse™ Standards Handbook* (Version 4.0). Retrieved from
34 https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/referenceresources/wwc_standards_handbook_v4.d.
35
36
37

38
39 Ward, M. L. (2016). Media and Sexualization: State of Empirical Research, 1995–
40 2015. *The Journal of sex Research*, 53(4-5), 560–577. doi:
41 10.1080/00224499.2016.1142496
42
43
44

45
46 WHO - World Health Organization (2002). *World report on violence and*
47 *health*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
48
49

50
51 WHO - World Health Organization/London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine
52 (2010). *Preventing intimate partner and sexual violence against women: taking action*
53 *and generating evidence*. Geneva, World Health Organization.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 WHO - World Health Organization (2016). *Violence against women. Intimate partner*
4 *and sexual violence against women.* Accessed 22 March 2018.
5
6
7 <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/en/>.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

EVALUATION OF USVreact: A STAFF TRAINING PROGRAM TO PREVENT SEXUAL VIOLENCE AT UNIVERSITY

Abstract

Interventions addressing the endemic of sexual violence at European universities are scarce, particularly those that take a bystander focus to sexual violence prevention and involve university staff. Evidence-based data on their effectiveness are also lacking. This paper reports the description of a pilot evaluation study of the USVreact Italian training program addressed to university staff for counteracting sexual violence.

We assessed initial (T1) representations of gender-based violence, rape myth acceptance, and attitudes to bystander intervention (172 participants), and evaluated the effectiveness of the course by comparing via paired sample T-tests the responses before and after (T2) training (66 participants). Comparison between pre- (T1) and post-training (T2) responses indicated that the participants' ability to recognize subtle forms of violence and reduce rape myth acceptance was increased after training. Relatively few training programs based on the bystander approach to prevent gender-based violence at university have been performed to date in Europe and data on their effectiveness are scarce. Several limitations notwithstanding, the present pilot evaluation study provides suggestions for a more systematic evaluation of training interventions that address cultural legitimization of gender-based violence and that sustain bystander interventions in sexual assault prevention.

Impact statement: training program evaluation, countering sexual violence, bystander intervention, university, staff training.

Introduction

Sexual violence can be defined as “any sexual act or an attempt to obtain a sexual act, unwanted sexual comments, or advances, acts to traffic or otherwise directed, against a person's sexuality using coercion, by any person regardless of their relationship to the victim in any setting, including but not limited to home and work.” (WHO, 2002). According to the World Health Organization (WHO, 2016) about 35% of women worldwide have suffered physical or sexual violence from partners or non-partners at some point during their lives. According to Eurostat, the statistical office of the European Union (EU), about 215,000 violent sexual crimes were reported to the police in the EU in 2015 alone. In Italy, the National Institute of Statistics (ISTAT- Istituto Nazionale di Statistica, 2015) reported that 31% of women aged between 16 and 70 years have experienced some form of violence during their lives: physical violence in 20%, sexual violence in 21%, and sexual harassment in 74% of cases. As Kelly (1987) underlined, sexual violence can assume several forms, from the most serious, such as rape, to the more subtle, such as verbal harassment. These different behaviors need specific interventions. The World Health Organization (WHO) specifies the three prevention levels to counteract forms of sexual violence: primary, secondary, and tertiary (WHO, 2010; Banyard, 2015). Secondary, focalized prevention actions should be activated in specific risky situations, and tertiary prevention is necessary after a violent episode. Primary prevention should act as extensively as possible to reduce the occurrence of any form of violence. The aims of primary prevention are to remove the

1
2
3 conditions that allow episodes of violence from happening, i.e., to promote a cultural
4 change towards stigmatizing sexual dominance and violence, in any form. In the
5 United States, bystander interventions are often proposed to counteract sexual violence
6 (focused on primary and secondary prevention). As clearly exposed by Banyard
7 (2015), bystander-based intervention can be useful in counteracting violence.
8 Bystanders can be proactive in supporting the victim of a violent episode and can
9 stigmatize the action of the perpetrator: in this way, the bystander can contribute to
10 enhance a culture of respect.

11
12 To prevent sexual violence, the European Commission finances international projects
13 with targeted actions addressed to the different forms of violence, to various different
14 social contexts (workplace environment, schools, universities) and social stakeholders
15 (e.g., healthcare personnel, law enforcement agencies, teachers, etc.) with the aim to
16 both support victims of violence and reduce sexist and discriminatory behavior (see
17 Daphne Funding Programme and Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme –
18 European Commission).

19
20 The training program presented and evaluated here is part of the European project
21 entitled "USVreact: University Supporting Victims of Sexual Violence"
22 (www.usvreact.eu) [1]. Why the university context? Because sexual violence is an
23 entrenched problem in higher education institutions, especially in the United States
24 and northern European countries: 68% of female students in the UK (NUS, 2010)
25 declared having experienced at least one episode of harassment or sexual violence on
26 campus (Perkins & Warner, 2017). While the prevalence in Italy is far lower - 30%
27 according to the Eu-Project *Gender-based Violence, Stalking and Fear of Crime*
28 (2012) - there are worrying signals of a culture that seriously underrates many forms
29 of sexual violence in society at large and in university settings. Newspaper reports,
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 television programs, and posts on social networks show that sexual violence is often
4 treated as a joke or attributed to provocations by the victim (Maass, Cadinu, Guarnieri,
5 & Grasselli, 2003; Ward, 2016; Krongard, & Tsay-Vogel, 2018).
6
7

8
9
10 Our project was entitled “USVreact” to emphasize the need to avoid stigmatizing the
11 victim of sexual violence and to change a culture that tends to justify violence,
12 perpetuate shame and self-stereotyping. The goal was to foster a culture of supportive
13 reaction: people should no longer be passive observers but rather active and reactive
14 subjects. The project title underscores the need to involve local and higher education
15 institutional communities so that they can react to behaviors that harm or risk harming
16 an individual’s dignity. Indeed, the moral responsibility of violent acts resides with the
17 whole community. Unfortunately, very few projects contradict cultural legitimization of
18 sexual violence in the university setting or involve higher education organizations
19 (students, faculty, administrative staff) in Europe or in Italy in particular (Fenton &
20 Mott, 2017).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 A project designed to bring about cultural change in the university setting should be
36 addressed to students (or their representatives) and staff alike. Staff can contribute to
37 the construction of an organizational and educational environment conducive to
38 building respect. Moreover, because they belong to the organization longer than
39 students do, staff can maintain and foster a respectful culture over time. These are the
40 main reasons why our work presents a pilot test for the implementation and evaluation
41 of a training program targeted chiefly to administrative staff.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 ***Theoretical basis of the intervention***

54 Training and education interventions to contrast sexual violence aim to change gender
55 stereotype, to raise awareness about the different forms that sexual violence can
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 assume and to sensitize people to be active subject to react to it (see, for example, the
4 role that a bystander could have). Despite national and international legislation against
5 sexual violence and despite the numerous initiatives to prevent it, sexual violence is
6 still justified and underestimated. Undervaluing the problem or attributing it to actions
7 by minority groups or isolated cases maintains the status quo and justifies the system,
8 particularly as regards gender relations, and reiterates gender inequality (Stahl, Eek, &
9 Kazemi, 2010; Chapleau & Oswald, 2013; 2014).

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 Jost & Banaji (1994) advanced the System Justification Theory to explain that the
20 consequence of "identification" with the culture to which subjects belong is the
21 "defense" of the status quo and the affirmation that differences between groups are
22 right. This theoretical model has been used to account for attitudes towards gender
23 differences (*Gender System justification*). For many studies on System Justification
24 Theory this belief underlies different forms of discrimination and sexual violence
25 against women. Jost & Kay (2005) showed a relationship between system justification,
26 gender stereotypes, and sexism. Chapleau & Oswald (2014) found that system
27 justification is related to moral outrage and stated that the phenomenon reiterates a
28 system of sexual violence. Other scholars (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995; Payne,
29 Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999) focused on a specific form of sexual violence - rape -
30 and analyzed so-called "rape myths": shared attitudes and beliefs that tend to justify
31 violence, to underestimate the brutality of a violent act, or to deny male sexual assault
32 to the detriment of a woman. Underestimating and justifying any form of violence
33 (including rape) are expressions of a cultural attitude that maintains, or does not
34 perceive, gender inequality (Payne et al., 1999). Research underlines the strong link
35 between gender system justification, rape myth acceptance (e.g., Chapleau & Oswald,
36 2014) and their relationship with the efficacy of intervention. Joseph, Gray, & Mayer
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (2013) defined gender system justification as a “barrier” that in a college campus
4 culture can reduce the effectiveness of prevention actions against sexual assault. A
5 change of perspective is needed to change behavior at the individual and the social
6 level.
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 ***Training at the Universities of Turin***

15
16
17 The training program on sexual violence prevention involved mainly university staff,
18 some faculty members, student dormitory directors, and student representatives of the
19 University of Turin and the Polytechnic of Turin.
20
21
22

23
24 While bystander interventions in the United States have usually been developed with
25 students, we chose to involve primarily administrative staff because:
26
27

- 28 (1) staff are already involved in operating direct-contact services for students; if
29 they are adequately trained, they can be observers of inappropriate behaviors, either
30 being themselves references for students directly or by signposting to the appropriate
31 services at the university and in the community
32
33 (2) once appropriately trained, staff can become a guarantor of "good practices" in
34 the workplace, contributing to the dissemination of a culture of respect at all
35 organizational levels
36
37 (3) staff turnover is low, whereas students complete their studies within 3 to 5
38 years, graduate, and leave the institution.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48
49 Participation in the program was voluntary and recognized as on-the-job training for
50 university staff, in agreement with the administration of the two universities and the
51 human resource departments. The staff of the University of Turin was informed of the
52 training course by the University General Direction; an invitation to participate was
53 sent by e-mail to all staff members, and voluntary enrollment in the training program
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 was collected. We had planned to involve 80 participants per university, but since we
4 received 90 registration requests from the University of Turin alone, we raised the
5 number of participants to 90 for the University of Turin and 80 for the Polytechnic of
6 Turin. The participants attended the training course during working hours without loss
7 of salary. They signed an attendance sheet at each training session.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14 The course ran for a total of 16 hours: two plenary sessions (one at the beginning and
15 one at the end of the course) and two small group meetings (about 10-15 participants
16 per group). In order to involve all participants, the small groups met 13 times. Overall,
17 the training program lasted 4 months from the initial to the final plenary session. The
18 first plenary session introduced the project and presented the university- and
19 community-based services currently operating against abuse and discrimination.
20 Course participants then met in small groups (2 half days, for a total of 8 hours of
21 training) to discuss: gender equality/inequality in society and at the University; what
22 sexual violence is; how to recognize behaviors that express discrimination; how to
23 intervene in case of violence disclosure; laws and policies concerning sexual violence,
24 stalking, and harassment. The groups reviewed case studies and vignettes, viewed
25 movies, and received theoretical input about gender stereotypes and sexism. At the
26 concluding plenary session, data on rape myth acceptance and sexual violence
27 perception in the University context, involving students, were presented and
28 commented with the participants. Finally, a post-training evaluation (T2) was
29 conducted.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 53 ***Training evaluation*** 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

1
2
3 The present paper describes the process and reports the results of the pilot evaluation
4 study of the training course addressed to university staff within the USVreact project.
5
6

7 The study had two main objectives:
8
9

10 O1) to describe, at the beginning of the program (T1), participants'
11 representations of sexual violence, their attitude to intervention as a "bystander" to
12 counter sexual violence, and their acceptance of rape myths. In line with Jost & Banaji
13 (1994), Chapleau & Oswald (2013) and Stahl, Eek, & Kazemi (2010), we expected
14 that, also for the course participants, higher gender system justification corresponds to
15 higher rape myth acceptance; also, we expected an inverse correlation between rape
16 myth acceptance and attitude to intervene to counter violence (coherently with
17 McMahon, 2010).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 O2) to compare participants' representations and attitudes before and after the
29 course and to highlight pre- and post-training differences and check for training
30 effectiveness.
31
32
33

34 We hypothesized that gender system justification and rape myth acceptance scores
35 would be lower at post-training assessment; participants would show greater
36 awareness of different forms of sexual violence and greater intention to intervene as a
37 bystander if a witness to such acts.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 **Material and method**

48 *Procedure*

49 At the beginning of the first plenary session, after registration, participants received a
50 copy of the questionnaire along with a short description of the evaluation procedure
51 and information on the processing of personal data. They were asked to complete the
52 questionnaire anonymously and to leave it in a box in the hallway outside the room
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 before the start of the training presentation. The questionnaire took about 20 minutes
4
5 to complete.
6

7
8 In order to compare participant answers before (T1) and after (T2) the training course,
9
10 the participants completed the same questionnaire at the final plenary session. The
11
12 procedure for completing the second questionnaire and providing information on
13
14 processing of personal data were the same as at T1. Participants were told to write the
15
16 same self-generated ID code on the T1 and the T2 questionnaire to permit matching
17
18 T1 and T2 answers, while allowing the participants to remain anonymous. The self-
19
20 generated ID code was composed of a simple data combination (e.g., a birthday)
21
22 familiar to the respondent.
23
24
25
26
27

28 *Measures*

29
30 The questionnaire, approved by the University Bioethics Committee (Approval No.
31
32 234687, 20th October 2016), consisted of a brief socio-demographic section and the
33
34 following scales:
35
36

- 37 • *System Justification – Gender* (Jost & Kay, 2005): 8 items (e.g., “In general,
38 relations between men and women are fair”) on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 9
39 (strongly agree);
40
41
42
- 43 • *Identification of Sexual Violence Experience*: adaptation of the 8 items that
44 Konik & Cortina (2008) selected from Fitzgerald et al. (1988; 1995): participants had
45 to choose which behaviours they felt are forms of sexual violence (multiple choice
46 scale; e.g., “Someone stares or leers at you in a way that made you feel
47 uncomfortable”);
48
49
- 50 • *Updated Measure for Assessing Subtle Rape Myth* proposed by McMahon &
51 Farmer (2011) in its Italian adaptation (SRMA-IT) by Martini, Tartaglia, & De Piccoli
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (in press): 20 items on a Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

4
5 The scale is made up of four factors that express different rape myths: “She asked for
6
7 it”, 6 items (e.g., “When girls go to parties wearing slutty clothes, they are asking for
8
9 trouble”); “He didn’t mean to”, 4 items (e.g., “When guys rape, it is usually because of
10
11 their strong desire for sex”); “It wasn’t really rape”, 5 items (e.g., “A rape probably
12
13 didn’t happen if the girl has no bruises or marks”); “She lied”, 5 items (e.g., “Rape
14
15 accusations are often used as a way of getting back at guys”);
16
17

18
19 • *Bystander intention to intervene scale* (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2002;
20
21 2005): Likert scale from 0 (not at all confident to act) to 10 (completely confident to
22
23 act); participants had to state how confident they felt as a bystander about undertaking
24
25 the 14 actions to counter sexual violence (e.g., “Express my discomfort if someone
26
27 makes a joke about a woman’s body”).
28
29
30
31
32

33 ***Participants***

34 *At T1*

35
36 At the beginning of the course (T1) (first plenary session), 177 people received the
37
38 questionnaire and 172 completed it adequately: 88 from the University, 80 from the
39
40 Polytechnic, and 4 from student dormitory directors or workers. In detail, 81.7% were
41
42 staff, 8.9% student representatives, 7.1% faculty, 2.4% student dormitory directors or
43
44 workers; 89.3% were women, 10.1% men, 0.6% declared “other”; the average age was
45
46 44.46 years (SD 9.81).
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 *At T2*

54
55 The T2 questionnaire was completed by 98 participants: all trainees who were present
56
57 at the final session completed it appropriately. Because about 70 T1 participants did
58
59
60

1
2
3 not attend the final plenary session and because some participants did not indicate
4 correctly their self-generated ID code, as they did not remember the data they had
5 chosen to use at T1, we were able to match the T1 and the T2 questionnaires for only
6
7
8
9
10 66 participants. As the T1 sample was composed of 172 respondents, the attrition rate
11
12 (U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences - IES) was
13
14 unfortunately high (62%).

15
16 Of the 66 matching respondents, 36 were from the University and 30 from the
17
18 Polytechnic: 87.5% were staff, 9.4% faculty, 1.6% student representatives, and 1.6%
19
20 dormitory directors or workers; 92.4% were women and 7.56% were men; the average
21
22 age was 45.67 years (SD 7.87).
23
24
25

26
27
28 As the attrition rate between the T1 and the T2 sample was quite high, we checked if
29
30 the attrition rate had an effect on the characteristics of the sample at T1 and at T2 by
31
32 comparing via the independent samples t-test the group of the 66 matching
33
34 respondents and the group of the 106 T1-only respondents.
35
36

37
38 No statistically significant differences in socio-demographics between the group of the
39
40 66 matching respondents and the group of the 106 T1-only respondents were found.
41
42 The chi-square test showed no differences in percentages: between women and men (p
43
44 = .49); between respondents from the University and the Polytechnic (p = .73);
45
46 between staff/faculty/students (p = .06). The independent samples T-test showed no
47
48 differences in average age (p = .14).
49
50
51

52 53 **Data analysis**

54
55 Data analysis was performed using IBM-SPSS Statistics version 24. After exploratory
56
57 factor analysis via eigenvalues greater than 1, the internal consistency of each scale
58
59
60

1
2
3 and subscale was calculated using Cronbach's alpha coefficient to verify the structure
4
5 of the scales.
6

7
8 In order to fulfil objective 1 of the present study, descriptive analyses (mean – M – and
9
10 standard deviation – SD) for summed score of each scale were carried out to show
11
12 respondents' system justification – gender level, rape myth acceptance, and bystander
13
14 intention to intervene. Relationships between the concepts were then analysed by
15
16 bivariate correlations. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to check for
17
18 differences in constructs between groups. Specifically, we compared via independent
19
20 samples t-test the responses from the participants from the University and from the
21
22 Polytechnic and via one-way ANOVA the participants by their roles (staff, student
23
24 representatives, faculty, and student dormitory directors/workers) at the two
25
26 universities.
27
28
29

30
31 In order to highlight pre- and post-training differences in participants' representations
32
33 and attitudes (objective 2), we used a paired sample t-test to compare the questionnaire
34
35 responses at T1 and T2 and to check whether, after participation on the course, there
36
37 were changes in the representation of sexual violence, in gender system justification,
38
39 in rape myth acceptance, and in bystander intention to intervene. The effect of the
40
41 attrition rate was also checked.
42
43
44
45

46 **Results**

47 ***T1 Sample***

48 *Participants' representations and attitude*

49
50
51 In order to evaluate participant representations and attitudes at the beginning of the
52
53 program (T1), we analysed gender system justification, i.e., the degree to which
54
55 respondents judge the system of gender relationships as being fair. As higher values
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 express agreement with equity of the system, the media of answers (Table 1) means
4 that participants at T1 were slightly critical of the fairness of relationships between
5
6 genders.
7
8
9

10
11
12 PLEASE INSERT TABLE 1
13
14
15
16

17 To understand respondents' representations of sexual violence, we asked them to
18 select from a list of behaviours which ones they considered violent and to express their
19 agreement with statements that express rape myths (rape myth acceptance). At the
20 beginning of the training course (T1; Table 2), the majority of participants (83.3%)
21 defined violence as the act of someone who "attempted to establish a romantic or
22 sexual relationship despite the other person's efforts to discourage it", but very few
23 (23.7%) considered violence as the act of someone "telling sexually coloured stories or
24 offensive jokes". Surprisingly, less than half of respondents (45.5%) defined "Being
25 stared or leered at in a way that makes you feel uncomfortable" as violence.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Rape myth acceptance was not very high; lower values express refusal of myths (Table
41 1) though higher acceptance was noted for the myth "He didn't mean to" ($M 1.87$) that
42 justifies assault by a man, affirming that he did not really intend to commit rape.
43
44 Regarding bystander intention to intervene, respondents stated they would act to
45 counter the assault ($M 8.43$).
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 As Table 1 shows, gender system justification was related strongly to acceptance of
55 the two rape myths "It was not really rape" and "She lied" acceptance and quite
56 strongly with acceptance of the rape myth "He didn't mean to": perceiving fairness in
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 relationships between genders was associated with higher acquiescence with
4 stereotypes and false beliefs about sexual violence. A strong inverse relation was
5 evident between acceptance of the rape myth “She asked for it” and bystander
6 intention to intervene: if respondents believed that the woman provoked the rape, they
7 would be less disposed to intervene to help her.
8
9

10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 *Differences between groups*

18
19 The independent samples t-test showed no differences between participants from the
20 University and those from the Polytechnic. One-way ANOVA showed no differences
21 between work roles.
22
23
24
25

26 27 28 **Sample 1 and Sample 2**

29 30 *Effect of the attrition rate*

31
32 As the attrition rate between the T1 and the T2 sample was quite high, we checked the
33 effect of the attrition rate by comparing via the independent samples t-test the group of
34 the 66 matching respondents and the group of the 106 T1-only respondents.
35
36
37

38 No statistically significant differences were found at the beginning of the training
39 program between the two groups in gender system justification, acceptance of the four
40 rape myths or bystander intention to intervene (Table 2; Independent samples t-test).
41
42
43

44 We can state confidently that the data at T1 and at T2 can be compared, despite the
45 substantially smaller sample at T2.
46
47
48
49

50
51
52
53 PLEASE INSERT TABLE 2
54
55

56 57 58 *Evaluation of Training Program Effects* 59 60

1
2
3 Comparison between the T1 and the T2 data showed that the number of respondents
4 who labelled different forms of behaviours as “violent” increased between T1 and T2
5
6 (Table 3): post-training identification of subtle forms of violence was higher.
7
8
9

10
11
12 PLEASE INSERT TABLE 3
13

14 gender system justification
15

16
17 The post-training data showed lower gender system justification and lower acceptance
18 of the rape myths “She asked for it” and “She lied” (Table 2: Paired samples t-test).
19
20 No significant pre- and post-training differences were found for the acceptance of the
21
22 myths “He didn’t mean to” and “It wasn’t really rape”. There were no significant
23
24 differences in bystander intention to intervene to prevent or counter a sexual assault.
25
26
27
28
29

30 **Discussion**

31
32
33 The present paper reports the process and main results of a pilot evaluation study of
34
35 the Italian training program of the USVreact European project for university staff,
36
37 faculty, and student representatives to prevent sexual violence inside universities. We
38
39 wanted to show the process of the evaluation and the first evidence of effectiveness of
40
41 the training intervention in promoting cultural change and bystander willingness to
42
43 intervene in a university setting. Assessment of participants’ representations of sexual
44
45 violence, gender system justification, rape myth acceptance, and bystander intention to
46
47 intervene was performed at the beginning of the training course. Effectiveness of the
48
49 course was then measured by comparing participants’ responses pre- and post-training
50
51 to determine whether changes had occurred.
52
53
54

55
56 Results of the evaluation study showed that participants at the beginning of the
57
58 training expressed quite a low acceptance of rape myths and a reasonable degree of
59
60

1
2
3 willingness to intervene to counter sexual violence. This observation is coherent with
4
5 the fact that participation on the course was voluntary, that participants were probably
6
7 already quite aware of sexual violence before starting the course, and that the training
8
9 course attracted mostly women. As reported in previous studies (Martini, Tartaglia, &
10
11 De Piccoli, *in press*; Papp & Erchull, 2017), women showed lower system justification
12
13 and rape myth acceptance and higher intention to intervene. Although the participants
14
15 were already aware of the seriousness of sexual violence, pre-training responses
16
17 showed they were less able to recognize the more subtle forms of violence. This
18
19 finding suggests the need to develop sensitivity to recognize violence also in its subtle
20
21 and hidden forms. Finally, consistent with previous work (McMahon, 2010), high
22
23 inverse correlations emerged between rape myth acceptance and bystander intention to
24
25 intervene.
26
27
28
29

30 The present results suggest that a training course designed to raise recognition of
31
32 stereotypes of sexual violence and of more subtle forms of violence (e.g., harassment)
33
34 could be helpful to foster attitudes to counter sexual violence in university settings. As
35
36 suggested by Banyard (2015), to prevent the occurrence of violent and discriminatory
37
38 situations, it is necessary to change the representations and attitudes towards sexual
39
40 violence. The perpetuation of gender-based violence is fueled by false beliefs and
41
42 stereotypes related to violence itself and to gender relationships. These attitudes help
43
44 to justify the abuse or the individuals who act on them and affect the identification of a
45
46 situation as risky or violent (Burn, 2009; Bennet, Banyard, & Garnhart, 2014;
47
48 Banyard, 2015). That said, in order to activate bystander intervention, the first step is
49
50 to enable an individual to recognize a situation as violent or risky and then to make the
51
52 individual feel responsible for intervening (Banyard, 2015). Comparison of pre- and
53
54 post-training responses revealed some differences. Paired sample t-test analysis
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 showed a significant increase in participants' ability to identify more subtle kinds of
4 violence and a reduction in gender system justification and in acceptance of the two
5 rape myths "She asked for it" and "She lied". This change suggests an impact of the
6 training course.
7
8
9
10

11
12 Summarizing, we can state that by the end of the training program, the participants
13 were more aware of what violence is and were better able to identify its subtle forms
14 and that they were less disposed to blaming the victim, as the attitude of attributing
15 responsibility for violence to the victim was considerably reduced. Reflection on the
16 subtle shades of violence and false beliefs about sexual assault probably helped raise
17 participants' awareness of the pervasiveness of a culture that legitimizes violence and
18 their ability to recognize it. No significant changes were observed for the other
19 dimensions in part because the participants were already quite aware of the problem of
20 violence against women and in part because deep cultural change probably takes
21 longer to manifest than the few months of a course program. Moreover, it is also
22 possible that the instrument we used to measure the intention to intervene, originally
23 designed for students, needs to be adapted for faculty and staff or, generally, for
24 workers. In future studies, we plan to develop a scale that captures situations more
25 relevant to the lifestyle of staff and/or teachers.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 This pilot study, like the evaluation design, has several limitations. First, it has no
45 control group. This weakness needs to be addressed when planning future training
46 courses. Second, the sample of respondents who completed both questionnaires was
47 small, also due to a problem with the coding process; greater attention will be paid to
48 avoiding errors in the identification coding process on future courses: a possible
49 solution is to indicate clearly which data are to be reported to generate the ID code
50 (e.g., first letter of mother's surname; month of father's birth; third letter of her/his
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 name). After the plenary introduction to the program, some participants did not
4 participate in the training and did not fill in the T2 questionnaire. The attrition rate
5 (i.e., matching the respondents to the T1 and T2 questionnaires) was quite high, which
6 is a serious weakness of the present study. For this reason, the results for the
7 effectiveness of the training course cannot be generalized as we had intended. In future
8 training courses, it would be interesting to ask participants why they did not attend the
9 course; it could be useful to try to foster attendance to the entire program. Third,
10 though women make up 68% of the administrative staff at the University of Turin and
11 60% at the Polytechnic of Turin, women accounted for more than 90% of the training
12 course participants, whereas men were strongly underrepresented. A further limitation
13 is that we did not administer a follow-up post-training questionnaire to analyse the
14 stability of changes over time; this step will be included in future research designs.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
These limitations notwithstanding, the pilot evaluation study suggests several thematic
areas that would be appropriate to develop in a training course on combating gender-
based violence. For example, two future areas of focus could be on contrasting the
tendency to blame the victim of sexual violence and on assessing the different forms
that violence can take. The data collected at T1 show that acceptance of the myth “She
asked for it” was inversely related to the bystander intervention attitude. The same
significant negative relationship between acceptance of the myth “She asked for it”
and the bystander intervention attitude was found by a previous study (Martini & De
Piccoli, 2020), with a sample of about 3000 university students. Moreover, because the
intention to intervene hinges on recognizing a potentially harmful situation for the
victim (Darley & Latané, 1968), a program designed to prevent sexual violence needs
to sustain the ability to recognize the different faces of violence.

1
2
3 Other variables may certainly come into play in motivating a bystander to intervene
4 against any form of violence; we believe that the present study findings provide a
5 preliminary basis on which to develop training courses. Keeping in mind critical issues
6 and some weaknesses in the design, this work can offer some suggestions to
7 implement evaluation of bystander-based interventions. Very few projects to date have
8 tested the effectiveness of bystander-based intervention involving university staff. This
9 specific approach, which originated in the United States (Banyard, 2015) but is not yet
10 common in Europe, may promote adequate first response to sexual assault and
11 prevention of more subtle violence. Bystander intervention can be fostered by
12 promoting cultural change, countering false beliefs such as rape myth acceptance, and
13 helping to identify violence. To reach this goal it is necessary to involve more men. In
14 Italy, gender-based violence is often considered a female issue. But as previous studies
15 have shown (Navarro & Tewksbury, 2017; Russell & Hand, 2017), because men and
16 women express different attitudes towards these problems, men cannot remain passive
17 spectators in counteracting sexual violence. A cultural change can be more effective
18 the more both men and women cooperate as active subjects in counteracting all forms
19 of violence and discrimination. Along this line, university management should include
20 among the compulsory courses for all administrative staff and, in perspective, for all
21 teachers, a program like USVreact which is aimed at preventing sexual violence in the
22 academic setting. In this way, more men would be involved in the reflection (and in
23 the action) on this topic and would contribute to spreading a culture of respect and
24 non-abuse, which is the basis of the primary prevention as indicated by the World
25 Health Organization (WHO, 2010).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Conflict of Interests Statement

The author(s) declare no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this paper.

References

- Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Toward the Next Generation of Bystander Prevention of Sexual and Relationship Violence, Action Coils to Engage Communities*. Cham: Springer.
- Banyard, V. L., Plante, E., & Moynihan, M. M. (2002). *Unpublished measures*.
- Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2005). *Rape prevention through bystander education: Final report to NIJ for grant 2002-WG-BX-0009*, <http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/grants/0208701.pdf> (last checked by the authors June 2018).
- Bennett, S., Banyard, V. L., & Garnhart, L. (2014). To Act or Not to Act, That Is the Question? Barriers and Facilitators of Bystander Intervention. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 29*(3), 476-496. doi: 10.1177/0886260513505210
- Burn, S. (2009). A situational model of sexual assault prevention through bystander intervention. *Sex Roles, 60*, 779-792.
- Chapleau, K. M., & Oswald, D. L. (2013). Status, Threat, and Stereotypes: Understanding the Function of Rape Myth Acceptance. *Social Justice Research, 26*(1), 18-41. doi: 10.1007/s11211-013-0177-z.
- Chapleau, K. M., & Oswald, D. L. (2014). A System Justification View of Sexual Violence: Legitimizing Gender Inequality and Reduced Moral Outrage Are Connected to Greater Rape Myth Acceptance. *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation, 15*(2), 204-18. doi: 10.1080/15299732.2014.867573.

1
2
3 Darley, J. M., & Latané, B. (1968). Bystanders Intervention in Emergencies, Diffusion
4 of Responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 8, 377-383.
5
6 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0025589>.

7
8
9
10 EU-project 2009-2011 – JLS/2007/ISEC/415, *Gender-based Violence, Stalking and*
11
12 *Fear of Crime*. (2012). Accessed 24 February 2018.
13
14 http://www.gendercrime.eu/pdf/gendercrime_final_report_smaller_version.pdf

15
16 Eurostat, *Violent sexual crimes recorded in the EU*. Accessed 24 February 2018
17
18 [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-eurostat-news/-/EDN-20171123-](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-eurostat-news/-/EDN-20171123-1?inheritRedirect=true)
19
20
21
22
23

24 Fenton, R. A., & Mott, H. L. (2017). The bystander approach to violence prevention:
25 Considerations for implementation in Europe. *Psychology of Violence*, 7(3), 450-458.
26
27 doi: 10.1037/vio0000104

28
29
30 Fitzgerald, L. F., Gelfand, M. J., & Drasgow, F. (1995). Measuring Sexual
31 Harassment: Theoretical and Psychometric Advances. *Basic and Applied Social*
32
33 *Psychology*, 17, 425–427. doi: 10.1207/s15324834basp1704_2.

34
35
36
37 Fitzgerald, L. F., Shullman, S. L., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, Y.,
38 Ormerod, A. J., & Weitzman, L. (1988). The Dimensions and Extent of Sexual
39 Harassment in Higher Education and The Workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*,
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 Kelly, L. (1987). The Continuum of Sexual Violence. In: Hanmer J., Maynard M.
(eds) *Women, Violence and Social Control*. Explorations in Sociology (British
Sociological Association Conference Volume series). Palgrave Macmillan, London
(p. 46-60).

1
2
3 Konik, J., & Cortina, L. M. (2008). Policing Gender at Work: Intersections of
4 Harassment Based on Sex and Sexuality. *Social Justice Research, 21*, 313–337. doi:
5
6 10.1007/s11211-008-0074-z.
7
8

9
10 Krongard, S., & Tsay-Vogel, M. (2018). Online Original TV Series: Examining
11 Portrayals of Violence in Popular Binge-Watched Programs and Social Reality
12 Perceptions. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture*. Advance online publication. doi:
13
14 10.1037/ppm0000224
15
16
17

18
19 ISTAT - Istituto Nazionale di Statistica [National Institute of Statistics] (2015). *La*
20 *violenza contro le donne*. Accessed 20 February 2018.
21
22 <https://www.istat.it/it/archivio/161716>
23
24

25
26 Joseph, J. S., Gray, M. J., and Mayer, J. (2013). Addressing Sexual Assault within
27 Social Systems: System Justification as a Barrier to College Prevention
28 Efforts. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 22*(5), 493-509. doi:
29
30 10.1080/10926771.2013.785460
31
32
33

34
35 Jost, J. T., & Kay, A. C. (2005). Exposure to Benevolent Sexism and Complementary
36 Gender Stereotypes: Consequences for Specific and Diffuse Forms of System
37 Justification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*(3), 498-509. doi:
38
39 10.1037/0022-3514.88.3.498.
40
41
42

43
44 Jost, J. T., & Banaji, M. R. (1994). The Role of Stereotyping in System-Justification
45 and the Production of False Consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 33*
46
47 (1), 1–27. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8309.1994.tb01008.x.
48
49

50
51 Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1995). Attitudinal Antecedents of Rape Myth
52 Acceptance: A Theoretical and Empirical Reexamination. *Journal of Personality and*
53
54 *Social Psychology, 68*(4), 704-711. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.68.4.704.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Maass, A., Cadinu, M., Guarnieri, G., & Grasselli, A. (2003). Sexual harassment under
4 social identity threat: The computer harassment paradigm. *Journal of Personality and*
5
6 *Social Psychology*, 85, 853–870. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.85.5.853.
7
8

9
10 Martini, M., & De Piccoli, N. (2020). Predicting bystander intention to intervene: The
11
12 role of gender-specific system justification and rape myth acceptance for men and
13
14 women. *Frontiers in Psychology, section Gender, Sex and Sexualities*, 11, 326.
15
16 doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00326
17
18

19 Martini, M., Tartaglia, S., & De Piccoli, N. (*in press*) Assessing Rape Myth
20
21 Acceptance: A Contribution to Italian validation of the Measure for Assessing Subtle
22
23 Rape Myth (SRMA-IT). *Sexual abuse* (accepted April, the 6th 2020).
24
25

26 McMahon, S. (2010). Rape Myth Beliefs and Bystander Attitudes among Incoming
27
28 College Students. *Journal of American college health*, 59(1), 3-11.
29
30 doi:10.1080/07448481.2010.483715.
31
32

33 McMahon, S., & Farmer, L. G. (2011). An Updated Measure for Assessing Subtle
34
35 Rape Myths. *Social Work Research*, 35(2), 71-81. doi: 10.1093/swr/35.2.71.
36
37

38 Navarro, J. C., & Tewksbury, R. (2017). Mythbusters: Examining Rape Myth
39
40 Acceptance Among U.S. University Students. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and*
41
42 *Practice*, 54(4), 343-356. doi: 10.1080/19496591.2017.1289094
43
44

45 NUS - National Union of Students (2010). *Hidden Marks A study of women students'*
46
47 *experiences of harassment, stalking, violence and sexual assault*. Accessed 4 March
48
49 2018.

50
51 https://www.nus.org.uk/Global/NUS_hidden_marks_report_2nd_edition_web.pdf
52
53

54 Papp, L. J., & Erchull, M. jJ. (2017). Objectification and System Justification Impact
55
56 Rape Avoidance Behaviors. *Sex Roles*, 76, 110–120. doi:10.1007/s11199-016-0660-8
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Payne, D. L., Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1999). Rape Myth Acceptance:
4 Exploration of its Structure and its Measurement Using the Illinois Rape Myth
5 Acceptance Scale. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 33, 27-68. doi:
6 10.1006/jrpe.1998.2238.
7
8
9
10
11 Perkins, W., & Warner, J. (2017). Sexual Violence Response and Prevention: Studies
12 of Campus Policies and Practices, *Journal of School Violence*, 16(3), 237-242, doi:
13 10.1080/15388220.2017.1318569
14
15
16
17
18 Russell, K. J., & Hand, C. J. (2017). Rape myth acceptance, victim blame attribution
19 and Just World Beliefs: A rapid evidence assessment. *Aggression and Violent*
20 *Behavior*, 37, 153–160. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2017.10.008
21
22
23
24
25
26 Stahl, T., Eek, D., & Kazemi, A. (2010). Rape Victim Blaming as System
27 Justification: The Role of Gender and Activation of Complementary Stereotypes.
28 *Social Justice Research*, 23, 239-258. doi: 10.1007/s11211-010-0117-0.
29
30
31
32
33 U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences (IES). *What Works*
34 *Clearinghouse™ Standards Handbook* (Version 4.0). Retrieved from
35 https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/referenceresources/wwc_standards_handbook_v4.d.
36
37
38
39
40 Ward, M. L. (2016). Media and Sexualization: State of Empirical Research, 1995–
41 2015. *The Journal of sex Research*, 53(4-5), 560–577. doi:
42 10.1080/00224499.2016.1142496
43
44
45
46
47 WHO - World Health Organization (2002). *World report on violence and*
48 *health*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
49
50
51
52 WHO - World Health Organization/London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine
53 (2010). *Preventing intimate partner and sexual violence against women: taking action*
54 *and generating evidence*. Geneva, World Health Organization.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 WHO - World Health Organization (2016). *Violence against women. Intimate partner*
4 *and sexual violence against women.* Accessed 22 March 2018.
5
6
7 <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/en/>.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

Table 1. Bivariate correlations (*r* values), descriptive statistics (M, SD) and Cronbach’s alpha at T1 (172 respondents)

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--|--------|---------|--------|--------|-------|------|
| 1. Gender system justification | - | | | | | |
| 2. Rape myth “She asked for it” acceptance | .106 | - | | | | |
| 3. Rape myth “He didn’t mean to” acceptance | .160* | .303** | - | | | |
| 4. Rape myth “It was not really rape” acceptance | .255** | .375** | .511** | - | | |
| 5. Rape myth “She lied” acceptance | .217** | .404** | .530** | .601** | - | |
| 6. Bystander efficacy | .041 | -.243** | -.128 | -.069 | -.148 | - |
| M | 4.27 | 1.66 | 1.87 | 1.35 | 1.77 | 8.43 |
| SD | 1.04 | .59 | .95 | .68 | .77 | 1.11 |
| <i>Cronbach’s alpha</i> | .76 | .72 | .83 | .90 | .89 | .81 |

* *p* < .05

** *p* < .001

Table 1. Bivariate correlations (*r* values), descriptive statistics (M, SD) and Cronbach's alpha at T1 (172 respondents)

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--|--------|---------|--------|--------|-------|------|
| 1. Gender system justification | - | | | | | |
| 2. Rape myth "She asked for it" acceptance | .106 | - | | | | |
| 3. Rape myth "He didn't mean to" acceptance | .160* | .303** | - | | | |
| 4. Rape myth "It was not really rape" acceptance | .255** | .375** | .511** | - | | |
| 5. Rape myth "She lied" acceptance | .217** | .404** | .530** | .601** | - | |
| 6. Bystander efficacy | .041 | -.243** | -.128 | -.069 | -.148 | - |
| M | 4.27 | 1.66 | 1.87 | 1.35 | 1.77 | 8.43 |
| SD | 1.04 | .59 | .95 | .68 | .77 | 1.11 |
| <i>Cronbach's alpha</i> | .76 | .72 | .83 | .90 | .89 | .81 |

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Table 2. Percentages of respondents at T1 and at T2 who define the described behaviours as violence and Independent T-test values between answers at T1 and T2 (66 matching respondents)

| <i>(Yes, it is violence = 1</i> <i>No, it is not violence = 0)</i> | % of Yes at T1 | % of Yes at T2 | <i>T-test values</i> |
|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Someone makes you afraid you would be treated poorly if you didn't cooperate sexually | 84.8 | 95.3 | $t(64) = -2.12, p = .038$ |
| Someone attempts to establish a romantic or sexual relationship despite your efforts to discourage it | 83.3 | 87.7 | $t(64) = -.73, p = .471$ |
| Someone touches you (for example put an arm around you) in a way that makes you feel uncomfortable | 63.3 | 81.5 | $t(64) = -2.82, p = .006$ |
| Someone makes crude and offensive remarks, either publicly or privately | 60.6 | 81.5 | $t(64) = -2.86, p = .006$ |
| Someone makes unwanted attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters | 50.0 | 86.2 | $t(64) = -5.56, p < .001$ |
| Someone displays, used or distributed sexist or suggestive materials | 46.9 | 76.9 | $t(64) = -4.60, p < .001$ |
| Someone stares or leers at you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable | 45.5 | 64.6 | $t(64) = -3.19, p = .002$ |
| Someone tells sexually suggestive stories or offensive jokes | 23.7 | 53.8 | $t(64) = -3.40, p = .001$ |

Table 3. Independent sample t-test at T1, between the group of 66 matching respondents and the group of 106 T1-only respondents and Paired sample t-test at T1 and T2 for the 66 matching participants

| | Independent sample t-test | | | Paired sample T-test | |
|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| | T1 66 Matching M (SD) | T1 106 Only-T1 M (SD) | Matching / only-T1 T-test values | T2 66 Matching M (SD) | T1/T2 T-test values |
| Gender system justification | 4.11 (.98) | 4.37 (1.07) | $t(170)=-1.60, p=.11$ | 4.68 (1.51) | $t(65)=-2.73, p=.01$ |
| Rape myth “She asked for it” acceptance | 1.63 (.54) | 1.68 (.62) | $t(17)=-.56, p=.55$ | 1.84 (.61) | $t(65)=-3.11, p=.01$ |
| Rape myth “He didn’t mean to” acceptance | 1.80 (.88) | 1.91 (.99) | $t(168)=-.74, p=.46$ | 1.72 (.69) | $t(64)=.96, p=.34$ |
| Rape myth “It was not really rape” acceptance | 1.33 (.57) | 1.36 (.74) | $t(168)=-.30, p=.76$ | 1.31 (.62) | $t(64)=.19, p=.85$ |
| Rape myth “She lied” acceptance | 1.77 (.69) | 1.78 (.82) | $t(168)=-.14, p=.89$ | 1.56 (.64) | $t(64)=2.61, p=.01$ |
| Bystander efficacy | 8.42 (1.09) | 8.43 (1.13) | $t(170)=-.05, p=.96$ | 8.63 (.95) | $t(65)=-1.68, p=.10$ |

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

For Peer Review

Table 3. Independent sample t-test at T1, between the group of 66 matching respondents and the group of 106 T1-only respondents and Paired sample t-test at T1 and T2 for the 66 matching participants

| | Independent sample t-test | | | Paired sample T-test | |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| | T1 66 Matching M (SD) | T1 106 Only-T1 M (SD) | Matching / only-T1 T-test values | T2 66 Matching M (SD) | T1/T2 T-test values |
| Gender system justification | 4.11 (.98) | 4.37 (1.07) | $t(170)=-1.60, p=.11$ | 4.68 (1.51) | $t(65)=-2.73, p=.01$ |
| Rape myth “She asked for it” acceptance | 1.63 (.54) | 1.68 (.62) | $t(17)=-.56, p=.55$ | 1.84 (.61) | $t(65)=-3.11, p=.01$ |
| Rape myth “He didn’t mean to” acceptance | 1.80 (.88) | 1.91 (.99) | $t(168)=-.74, p=.46$ | 1.72 (.69) | $t(64)=.96, p=.34$ |
| Rape myth “It was not really rape” acceptance | 1.33 (.57) | 1.36 (.74) | $t(168)=-.30, p=.76$ | 1.31 (.62) | $t(64)=.19, p=.85$ |
| Rape myth “She lied” acceptance | 1.77 (.69) | 1.78 (.82) | $t(168)=-.14, p=.89$ | 1.56 (.64) | $t(64)=2.61, p=.01$ |
| Bystander efficacy | 8.42 (1.09) | 8.43 (1.13) | $t(170)=-.05, p=.96$ | 8.63 (.95) | $t(65)=-1.68, p=.10$ |

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

For Peer Review