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Abstract

Sexualized violence is a growing problem among middle school and high school students, exacerbated by the proliferation of social media and technology. A group of community members and university researchers created the Pass it On program using feminist definitions and bystander frameworks to address this problem. This program was implemented in two waves, with three middle school and three high school male-only groups in the Thames Valley District School Board in London, Ontario, Canada. After the five-week program, high school participants showed significant positive change in both bystander and victim blaming attitude measurements. Both groups of participants showed significant positive change in knowledge about bystander intervention. Due to test version interaction, results about bystander beliefs could not be assessed. Results indicate that there were no significant changes in most attitude, knowledge, and belief measurements about sexualized violence in both age groups. Limitations and future directions of this program are discussed.
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Introduction

In recent years there has been an increase in media attention to a toxic mix of online bullying (referred to here as “cyberbullying”) and sexualized violence. Currently, there are two well-known cases in Canada of young adolescent girls, Amanda Todd and Reteah Parsons, who took their own lives after experiences of sexualized cyberbullying. With an increasingly “wired in” generation, it has become vital to better understand the nature of cyberbullying and sexualized violence in order to create a framework in which adolescents can be taught skills for identifying and intervening in acts of sexualized violence, cyberbullying, or both. Such frameworks appear to be lacking in extant literature. There are very few empirically based programs that explicitly address sexualized violence in the middle or high school context; rather, interventions appear to be aimed either at identifying and intervening in dating violence, with sexualized violence considered as a potential form of abuse between adolescent intimate partners, or at general bullying with cyberbullying discussed to a lesser extent and the intersection between bullying and sexualized violence not discussed at all.

In this literature review, knowledge gaps are highlighted to help guide a novel intervention meant to address sexualized violence and cyberbullying in adolescent and emerging adolescent populations. First, the importance of engaging adolescents is explored (Adolescents and their Relationships). Second, definitions of sexualized violence and cyberbullying are discussed and clarified for the purpose of the current project. In these sections (Sexualized Violence: Definitions and Prevalence and Cyberbullying: Definitions and Prevalence), prevalence rates of sexualized violence and cyberbullying in the adolescent population are also elucidated. Third, after the definitions and prevalence rates of sexualized violence and cyberbullying have been established, past school-based violence prevention programs (Sexualized Violence Preventions and Interventions) and cyberbullying prevention programs (Cyberbullying Prevention Programs) are reviewed. Finally, at the end of this review, gaps in the literature are highlighted (Gaps in the Literature and Conclusion).

Adolescents and their Relationships

Adolescence is the developmental stage that begins with the physiologically normal onset of puberty and ends when adult identity and behaviour are accepted (Canadian Paediatric Society, 2003). According to the Canadian Paediatric Society (2003), following the guidelines
of the World Health Organization (WHO), adolescence lasts from roughly the age of 10 to 19. This time period is marked by rapid changes in several aspects of a person, such as behavioural and physical changes. In addition to the physical and behavioural changes, adolescence is associated with many changes in the types of interpersonal relationships experienced (Collins & Sroufe, 1999). Specifically, the development of romantic relationships is a hallmark of the transition from childhood to adolescence (Collins & Sroufe, 1999).

There is widespread agreement that, in terms of developmental timing, adolescence is an excellent window of opportunity for providing youth with the tools they need for healthy intimate and sexual relations. Romantic relationships are the first relationships that a person experiences that are symmetrical, voluntary, and to a greater extent than peer relationships, dependently reciprocal (Collins & Sroufe, 1999). Romantic relationships often offer the first experience of intimate sexual contact (Collins & Sroufe, 1999), and with this, the opportunity to work out which sexual behaviours are appropriate and inappropriate (Lacasse & Mendelson, 2007). Perhaps in part due to the challenges of negotiating these new relationships, adolescence is also a high-risk time for violence. Sexual aggression frequently emerges in adolescence (White & Smith, 2004) along with other types of relational violence, such as physical dating violence (PDV). This type of violence also appears to peak during this developmental stage (Peplar, 2012; Woodin, Caldeira, & O’Leary, 2013). Theorists have suggested that behaviours taught and learned during adolescence are highly likely to be maintained through adulthood (Wolfe et al., 2009), and that preventative interventions timed during adolescence may have a greater likelihood of disrupting the development of coercive behaviours and their correlates, such as rape-supportive attitudes (Casey & Lindhorst, 2009). It is for these reasons that it is important to create programs for middle school and high school students that address sexualized violence and cyberbullying.

**Sexualized Violence: Definitions and Prevalence**

Currently, there are two major schools of thought on how to define sexualized violence. One is the legal/medical view that is characteristic of most governmental agencies. The Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) in the United States, for example, currently offers the clearest legal/medical operational definition for sexualized violence. According to the CDC, sexualized violence is, “…sexual activity where consent is not obtained or freely given” (Centre for Disease Control and Prevention, 2012). The CDC further defines types of sexualized violence to include, “…physical acts, such as unwanted touching or rape…sexualized violence
also includes acts that do not have physical contact between victim and perpetrator-- for example, sexual harassment, threats, and peeping.” (CDC, 2012)

There are three different kinds of sexual assault described in sections 271 through 273 of the Canadian Criminal Code. Sexual assault is defined as “…an assault…. which is committed in circumstances of a sexual nature such that the sexual integrity of the victim is violated.” (Martin’s Criminal Code, 2010). Section 271 in the Criminal Code criminalizes “Sexual assault.” Sexual assault has been interpreted as a crime when someone forces any form of sexual activity on another person without that person’s consent, and includes such things as touching, kissing, oral sex, and sexual intercourse (Memorial University, 2010). Section 272 criminalizes “Sexual assault with a weapon, threats to a third party or causing bodily harm”; and lastly Section 273 criminalizes “Aggravated Sexual Assault.” In aggravated sexual assault, the assailant needs to wound, maim, or disfigure the victim, while “Sexual Assault with a weapon, threats to a third party of causing bodily harm”, the perpetrator just needs to cause bodily harm the person (Edmonton Police Service, 2014). Other sections of the Canadian Criminal Code that could be relevant to acts of sexualized violence include Section 265 and 266 (Assault), 246 (Criminal Harassment, includes Stalking), and 162 (Voyeurism).

Statistics Canada acknowledges that fewer than 1 in 10 sexual assaults are reported to the authorities; and thus, the reported and published rates are an underestimation of the actual prevalence (Brennan & Taylor-Butts, 2008). In 2009, Statistics Canada reported that approximately 472,000 females self-reported being sexually assaulted, a rate of 34/1000 females over the age of 15. Among young people (ages 15-24), approximately 307,000 persons were victims of sexual assault, a rate of 69/1000 for this age group (Statistics Canada, 2009).

The second approach used to define sexualized violence is a feminist approach. In this theoretical framework, sexualized violence cannot be understood as separate discrete acts; rather, all acts of sexualized violence exist on a continuum and are all connected and based in patriarchal power and control (Stout & McPhail, 1998). At one end of the scale, there are the more physical and easily identifiable acts of sexualized violence, such as those included in the legal/medical definitions. These acts include rape, sexual assault, and criminal sexual contact. The acts of sexualized violence on the other end of the scale are less likely to fall into legal/medical definitions and may not be readily labeled as sexual violence by mainstream society. Examples of these behaviours include the use of sexually degrading language, sexually
violent media images, and pornography (Stout & McPhail, 1998). Moreover, because this continuum is based in patriarchy, gender imbalance is expected, with women most often victims and men most often perpetrators. From a feminist perspective, these acts of sexualized violence constitute behaviour that allows for the continuation of sexualized violence, or what is known in the media as “rape culture.” Support for this perspective has come from research showing that simple bullying and homophobic teasing were significant predictors of sexualized violence perpetration over time (Espelage, Basile, & Hamburger, 2012). A feminist definition has particular value for prevention programming as it provides a context to address the behaviours that are common and normalized among adolescents, such as sexist jokes and minor aggression, along with those behaviours that are more generally recognized as problematic. Thus, for this research project, the feminist definition of sexualized violence will be utilized to create and inform our questions and interventions.

Unsurprisingly, differing definitions of sexual violence lead to different estimates of prevalence. When using a feminist definition of sexual violence, concerning high rates of sexualized violence are found. For example, in the most recent American Association of University Women (AAUW) survey of 1195 Grade 7-12 students, using a feminist definition, 44% of respondents reported experiencing some form of sexual harassment (Hill & Kearl, 2011). The results of the AAUW survey also demonstrated that there were differences in the prevalence of sexualized violence based on gender, with females experiencing a greater proportion. Recently, a survey of 40 countries also provides evidence for the trend that girls are victimized to a greater extent in cases of sexual harassment compared to boys (PREVNet, 2014). Specifically, data from the AAUW survey found that 52% of females report in situ sexual harassment, such as having unwelcomed sexual comments, being physically intimidated in a sexual way, or being touched in an unwelcomed sexual way, compared to 35% of boys (Hill & Kearl, 2011). When broken down into the sexual violence continuum, 46% of girls reported that they have received unwanted sexual comments, jokes, and gestures made towards them, compared to 22% of boys (Hill & Kearl, 2011). With regards to physical violence, 13% of girls reported experiencing being touched in an unwelcome sexual way, compared to just 3% of boys (Hill & Kearl, 2011). Lastly, 4% of girls reported that they were forced to do something sexual that they did not want, compared to just 0.2% of boys.
In a Canadian context, Wolfe and Chiodo (2008) also reported high prevalence and large gender differences in their survey of sexualized violence behaviours in high schools. For example, in Grade 9, 46% of female students reported being a victim of a sexual comment, joke, gesture, or look, compared to 36% of male students. In this survey 30% of females reported they experienced physical victimization (i.e. being touched or grabbed in a sexual way) while this was reported by only 24% of males. Moreover, Wolfe and Chiodo (2008) found that although the rate of victimization decreased for both male and female adolescents over a two-year span, victimization rates declined at a slower rate for females.

Many studies have shown that victims of sexual violence experience negative health outcomes (Espelage, Basile & Hamburger, 2012) such as anxiety and depression, and negative health behaviours such as drug and alcohol use, and risky sexual behaviour (CDC, 2012). Because of the long-term impact of sexualized violence, it is important that prevention and education programs to be put in place to address this issue. Currently, most of the sexual violence literature focuses on the personal face-to-face level, but in the context of this generation, it is vital that research be conducted to understand the influence of the cybersphere on the perpetration, mechanisms, and impact of sexualized violence. In summary, there is a convergence of reasons, such as the prevalence, gendered differences, negative health outcomes, and changing social contexts that makes creating a new intervention for the prevention of sexualized violence important.

**Cyberbullying: Definitions and Prevalence**

Currently, the average teen spends approximately 50 hours a week on computers and cellphones (Korenis & Billick, 2014). Although the idea of cyberbullying is not new (Yberra & Mitchell, 2004), as the Internet becomes more pervasive and easily accessible to the masses, the problem of cyberbullying becomes more essential to understand and research. Slonje, Smith, and Frisen (2012) have argued that it is hard to create an operational research definition for cyberbullying because there are many terms and parameters in which cyberbullying can be researched. These parameters include investigating the media used, the more specific ways of using information and communication technologies, and the type of behaviour. One current definition of cyberbullying is “willful and repeated harm inflicted through the use of computers, cell phones, and other electronic devices” (Patchin & Hinduja, 2012). Another definition of cyberbullying is “aggressive and deliberate behaviour that is frequently repeated over time,
carried out by a group of individuals using electronics and aimed at a victim who cannot defend him- or her-self easily” (Calverte, Orue, Estevez, Villardon, & Padilla, 2010).

Researchers of cyberbullying have pointed out that although cyberbullying shares features of traditional face-to-face bullying, there are some key differences between the two. In terms of similarity, Menesini et al. (2012) concluded that cyberbullying shares three features with traditional bullying: 1) Intentionality: the perpetrator must have the intent to harm another person; 2) Repetition: the act must be repeated (though this criterion was considered to be one of the less reliable criteria for defining cyberbullying); and 3) Imbalance of power: in cyber- and traditional bullying, a person who is perceived as more powerful in some way targets a person who has less perceived power. However, the two aspects that make cyberbullying different from traditional bullying are the concepts of anonymity, and private vs. public. The public vs. private criterion posits that cyberbullying can occur in both the private and public realm, unlike traditional bullying which mostly happens in the public realm. The public realm is a space in which the interaction between the victim and bully can be witnessed by bystanders, while the private realm is a space where only the bully and victim experience or perpetrate the incident. For example, a form of private cyberbullying would be sending someone a text message, while a more of public form of cyberbullying would be posting an embarrassing picture in a public forum, such as Facebook (Menesini et al., 2012). The importance of anonymity as a differentiating criterion between traditional and cyberbullying is also emphasized (Calverte et al., 2010). Researchers assert that, with the feeling of anonymity, perpetrators have a sense of liberation from societal norms, moral and ethical situations, and consequences for their behaviours (Alverez, 2012; Calverte et al., 2010). Such anonymity might also make cyberbullying more injurious (Alverez, 2012). In a study that asked youth to rate the severity of aspects of bullying (anonymity, medium, and publicity), youth rated anonymous cyberbullying to be more severe that traditional face-to-face bullying (Sticca & Perren, 2013).

Estimates of the prevalence of cyberbullying in middle and high school vary from as low as 10% to as high as 40% (Patchin & Hinduja, 2012). In Ontario, it is estimated that about 22% of students between Grade 7-12 have experienced some form of cyberbullying (Pagila-Boak, Adlaf, Hamilton, Beitchman, Wolfe, & Mann, 2012). In the Wolfe and Chiodo (2008) study, 12% of male Grade 9 students report electronically bullying someone via the Internet, with 14% of females reporting the same behaviour. The perpetration prevalence rate remained the same
when the survey was re-administered in Grade 11. These results are consistent with the conclusion of Slonje et al’s, (2013) literature review that cyberbullying is a prevalent problem in adolescence.

Currently there are few papers that elucidate the intersection of sexualized violence and cyberbullying. One that does capture this intersection is the AAUW survey, described earlier (Hill & Kearl, 2011). This survey captured nodes of intersectionality between these concepts, such as the rates of adolescent males sending nude pictures of girls without their permission, or the rates of making sexually inappropriate comments over e-mails and text messages. In their overall sample (n=1195), 30% of students in Grade 7-12 reported being sexually harassed online. When broken down by gender, 36% of female students reported this experience compared to 24% of male students. When divided into type of sexual harassment experienced online, most respondents (20% of the overall sample) indicated that they have received an unwanted sexual comment, joke, or picture over some media. It is important to note that in this survey the rates of experiencing sexual harassment in person were still higher than experiencing sexual harassment online, but with the consistent trend for female students to experience more sexual harassment compared to male counterparts.

**Sexualized Violence Prevention and Intervention**

In this section, past programs that aimed to address and prevent sexualized violence are discussed. Strengths and gaps of these programs are highlighted and related to the goals of this current research project.

Generally speaking, researchers focus on prevention programming because prevention methods are deemed to be more effective than criminal justice intervention and mandated treatments. Likewise, early intervention and/or prevention treatments are considered to be more cost-effective (Langhinrichsen-Rohling & Capaldi, 2012). Nation et al. (2003) completed a review to identify characteristics of successful prevention programs regardless of the program’s content. From this review, Nation et al. identified nine principles of successful prevention programming that can be organized into three groups: program characteristics, matching programs to specific groups, and implementation and evaluation. The principles that fall under the category of program characteristics are: comprehensiveness varied teaching methods, sufficient length, theory driven, and opportunities for positive relationships. The principles related to matching programs to specific group are appropriately timed programs and socio-
cultural relevant programming. For the third and last group, implementation and evaluation, the principles are including an outcome evaluation and involving well trained staff. When dealing with prevention of sexualized violence, researchers recommend staying away from exclusively focusing on perpetrators’ behaviours, which is viewed as the traditional model. Programs using a traditional model have sometimes demonstrated a worsening of attitudes in men towards rape prevention programming (Hillenbrand-Gunn, Heppner, Mauch, & Park, 2010), the opposite goal of sexualized violence prevention programming. Alternatively, teaching students to examine societal portrayals of male and female gender roles, recognizing the early signs of violence, avoiding and disengaging from bad relationships, and correctly identifying and interpreting aggression, are skills taught in existing sexual assault prevention programs (Morrison, Hardison, Matthew, & O’Neil, 2004).

Clinton-Sherrod et al. (2009) administered a pre- and post-test questionnaire to youth or young adults enrolled in four different sexual violence prevention programs (Men of Strength; Students Upholding Respect and Gender Equity; Safe Place; and Metropolitan Organization to Counter Sexual Assault) in order to explicate what program factors affect program effectiveness. The program factors that these researchers were focusing on include the gender make-up of the intervention group (single gender vs. mixed gender), the teaching style of the program, and group size. Across the four programs, pre- to post- program change was noted in understanding of sexual harassment, personal boundaries, and positive dating relationship norms (though not in rates of self-reported sexual coercion). Changes in these outcomes measures were dependent on a number of program factors. For males participating in these programs, mixed-gender groups taught in classroom settings showed steeper changes in attitudes toward relationship norms and sexual harassment and personal boundary knowledge. Female participants, on the other hand, showed similar improvements in both outcomes regardless of group composition or setting.

In summary, current research recommends moving away from a traditional perpetrator and victim-focused model of sexual violence prevention when creating new programming for youth. Similarly, depending on the desired outcome, the make-up of the group and program delivery model can influence the effectiveness of the prevention program. In order to gain a better understanding of previous successful sexualized violence prevention programming, my review next cover programs that use other prevention theories, such as ecological interventions, and other successful prevention programs. The covered interventions include Bringing in the
Ecological Interventions: Bystander and Social Norms Model

Currently, the ecological model for the prevention of sexualized violence is gaining popularity among program developers. An ecological approach recognizes that human behaviour is reciprocally shaped by factors and norms at multiple levels, including the individual, familial, peer, and community level (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Thus, an ecological prevention model would endeavour to change knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs of individuals about sexualized violence, and also endeavor to change the greater societal views of the topic (Casey & Lindhorst, 2004). By combining the desire to promote change at both the community and individual level, most ecological sexualized violence prevention programs can be described as community level interventions (Wandersman & Florin, 2003). Currently in sexualized violence prevention, two types of ecological intervention models that are popular are the social norms and bystander models.

Bystander interventions. The bystander model incorporates the feminist perspective that sexualized violence exists on a continuum, and that there are several different and distinct times in which a person can intervene to stop sexualized violence. McMahon and Banyard (2012) recently created a conceptual framework in which bystander intervention models could be used for sexualized violence prevention. In this framework, sexualized violence prevention needs to address all behaviours along the sexualized violence continuum including high-risk behaviours that immediately precede a sexual assault and low-risk behaviours that support sexualized violence. The argument for using the bystander model for sexualized violence prevention programming is that with proactive changes related to factors and norms that create “rape culture,” there will be a corresponding decrease in incidents at the severe end of the continuum. Thus, within a bystander intervention framework, persons are expected to act in both emergency situations and ambiguous situations that may not be clearly defined as sexualized violence in some frameworks, such as peers using sexist language (Casey & Ohler, 2012). Examples of prevention methods that employ the bystander model are Bringing in the Bystander (Baynard, Eckstein, & Moynihan, 2010) and the Green Dot program (Coker, Cook-Craig, Williams, Fisher, Clear, Garcia, & Hegge, 2011). Both of these programs were created for post-
secondary aged youth. In *Bringing in the Bystander*, participants receive a 90-minute lesson about prevalence, causes, and consequences of sexualized violence, and engage in a discussion of how community members can play an active role in stopping sexualized violence. In addition to receiving information, participants of *Bringing in the Bystander* engage in roleplaying and practicing bystander scenarios. In the *Green Dot* program, students receive intensive training in becoming an active bystander.

Both the *Bringing in the Bystander* and the *Green Dot* programs have been shown to promote positive attitude changes in regards to sexualized violence and positive bystander behaviour. For example, participants who received *Green Dot* training had more self-reported bystander behaviour in situations of sexualized violence when compared to untrained classmates. Similarly, participants of *Bringing in the Bystander* showed improvements in measures of attitudes and knowledge of sexualized violence, as well as measurements of bystander behaviour, when compared to controls (Baynard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007). There was no gender effect in outcomes for either program.

In the current project, one of the aims is to increase male bystander engagement and efficacy in situations of sexualized violence. Although bystander based sexualized violence programming shows success with male participants, some improvements can still be made. Casey and Ohler (2012) interviewed past studies involving male participants of anti-violence against women programming, and concluded that though bystander interventions are useful for males, they should be longer and more comprehensive, as males still struggle to implement effective bystander behaviours across all situations of sexualized violence. Moreover, to date, there has been no research on the efficacy of bystander interventions in adolescents in regards to attitudes, knowledge, and beliefs about sexualized violence.

**Social norms interventions.** Social norms theory focuses on individuals’ perceptions of peer norms (Perkin & Berkowitz, 1986). Central to this theory is the idea that the influence of one’s peers is dependent on an individual’s perception of what one’s peers do and believe (perceived norms) instead of the actual behaviours and beliefs of peers (actual norms) (Hillenbrand-Gunn et al., 2012). Social norms theory identifies a number of misconceptions that promote undesirable behaviour. Pluralistic ignorance occurs when individuals engage in a healthy behaviour but they think that they are in a minority. False consensus errors occur when people believe that they are in the majority, but when in fact, they are in the minority (Ross,
Greene, & House, 1977). The last type of error in social norms theory is false uniqueness, an error in which individuals consider their behaviour to be unique when it is not. These types of errors relate to sexualized violence because there are numerous hypothetical situations in which young men opposed to sexualized violence remain silent bystanders because of the assumption that most of their peers support sexist attitudes, when in reality they do not (pluralistic ignorance). Social norms theorists posit that the more men believe that sexist attitudes supporting rape are outside the norm, the more likely they are to intervene when witnessing acts of sexualized violence.

An example of an intervention that uses a social norms framework is Men as Allies. This program consists of male students taking three 45-minute sessions taught by a teacher with knowledge in sexualized violence prevention. These three sessions cover various themes including: language used to empower men to be the change, emphasizing the role of men as bystanders to stop the perpetration of sexualized violence against females, and incorporating male role models. In relation to social norms theory, the comparison of the two “Discomfort with Sexist Situations” scales at pre-intervention showed that individuals were likely to rate their peers as more sexist than themselves. At post-intervention, those in the experimental group thought that their peer had less sexist attitudes, and that they were more likely to intervene in uncomfortable sexist situations. When males received this intervention, compared to pre-intervention, their average mean scores on the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance scale (Payne, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999) showed lower acceptance of rape-supportive attitudes, and these attitudes changes were maintained at four-week follow up. Similarly, the What Would You Do—Typical Guy scale (Hillenbrand-Gunn, 2003) showed higher scores at post-intervention and at follow-up, indicating a greater likelihood of males intervening in instances of sexualized violence.

At the high school level, the Safe Dates program uses aspects of social norms theory for their sexualized violence intervention. Safe Dates (Foshee et al., 1998) was one of the first programs for the prevention of adolescent dating violence in North America. This program hoped to serve as both a primary and secondary prevention program for sexualized violence. The aims of the primary prevention aspect of this program include changing norms about partner violence, decreasing gender stereotyping, and improving conflict management skills.
The goals of the secondary prevention aspect of the program were changing beliefs about the need for help, and awareness of services for victims and perpetrators of partner violence.

In order to achieve their primary and secondary prevention objectives, Safe Dates employed school and community activities. School activities included a theatre production performed by peers, a 10-session curriculum, and a poster contest. Community activities included creating special services for victims of dating violence, such as crisis lines, and 20 sessions of community service training for laypeople (Foshee et al., 1998).

In the analysis of the Safe Dates program, researchers divided the participants into control and treatment groups, and in addition to these groups, the researchers created two subgroups of students, one group consisting of individuals who have never perpetrated or had been victimized by dating violence, and another group consisting of individuals who were victims or perpetrators of dating violence. Half of those with no history of violence perpetration or victimization received the study intervention, which consisted of the primary prevention program of Safe Dates. Overall, students in the prevention group, when compared to controls, reported significantly less psychological abuse perpetration, dating violence perpetration, were less supportive of proscribed dating violence and gender norms, used more constructive communication skills, and were more aware of victim services. Participants in the treatment group who already perpetrated or experienced dating violence showed lower endorsement in psychological abuse and sexual violence perpetration that trended towards significance when compared to controls.

In summary, there is empirical support for programs that use either a social norms or bystander model for changing behaviours and attitudes about sexualized violence. At the time of this literature review, most of the programs employed and developed with the bystander model have been utilized at the university level. Given their success, with a little modification, the bystander model could be used at the middle school and high school level. The two programs that have employed social norms theory, Men as Allies and Safe Dates have been shown to affect change at the high school level. Overall, there is support that using ecological interventions at both the university and high school level is an effective way to cause desirable change in behaviours and attitudes about sexualized violence.
Violence Prevention in Intimate Relationships

A second set of prevention programs for sexualized violence has focused on interpersonal violence in dyadic relationships at a high school level. In these interventions, sexualized violence is not a main focus; rather, it is discussed in the context of dating violence as one form of abuse. Sexualized violence in the context of non-intimate relationships (i.e., sexualized violence in the context of bullying) is addressed less often. Safe Dates, which has already been discussed, is an example of such a program. Other examples of empirically supported interventions are the 4th R (Wolfe et al., 2009), Expect Respect (Ball, Rosenbulth, & Aoki, 2008), and Shifting Boundaries (Taylor, Stein, Mumford, & Woods, 2012).

The 4th R (Wolfe et al., 2009) is a program that addresses the overall promotion of healthy interpersonal relationships among Grade 9 students. The lessons delivered in this program are divided into three major units: Personal Safety and Injury Prevention; Healthy Growth and Sexuality; and Substance Use and Abuse. Each unit comprises seven lessons, delivered in 75-minute in classroom session. The 4th R does include a lesson that discusses sexualized violence that is presented only in the context of intimate partners and/or dating dyads. Results from a pre- and post-intervention analysis of this program showed that physical dating violence (PDV) perpetration rates increased between Grade 9 and Grade 11, but the rates were higher at schools that did not receive any 4th R lessons. Analysis also showed that there was a significant effect of gender on PDV. Boys who received the intervention showed lower rates of PDV compared to boys at control schools. No significant intervention effects of PDV were noted for girls in either group (Wolfe et al., 2009).

Similar to the 4th R, the Expect Respect program is a program designed to prevent and reduce dating violence among at-risk middle and high school students (Ball, Tharp, Noonan, Valle, Hamburger & Rosenbluth, 2012). Once again, like the 4th R, Expect Respect does not explicitly focus on sexualized violence as a form of bullying; it touches upon the topic of sexualized violence through the lens of dyadic dating relationships. Overall, Expect Respect focuses on “peers, acceptance and justification of violence, trauma, and a deficit in social skills” (Ball et al., 2012). This program consists of 24 sessions designed to provide participants with a safe place to share their experiences, give and receive emotional support, and learn skills for healthy relationships (Ball, Rosenbluth, & Aoki, 2008). These 24 sessions are structured around 5 units: developing group skills, choosing equality and respect, recognizing abusive
relationships, learning skills for healthy relationships, and becoming a proponent of healthy relationships (Ball et al., 2012). The 55 minute sessions are highly structured, and each of session runs in the following manner: 5 minute check in, 15 minutes of educational material, 30 minutes of group activities and instruction, and, a 5 minute wrap up.

When the program was evaluated (Ball, Kerig, & Rosenbluth, 2009), gender specific outcomes were noted. Boys felt that they acquired better skills in communication and anger management, while girls felt that they learned assertiveness and appropriate expectations about how to be treated by their partners, and reported higher self-esteem. This evaluation showed that healthy conflict resolution behaviours increased over the course of the intervention. However, researchers found no reduction in victimization and perpetration rates of dating violence over the course of the intervention.

*Shifting Boundaries* (Taylor, Stein, Mumford, & Woods, 2012) is a relatively new dating violence and sexual harassment prevention program, informed by the theory of response action (TRA). TRA states that attitudes towards norms and perceived norms about desired behaviour facilitate the intention to change, modify, or adopt a particular behaviour. In this way, TRA is similar to social norms theory. *Shifting Boundaries* is unique from the other reviewed programs, as it focuses on middle school students (Grade 6 and 7) instead of high school students, and it contains lessons that address sexual violence outside the dating context.

For 6 to 10 weeks, students in the *Shifting Boundaries* experimental group were placed in one of three intervention groups. One group received a classroom-based intervention. This intervention consisted of a six-session curriculum taught by a trained teacher, counselor, or facilitator. The lessons in this program included emphasizing consequences of perpetrating dating violence/sexual harassment, the legal aspects of sexualized and dating violence in New York State and America, setting and communicating one’s boundaries in interpersonal relationships, and the role of bystanders as interveners. The second treatment group received a building-based intervention, in which students focused on learning and implementing strategies to make their school building safer (for example, where to put hall monitors during break). This intervention consisted of introducing building specific temporary restraining orders, placement of posters in the school building raising awareness of reporting dating violence, and identifying unsafe areas of schools. The third treatment group received both classroom and building based
interventions. The control group in the *Shifting Boundaries* evaluation received no intervention (Taylor, Stein, Mumford, & Woods, 2012).

Evaluation of *Shifting Boundaries* was done by pencil and paper surveys distributed to all groups at pre- and post-intervention, and at 6-month follow up. Evaluation of this program showed that the classroom-based intervention was not effective at reducing rates of sexual harassment or dating violence. When analyzing the data, the building-based intervention and combined intervention made significant impact on desired outcome or reducing dating violence and sexual harassment. Compared to all groups, the building-based intervention is the only one that was associated with the intention to act as a bystander, but this change was only present at 6-month follow up. Similarly at 6-month follow up, the building-based intervention reduced victimization and perpetration of dating violence by about 50%. Right after the intervention, those in the building based group were more likely to intend to avoid perpetrating violent behaviours and had more pro-social intentions. The combined and building based interventions reduced sexual harassment by 26-34% at 6-month follow-up. Likewise, these two intervention types led to a 32-47% reduction in the rate of peer sexual violence victimization and perpetration at 6-month follow up. However, the data analysis showed that there was an increase in prevalence of sexual harassment at schools that received the intervention, but the researchers decided upon further analysis that the reported increase was a spurious result (Taylor, Stein, Mumford, & Woods, 2011).

In summary, there have been several violence prevention programs that have been created for the middle school and high school populations that have been successful in reducing the frequency of the undesirable behaviours. These programs include the 4th R, *Expect Respect*, and *Shifting Boundaries*. Most of these programs address the issues of dyadic interpersonal dating violence and briefly touch on the topic of sexualized violence. The most recently developed of these interventions, *Shifting Boundaries*, focuses both on dating and sexualized violence bullying in the middle school population. Although these programs differ from the aims of our novel intervention, each of these programs has their strengths and provides lessons into what works in prevention programming at the middle school and high school level.

**Cyberbullying Prevention Programs**

Cyberbullying is a relatively new phenomenon that coincided with the rise of the mass use of the Internet, smartphones, and social media. As a result, developments in prevention
programming for cyberbullying are in their nascent stages and there are currently few empirically validated cyberbullying prevention programs (Snakenborg, J., Van Acker, R., & Gable, R.A., 2011). Likewise, there is no current empirical evidence on whether a school based bullying prevention program can reduce the perpetration of cyberbullying (Williford et al., 2013). Presently, most prevention programs created to address cyberbullying in North America are extensions of traditional anti-bullying curricula. Examples of such programs include the iSAFE Internet program (i-SAFE Inc., 1998), and Lets Fight it Together: What We All Can Do to Prevent Cyberbullying (Childnet, 2007). Some authors posit that a traditional anti-bullying curriculum has the potential to be extended to cover cyberbullying (Slonje et al., 2013) though others doubt full transferability of impact due to the different contexts in which cyberbullying occurs (Williford et al., 2013). Empirical examinations of these programs are not yet available to provide evidence one way or the other.

Europe is somewhat ahead in terms of addressing cyber-bullying with a number of curricula currently in the process of being empirically validated. One example is Finland’s KiVa program that uses a bystander approach to prevent cyber-bullying (Williford et al., 2013). Although initially it may appear to be counter-intuitive to use a bystander prevention approach for cyberbullying, a Swedish study reported that roughly 20% of primary and secondary school youth have been targeted as bystanders (Slonje, Smith, & Frisen, 2012). Bystanders in cyberbullying, also known as “actively targeted bystanders,” are pupils who have been sent information or images that are intended to cyberbully someone else. Similarly, studies show that cyberbullying occurs frequently in a youth’s social network, which is often made up of their classroom peers as bystanders (Mishna, Saini, & Solomon, 2009).

The KiVa program consists of classroom based activities, teacher-training modules, indicated actions, and a parent’s guide. There are curricula for grades 4-6 and 7-9. Both curriculums consist of 20 hours of classroom time, but the lessons are divided differently based on age. In grade 4-6 the lessons are one hour and are presented weekly, while in the upper grades (7-9), four longer lessons are presented at different times of the year. Teachers are trained step-by-step to deliver lessons, and after the lessons, youth participate in computer programs meant to reinforce their lessons. The classroom-based lessons consisted of raising awareness of the role the group plays in maintaining bullying, increasing empathy towards victims, and promoting strategies for supporting victims of bullying. The parents’ guide contains
general advice for parents on how to work with schools and their children to address bullying (Williford et al., 2013).

For an evaluation of the KiVa program, a group of schools in Finland were randomly assigned to the KiVa curriculum or no intervention (control). For both grades 4-6 and 7-9, the groups’ data was collected at baseline, during the winter, and the spring following the intervention for a total of three waves of data collection. When evaluated using multilevel ordinal regressions, the initial evidence from the KiVa program suggested that it can be an effective program to reduce the frequency of cyberbullying and cybervictimization in elementary or middle school students, but the effects are age dependent. Across all age groups there was a decrease in cyber victimization. However, an age effect was present; younger participants (under the age of 12) showed larger decreases in the perpetration of cyberbullying when compared to older peers.

Another cyberbullying prevention program from Europe is the ConRed cyberbullying prevention program from Spain (Ortega-Ruiz, Del Ray, & Casas, 2012). While its overarching goal is to reduce cyberbullying, other goals of the ConRed program are to decrease the amount of time on digital devices, and to improve perceived control over information on the Internet. The theoretical underpinning of this program is normative social behaviour theory (Rimal et al., 2005). Normative social behaviour theory posits that human behaviour and attitudes are influenced by perceived social conventions (Ortega-Ruiz, Del Ray, & Casas, 2012). In the case of cyberbullying, youth may see how they communicate online to be normal and inevitable, and are unaware of its consequences. For this literature review, we will only be focusing on scales and results related to cyberbullying component of this intervention.

The ConRed program uses four strategies: proactive policies, procedures, and practices (how to use technology safely and healthily); school community key understandings and competencies (instructing students, teachers, and parents to facilitate safe and healthy use of the internet and social networks); protective school environment (creating safe communication spaces in schools); and school-family-community partnership (Ortega-Ruiz, Del Ray, & Casas, 2012). ConRed was also designed to be holistic, engaging students, teachers, and community to prevent cyberbullying by raising the levels of technical, procedural, and communication expertise and social skills on the Internet and social networks (Ortega-Ruiz, Del Ray & Casas, 2012). This program was delivered over the course of 8 classes from a manual written to address
the goals of the program. The *ConRed* program was evaluated with a quasi-experimental, ex post facto, longitudinal design with pre- and post-measurements for an experimental and control group. When compared to controls, students who received the *ConRed* program reported less cyberbullying behaviour with more pronounced differences in cyberbullying behaviour reported by boys than girls.

From this literature review, it becomes apparent that the creation and research into prevention and intervention programs for cyberbullying is in the early stage. Currently, most cyberbullying prevention and intervention programs with empirical research, such as *KiVa* and *ConRed*, are based in Europe. These European programs have been shown to reduce cyberbullying behaviours, although the effects seem to be age and gender related. Yet, from these programs one can glean information, such as the ideal age for intervention, for developing an effective cyberbullying intervention for North America.

**Conclusions, Gaps, and Recommendations**

Sexualized violence, as experienced either in-person or online, is an important and prevalent concern for today’s youth. Over 40% of high school youth report being a victim of harassing sexual comments, jokes, gestures, or looks and many have experienced some form of sexual bullying online. There is robust theory for intervening to end this type of sexual bullying. Using a feminist perspective, programs should address behaviours on the broad spectrum of sexual violence, from sexist language and verbal harassment to more frank instances of sexual bullying. Online methods of sexual bullying and victimization need to be a prominent component of prevention when targeting the adolescent age group given their frequent use of technology for social interaction (health and unhealthy). Drawing from the bystander model of bullying intervention, a critical component for change is empowering those surrounding victims and perpetrators to step in to end bullying. Social norms theory also helpfully directs prevention efforts at addressing perceived norms for both engaging in sexual bullying and for taking action to stop such behaviour when it is observed.

There are a number of empirically supported programs for addressing bullying, cyberbullying, and interpersonal and sexual violence, but surprisingly few addressing the intersection of these concerns in early adolescence. Programs such as *Safe Dates*, the *4th R*, and *Expect Respect*, provide frameworks of successful interpersonal violence prevention/intervention programs at the high school level. Unfortunately, with their focus on
dating and intimate relationships, curricula of these programs offer limited resources for addressing sexual bullying between non-dating partners. Cyberbullying and online safety is addressed in programs such as KiVa and ConRed, but once again, the sexual aspects of bullying that become prominent at this age appear to be minimally addressed. Programs that do explicitly and directly address sexual harassment and bullying, such as Bringing in the Bystander, and the Green Dot, only target college-age students. Only one recent program, Shifting Boundaries, provides groundwork and structure of a dating and sexualized violence prevention program at the middle school level. Unlike previous programs, aspects of Shifting Boundaries focus exclusively on sexualized violence in this population and provide information about how to address and evaluate the problem of sexualized violence in this age group. Given the promise of early results of evaluation of this program, it should be seriously considered for possible use in Ontario as well.

As a result of this literature review, a new program called Pass it On was created by community members in London, Ontario, Canada with the goal of affecting change in knowledge, attitudes and beliefs about sexualized violence and bystander behaviour in both male middle and high school students. This Pass it On program is thought to be the first program that exclusively discusses sexualized violence with this age group and integrates bystander strategies in order to combat sexualized violence and cyberbullying. Overall, it was hypothesized that youth enrolled in the Pass it On group would show positive significant changes in knowledge, attitudes and beliefs about sexualized violence, bystander behaviour and cyberbullying.
Methods

Pass it On Project Development

The *Pass it On* project was developed by community agencies, Changing Ways London and the London Sexual Assault Centre, both based out of London, Ontario, Canada. Prior to the creation of the curriculum, students were invited to participate in focus groups and complete questionnaires, while educators completed questionnaires in order to gauge their perception of the problem of sexualized violence/gender based bullying in their school environment.

Program Development Focus Groups and Questionnaires

**Students.** The purpose of conducting the program development focus groups with students was to get an understanding of their perception of sexualized violence in their schools. In addition, these focus groups assessed characteristics of an after school program that would entice students to participate. Characteristics that were examined in this part of the program development groups included: length of program, material covered by program, program delivery, program facilitator, and compensation. A total of 59 middle school and high school students participated in these groups. In addition, 93 male students completed a short questionnaire about perception of sexualized violence and ideal program structure, for a total of 152 students. All students who participated were enrolled in the Thames Valley District School Board (TVDSB) at the time of the focus groups. The schools selected for the program development group consisted of a cross section of urban, suburban, and rural schools. One focus group was conducted as a mixed gender group, one focus group was separated by gender, and one group was comprised exclusively of male students. Questionnaires were disturbed to students asking them about their perception of sexualized violence in their schools, what they knew about, and what they would like to learn about sexualized violence prevention, and what would entice them to attend an extra-curricular group (Appendix B). Further, students were allowed to orally elaborate on any questions they were asked. These groups took place between March and May of 2014.

**Educators.** A total of 54 middle school and high school educators (teachers and administrators) filled out questionnaires about their perceptions of sexualized violence in their schools and opinion questions about what they perceive to be both personal and systemic barriers and facilitators of discussing and/or teaching about sexualized violence (Appendix C). At the time of the questionnaire distribution, all personnel were employees of the Thames
Valley District School Board. These answers were used to get a better understanding the educators’ perception of sexualized violence in their schools. Parents were also asked for input using a questionnaire (Appendix D) similar to the teacher’s questionnaire, but only two parents completed the questionnaire, and thus no analysis occurred.

**Program development analysis.** The results of the questionnaires distributed during the program development groups were analyzed using frequency tables in order to establish what would interest students to come out to a sexualized violence prevention program, and what topics they would like to cover.

**Curriculum Development**

Results of the focus groups were used by community members from Changing Ways London and the Sexual Assault Centre London were used to develop the initial curriculum used by the *Pass it On* project. The basic lesson structure is the following:

1. Defining positive, healthy, relationships and consent
2. Unpacking and discussing what it means to “be a man”
3. Understanding cyberbullying and its impacts
4. Bystander intervention—or how to respond when you see cyberbullying
5. Becoming a media ambassador - critiquing the media and their messages

Development of the curriculum specifics was dynamic, incorporating youth participant feedback from previous sessions in order to inform the upcoming lesson. The rationale behind this type of curriculum development model was to acknowledge that the students know themselves and their environment best and should have input into what and how they are learning.

**Pass it On Project Implementation**

**Program delivery.** The *Pass it On* project was run for five consecutive weeks by one or two trained facilitators, depending on group size, after school or during the lunch hour. Each session lasted between 45 and 60 minutes. Students who participated in these sessions received pizza at the beginning of each session, and were compensated with gift cards for local restaurants and businesses at the end of each session.

**Participants.** A total of 64 students all enrolled in the Thames Valley District School Board (TVDSB) took part in the *Pass it On* project. These students volunteered to take part in this program. These students were recruited from their classrooms after a teacher or Vice Principal came in and discussed the program and participation. They were recruited for this
project, as per the project’s aim of reducing positive sexualized violence attitudes and increasing bystander behaviour in male students. Both the University of Toronto and Thames Valley District School Board ethics committees approved for this project. The age range of participants was 11-18 years old, with the majority of participants being enrolled in middle school ($n = 44$). The average age of participants was 13.1 years old ($SD = 1.56$).

**Wave 1.** Wave 1 was held in November-December 2014. In this wave, a total of 32 students participated from two elementary schools ($n = 17$ and $n = 12$) and from one high school ($n = 4$). During this wave, the programing for the *Pass it On* project occurred after school. Data was collected from students who were present in the first and fifth session of the project. It is important to note that the lower number of participants at post-intervention is due to those participants not being present at the final session, and not because the youth did not consent to participation. Of these participants, 75% (24/32) completed both pre and post-intervention questionnaires, 22% (7/32) filled out the pre-intervention questionnaire only, and 3% (1/32) completed the post-intervention questionnaire only.

**Wave 2.** Wave 2 was held during March-April 2015. During this wave, a total of 32 students participated in the project from one elementary school ($n = 16$), one high school ($n = 11$) and from a high school aged Children’s Aid Society group ($n = 5$). During this wave of data collection, the elementary and high school groups occurred during the lunch break. For the participants of the Children’s Aid group, the sessions occurred after school. Data was collected from students who were present in the first and fifth session of the project. In this wave, 72% of participants (23/32) filled out both pre- and post-intervention questionnaires, 16% completed the pre-intervention questionnaire only (5/32) and 12.5% (4/32) completed the post-intervention questionnaires only. Overall, the rate of participants completing both pre- and post-intervention questionnaires was 73% (47/64).

**Measurements**

K. Scott and A. Winegust developed pre-intervention and post-intervention questionnaire for the purpose of this study. Although these questionnaires were original and program specific, sections of the questionnaire were adapted from the *Shifting Boundaries* evaluation questionnaire (Taylor, Stein, Mumford & Woods, 2012). Questionnaires were used to assess participants’ knowledge (e.g. “what is sexualized violence?”), attitudes (e.g. “It’s okay to make a rape joke”) and beliefs (e.g. “girls lie about rape to get back at their boyfriends”) about both
sexualized violence and bystander behaviours of youth. Examples of cyberbullying were embedded in the questions asking about sexualized violence. Two versions of the questionnaire were created in order to counterbalance questions between times and between groups (Appendix E and Appendix F). Questions that did not show results were dropped from Wave 1 to Wave 2, resulting in a shorter questionnaire given to Wave 2 participants (Appendix G, Appendix H). A shortened version of the questionnaire was distributed at the post-intervention evaluation, taking out the demographic and prevalence sections.

The pre-intervention questionnaires were completed at the beginning of the first session, prior to the students receiving any of the lessons, and the post-intervention questionnaire was completed at the end of the fifth session, regardless of whether the student participated in the pre-intervention questionnaire. Prior to completing the questionnaire, students were told that they could participate in the *Pass it On* project without participating in research and that they would receive compensation for their participation regardless of their research participation. Finally, students were told that they would be able to withdraw from the research and/or the programming whenever they wanted and without penalty any time until the end of the study data collection. Questionnaires took approximately 10-20 minutes to complete at both pre- and post-intervention evaluations.

The following part of the Methods chapter reviews each specific section of the evaluation questionnaire.

**Section one: Participant profile and technology use.** This section, which was only completed at the pre-intervention/first assessment, consisted of demographic questions including age, grade, and gender. These questions were asked in order to get a better understanding of the composition of each participating group. In addition to the demographic questions, students were asked about personal messenger device (i.e. iPod, cellphone) ownership and the amount of time they use each device on a daily basis. Similarly, youth were asked about home computer ownership and average use on weekdays and weekends.

**Section two: Video scenarios.** In the second section of the questionnaire, videos were shown that had some act of sexualized violence portrayed in them. Participants were shown one of two videos that were counterbalanced between groups, and between times. For instance, group one would receive version A at pre-intervention and version B and post-intervention and group two would receive version B at pre-intervention and version A at post-intervention. After
being shown these videos, students were asked to rate the responsibility of the victim, perpetrator, and bystander in causing or intervening in this situation on a scale of 1 to 10. A rating of 1 meant that the person was not responsible at all for the situation, while a rating of 10 meant that the person was completely responsible for the situation. Another question that the students had to answer was about their willingness to “step-in”/ intervene to help the victim out in the situation they saw. Answers for this question were given on a Likert scale, with 1 being “Not Likely” and 5 being “Always Likely.”

In addition, this section of the questionnaire had written answers. First, students were asked to identify what type of sexualized violence was present in the video. These answers were coded based on the amount of insight the participant had into what occurred on screen. Second, students were asked to write down what possible actions a bystander in the video could have taken (see coding section for details). These answers were coded based on the type and number of strategies given. Third, students were asked to reflect on how they would have responded and intervened in the situation. Like the previous question, the responses were coded for the type and number of strategies given. Finally, students were asked to write down what would have prevented them from engaging in the situation. This question was used to understand why students in this age group would be reluctant to help a peer.

Section three: Written scenarios. In this section of the questionnaire, students were given a scenario where sexualized and/or gender based violence has the potential to occur, and were then asked about their willingness to intervene in the situation based on the friend status (friend or not a friend) of the perpetrator or victim. There were two scenarios possible for this question that were dependent on the version of the questionnaire. Responses to the four questions were rated on a Likert Scale, with 1 representing “Not Likely” to step in and 5 being “Always Likely” to step in.

Section four: When is it OK To? Tolerance measurement. In this section, students were asked about their tolerance for certain verbal, physical, or cyber sexualized bullying behavior; for example, students were asked, “when is it OK to send a sext?” Students were then asked to select how often this kind of behaviour is permissible. The options were presented on a scale of 0-3 with “Never” (0) representing a low tolerance for this behaviour, and “This is not a big deal, pretty much OK” representing a high tolerance for this behaviour.
Section five: Recognizing sexualized violence in peer group. In this section, students were asked if they were present with someone while they were being victimized or perpetuating sexualized/gender based violence. Participants were asked to select from a list the frequency that they have witnessed either scenario, ranging from “I haven’t been with anyone…” to “several times a week or more.” These questions were used as an approximation for the prevalence of sexualized violence in the participant’s life. In addition, students were asked to indicate where this type of bullying took place, whether it was primarily face to face, or in an online context. These questions were used to approximate the prevalence of cyber bullying in this group of students. Finally, students were also asked about what they did in these situations in order to assess if any effective bystander behaviour was present prior to the Pass it On project and if they have changed over the course of program delivery.

Section six: Attitude measurements. In this section, participants were asked to rate their attitudes towards questions posed in this section of the questionnaire. The questions used in this section of the questionnaire were adapted from the evaluation of the Shifting Boundaries program (Taylor, Stein, Mumford & Woods, 2012). A total of nine questions were asked in this part of the questionnaire. From these nine questions, four subscales were measured for our study: Victim Blaming (Cronbach’s α = .62), Perception of Sexualized Violence as a Problem (Cronbach’s α = .80), Intention to Confront Sexualized Violence (Cronbach’s α = .75), and Bystander Efficacy (Cronbach’s α = .64). The Cronbach’s alphas were consistent, or better, with the alphas in Stein et al.’s (2012) evaluation of Shifting Boundaries. Questions were scored on a scale of -2 (Strongly Disagree) to +2 (Strongly Agree). A score of 0 (Unsure) indicated that the student was “fence sitting” in regards to the question, and had neither a positive nor negative attitude towards the statement.

Section seven: Prevalence. This section of the questionnaire was used to measure the prevalence of sexualized violence victimization in the participants. Participants were asked if they had been a victim of sexualized violence, the frequency and duration of their victimization, what specifically occurred, the context of the bullying (online vs. face to face), the emotional valance, and what they did when they were victimized. These prevalence questions were only asked at pre-intervention.

Section eight: Oral questions. When the students submitted their questionnaires to the researcher, they were asked one of three oral questions to further gauge their understanding of,
tolerance for, and intentions regarding verbal, physical, and cyber violence. Information gained from these questions did not add meaningfully to the information youth provided on surveys and they were discontinued in Wave 2.

**Exit interviews.** After the final questionnaire was completed, participants were interviewed in small groups to get their feedback about the program’s content and what they had learned from this program (Appendix I). More specifically, participants were asked about the most important thing they learned about gender based bullying from this program, and what specific bystander strategies they would use if they saw gender based bullying occurring in their school. These questions were conducted in an oral manner and the researcher jotted down the most important points said by the participants. Answers provided for the content of the program were used to help inform future program development. These exit interviews took approximately 6-12 minutes to complete depending on the group size and the information participants were willing to share.

Facilitators of the project in Wave 1 were also given an exit questionnaire asking to reflect on the facilitators and barriers to run a successful group (Appendix J). The answers provided by the facilitators (n =4) were used to inform the implementation of Wave 2. Facilitators (n =3) were also asked the same questions at the end of Wave 2 in order to inform further program development.

**Data Analysis**

Demographic data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and frequency tables. The data from Wave 2 were collapsed into Wave 1 in order to increase power. Only people who completely completed both questionnaires at pre- and post-intervention were included in the final data analysis (n =47).

Mixed MANVOAs (with time as the within factor and school type as the between factor) were conducted to assess whether measures showed pre- to post- group differences. Only significant results are reported in this thesis. For section three of the questionnaire (Written Scenarios), the questions were collapsed into friend categories (friend vs. not good friend) and analyzed using an ANOVA to assess for change in the likelihood of intervening based on friend status over time. Since this is an exploratory study alpha was set at .10, which increases the likelihood of a Type 1 error (false positive), but allows for a more liberal examination of
possible program effects for this pilot implementation. All statistical analysis was conducted using SPSS V.22.

**Coding scheme.** There were a number of written answer questions created to measure different areas of the students’ knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs about sexualized violence. These questions were used in the Video scenario section of the questionnaire. There was also a written component in the “Recognizing sexualized violence in peer group” section of the questionnaire. Two raters, who were blind to each other’s answers, coded all written answers. Overall, there was a 92.8% level of agreement overall between the two coders in this section of the questionnaire.

The first question of the video scenario section of the questionnaire asked the participants to identify what sexualized violence occurred in the scenario, if there was any. The answers were coded on a scale of -1 to 3. A score of -1 indicated that the student wrote that there was no sexualized violence in the scenario (which was incorrect, as all scenarios included sexualized violence). A score of 0 was given to students who wrote an irrelevant answer or did not answer the question. A score of 1 indicated that they gave a vague answer, such as writing something like “I saw abuse” or “Sexual harassment.” The next level, a score of 2, was given to students who simply described the situation. An example of this type of answer would be “The type of sexualized violence I saw was hands on” or “touching the girl.” A student would only get the highest score of 3 if the answer included a description, and an indication of the idea of consent, or an emotional reaction to the situation. An example of this type of answer would be “Billy was trying to touch Jessica when she didn’t want him to.” For this specific question there was a 91.7% level of agreement between the two coders.

The second video scenario question asked the participants to indicate what the bystander in the video could have done. This question was used to measure the youths’ ability to recognize that there was a bystander in the scenario and if the youth would be able to give an appropriate bystander response. In question 3, the students were asked to write down what they would do as a bystander if they saw the scenario play out in front of them. There were five different levels of coding for this question. A score of “-1” indicated that the student said that the person could not do anything, or could in fact join in with the bully. A score of “0” indicated that the student did not write an answer, wrote something irrelevant, or said that they don’t know the answer to the question. A score of “1” indicated that the student gave a vague response. An example of this
would be an answer of “she could have intervened”. In this response, the participant can correctly identify the bystander, but does elaborate further by giving an example of bystander behavior that the person could engage in. Finally, students who wrote an appropriate bystander response got a score of “2a” (e.g. “I would have told the guy to leave her alone or I’d take Jessica out of the situation”), and those who gave an inappropriate response got a code of “2b” (e.g. “Tell them to fuck off”). The frequency of answers was evaluated to see if there was a change in the type of response from pre-intervention to post-intervention. The coding scheme for question 2 is the same for question 3. The agreement level between the two coders was 94.5% for question 2 and 92.5% for question 3.

The final qualitative answer for the Video scenario was a question asking students what would prevent them from engaging in bystander behaviour. A score of “-1” was given to students who said they would not intervene without giving a reason. A code of “0” indicated that the student did not give an answer or wrote something irrelevant. A code of “1” was given to youth who said that nothing would prevent them from intervening. For the reasons that were given for not intervening fell into three groups: verbal (e.g. “I don’t want making fun of me”), physical (e.g. “The amount of people bullying her”), or social (e.g. “If the people were my friends”) reasons. These reasons were coded and the frequencies of responses were analyzed from pre-intervention to post-intervention to assess for change in participant’s self-efficacy. A summary of the coding scheme is provided in Appendix K.

In addition to written answers for the video scenario, there were other written answer questions asking participants if they have ever witnessed someone perpetrating sexualized violence or being victimized in this manner in the past two months. In addition to this question, participants were asked to write what they did or did not do to intervene in the situation. Since so few participants answered these questions, the answers were not analyzed.
Results

Program Development Focus Groups and Questionnaires

**Students.** A total of 152 students completed the program development questionnaire. Students were first asked about their perception of the problem of sexualized violence in their school. The results are summarized in Table 1 and revealed that about 60% of student respondents see sexualized violence as a problem in their school, with the majority feeling that it is a bit of a problem (as opposed to a pretty big or very big problem).

**Table 1.** Students’ perspective of sexualized violence in their schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not a problem</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bit of a problem</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretty Big Program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Big Program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the purpose of these focus groups was to inform program development, the remaining questions analyzed from the focus groups concentrated on elucidating program factors that would entice students to participate. Generally, students noted that they wanted to gain a better understanding of the definition of sexualized violence \( (n = 123, 80.9\%) \), intervention skills when they see sexualized bullying \( (n = 111, 73.0\%) \) and how to defend themselves against sexualized bullying \( (n = 106, 69.8\%) \). It is important to note that students were able to select more than one skill to learn. Another important aspect of programming was to determine what incentives should be used to attract participants to the program. In the program development questionnaire, food \( (n = 108, 71.1\%) \) was the most popular incentive, followed by volunteer hours \( (n = 71, 46.1\%) \), gift cards \( (n = 62, 40.1\%) \) and a certificate of completion \( (n = 37, 24.3\%) \).

**Teachers.** The first issue explored with teachers was whether or not they perceived sexualized violence as a problem in their schools. A majority of teachers \( (n = 37, 68.5\%) \) viewed sexualized violence as a problem in their school compared to 16.7% \( (n = 9) \) of teachers who felt that it was not a problem. The remaining teachers didn’t know if sexualized violence was a problem \( (n = 2, 3.6\%) \), or felt that it depended on the school they teach in \( (n = 1, 1.9\%) \).
Just under 10% \((n = 5, 9.3%)\) of teachers did not respond to this question. In addition, teachers were asked about what they perceived to be a contributor to sexualized violence in their school. The vast majority of teachers \((n = 49, 90.6\%)\) endorsed that social media is a major contributor to sexualized violence at schools.

This educator questionnaire revealed that the vast majority of teachers \((n=53, 98\%)\) felt that it was important for sexualized violence to be discussed and taught in school. In terms of perceived facilitators and barriers to discussing this topic with their students, 76.0% \((n=41)\) of teachers indicated that they are “comfortable” to “extremely comfortable” discussing sexualized violence with their students. Although this number is high, several teachers wrote that they would be more comfortable discussing this topic with older students and students who are the same gender as them. Teachers also noted that their comfort level is dependent upon their own knowledge, be it from PD day training, the health curriculum, or personal experience. Teachers who felt like they have a close relationship with their students, or who felt more aware of current pop- and social- culture, also felt more comfortable discussing this topic. Some teachers, though comfortable with the topic, feared that there would be some sort of backlash from the community or parents complaining if this topic is discussed with their children. One teacher lamented, “If only we had some sort of educational environment where sexual things were discussed.”

Although most teachers indicated that they had sufficient knowledge to discuss sexualized violence with their students, a significant minority \((n =11, 21.2\%)\) felt like they did not have the knowledge to discuss sexualized violence with their students or had only some of the knowledge they needed. When asked what information they would need in order to feel like they had the knowledge to discuss this topic, teachers indicated that they would like training, definitions, recent statistics, and access to evidence-based resources. Some teachers indicated that they would be interested in gaining strategies on how to incorporate this topic into a non-health studies classroom discussion.

**Pass it On: Intervention Results**

For the sake of clarity, the results of the *Pass it On* project will be presented in the manner that they are presented in the questionnaire. The discussion will thematically link different parts of the questionnaire together. In total, 64 youth participated in the *Pass it On*
project. Only 47 youth completed both pre- and post-intervention questionnaires, and these participants were included in the analysis.

**Preliminary analysis results.** Preliminary analysis of the questionnaire revealed several sections of the questionnaire showed ceiling effects. The first section that showed ceiling effects was the When is It OK to? attitude/tolerance section. When first administered to the youth in the pre-intervention of Wave 1, results indicated that there was already a low tolerance for gender-based violence, as most questions had a high frequency count (ranging from 95%-80%) of the “Never OK” response. This response pattern made it difficult to assess for change between pre-intervention and post-intervention, as few students would have a different answer. As a result, this section was dropped between Wave 1 and Wave 2.

Other sections that had too little meaningful distribution of data to analyze were sections that addressed prevalence. The first section of the questionnaire that attempted to assess for prevalence was the Recognizing sexualized violence in peer group section. Here, only six participants reported that they had been with someone who was either the perpetrator of sexualized violence or was being victimized. As a result, neither data on prevalence nor on the context of the bullying experiences were analyzed. The specific section that asked about the participant’s own experience with victimization was only administered at pre-intervention. Reported prevalence of victimization was extremely low and was not analyzed.

**Participant profile and technology use.** In terms of personal communication device ownership, 36 of 47 (76.6%) students owned one of these devices. The follow-up question asked how many messages they send a day. This question has a bimodal distribution. Students either sent 1-5 texts a day \((n = 9)\) or 51-60 texts a day \((n = 10)\). In terms of computers, 97.9% \((n = 46)\) said that they have a computer at home. Most participants indicated that on weekdays they spend less than an hour \((n = 21)\) or 1-2 \((n = 9)\) hours using the computer during the weekday and this pattern remains similar on the weekend.

**Video scenarios.** Because the questionnaire had two different scenarios, a mixed ANOVA was run to determine if the test version, time of writing the questionnaire or an interaction of the two, influenced participants’ ability to recognize and name the type of sexualized violence present in the video. Analysis showed that there was no significant multivariate effect. However, univariate analysis showed that the test version’s influence on the participant’s ability to recognize sexualized violence in the video trends approaches
conventional levels of significance \[ F(1, 41) = 2.971, p = .092, \eta^2 = .066 \]. There was no significant influence of school type on the outcomes \[ F(1, 41) = .779, p = .382, \eta^2 = .018 \].

Further analysis showed that there was a significant multivariate effect for the interaction of test version and time on the participants’ likelihood of intervening in the situation (Pillai’s Trace= .067, \( F(1,41) = 2.922, p = .095, \eta^2 = .067 \)). Table 2 shows the means and standard deviations of the likelihood of a person intervening depending on the time and test version. This table shows that participants who received Version A had a higher likelihood of intervening than those who received Version B. Regardless, the scores hovered around “3”, which indicated that students were “Likely” to intervene. Time did not have a significant effect on the likelihood of a participant intervening \[ F=.356, p=.554, \eta^2=.009 \].

Table 2. The estimated marginal means and the likelihood to intervene as influenced by time and test version

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Version</th>
<th>Version A</th>
<th>Version B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M(SD)</td>
<td>M(SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>3.52 (.219)</td>
<td>3.00 (.316)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>3.50 (.281)</td>
<td>3.27 (.195)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that overall on average, Version A has higher scores that Version B. Yet, in between pre-intervention (Time 1) and post-intervention (Time 2) there is a change in score for Version B that is not seen in Version A.

Test version also influenced the outcomes of participant’s responsibility attributions for the video. There was a significant multivariate effect of test version of participants’ responsibility attributions (Pillai’s Trace= .206, \( F(1,40) =3.454, p = .025, \eta^2 = .206 \)). There were no significant multivariate effects of time (Pillai’s Trace= .058, \( F(1,40)=.818, p=.492, \eta^2 = .058 \)) or time by test version interaction (Pillai’s Trace= .130, \( F(1,40)=1.996, p=.130, \eta^2 = .130 \)) on the results. Between subject analysis showed that test version had a significant main effect for victim responsibility attribution \[ F(1,42)=5.98, p=.019, \eta^2 = .125 \] and bully responsibility attribution \[ F(1,42)=6.57, p=.014, \eta^2 = .135 \] (Table 3). There was no significant main effect of test version on bystander responsibility \[ F(1,42)=.026, p=.873, \eta^2 = .001 \].
Table 3. The estimated marginal means of responsibility measures as influenced by test version on the perception of bully and victim responsibility between subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Version A M(SD)</th>
<th>Version B M(SD)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>2.90(.348)</td>
<td>1.39 (.509)</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bully</td>
<td>6.68(.494)</td>
<td>8.92(.818)</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows that in this instance, participants attributed lower responsibility to the victim and higher responsibility to the bully when responding to Version B.

When examining the responses between pre-intervention and post-intervention when the students are asked how they could intervene, the changes in answers were significant ($\chi^2=11.54$, $p=0.02$). At post-test, students were more likely to list an appropriate intervention option when compared to pre-test. Similarly, the number of inappropriate responses decreased from pre- to post-intervention for this question. This result indicates that the participants increased their knowledge about bystander behaviour, but it is unclear whether they changed their bystander behaviour per se.

**Written scenarios.** A repeated measure multivariate ANOVA was conducted to assess if time or friend status (friend vs. non-friend) made a difference in a person’s willingness to intervene in a situation. Multivariate analysis showed that friend status had a significant effect on a participant’s willingness to intervene (Pillai’s Trace= .114, $F (1, 40) =5.138, p =.029$, $\eta^2=.114$), Friends were significantly more likely to be helped out by a participant ($M =3.49, SD =.185$) compared to a non-friend ($M = 3.15, SD =.180$). School type had no significant influence on the results from this section of the questionnaire [$F (1,38) =1.256, p =.296, \eta^2=.062$]. Similarly the interaction between time and friend type was not significant (Pillai’s Trace= .047, $F (1, 40) =1.965, p =.169, \eta^2=.047$).

**Assessment of Attitudes.** A mixed measure ANOVA was conducted to assess whether school type (middle school v. high school), time, or an interaction of the two, made a difference in changing a participant’s attitude on the various attitude subscales.

Estimated marginal means of the subscales between middle school and high school are presented in Table 4. Findings revealed significant multivariate effects for school type (Pillai’s
Trace = 0.34, $F(4, 33) = 4.19, p < .01$). Findings also revealed significant univariate effects of school type on the results. Regarding school type, there was a significant main effect for "Victim Blaming", $[F(1, 36) = 4.94, p = .03, \eta^2 = .121]$, and “Intention to Confront Sexualized Violence”, $[F(1, 36) = 5.29, p = .03, \eta^2 = .128]$, and for the “Bystander Efficacy” subscale $[F(1, 36) = 3.72, p = .06, \eta^2 = .094]$. In all cases, the high school students reported better, more positive attitudes and efficacy ratings when compared to the middle school participants.

**Table 4.** Estimated marginal means, standard deviations and significance of between subject differences in different attitude subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Middle School M(SD)</th>
<th>High School M(SD)</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim Blaming</td>
<td>.481 (.153)</td>
<td>1.11 (.240)</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Confront</td>
<td>-.065 (.185)</td>
<td>.727 (.290)</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexualized Violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bystander Efficacy</td>
<td>.560 (.136)</td>
<td>1.08 (.214)</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings revealed no significant multivariate effects for time. However, findings revealed a significant univariate effect of time on the “Intention to Confront Sexualized Violence” subscale $[F(1, 33) = 5.60, p = .023, \eta^2 = .135]$. Overall, youth showed a positive change in this attitude measurement (pre-intervention $M = .102$, $SD = .188$ and post-intervention $M = .559$ and $SD = .206$). These results must be interpreted with caution given the non-significant multivariate effect and the increased likelihood of a type I error.

Overall, in multivariate analyses there was a significant interaction between school type and time when assessing for change in the attitude measurement subscales (Pillai’s Trace=.222, $F(1,33)=2.355, p=.074, \eta^2=.222$). Two univariate interaction effects were significant, specifically, the main effects in the “Victim Blaming” $[F(1,33)=3.135, p=.085, \eta^2 = .080]$ and “Intention to Confront Sexualized Violence” $[F(1,33)=3.556, p=.067, \eta^2 = .090]$ subscales. Figure 1 and Figure 2 demonstrates the interaction effects that were present for each subscale.
**Figure 1:** The interaction of school type and time on the outcome of the Victim Blaming Subscale

From the above figure, at baseline high school students already have higher attitude ratings compared to their middle school peers. Similarly, for high school students the attitude rating for this subscale increases and improves over time, while the middle school attitude ratings trend in the other direction, indicating a worsening of their attitudes for the Victim Blaming subscale.
Figure 2: The interaction between school type and time on the outcome of the Intention to Confront Sexualized Violence subscale

Similar to the Victim Blaming subscale, high school students show higher positive baseline attitudes when compared to middle school students. The changes in attitude increase and trends in the positive direction for the high school students, and there is slight positive change in attitudes for middle school students.

Exit Interviews- An Exploratory Analysis

Student interviews. At the end of the final Pass it On lesson, a total of 57 (n =57) students participated in small group interviews assessing likes and dislikes of program content and delivery, and what they took away from lessons. Similarly, these exit interviews allowed researchers to obtain information that may not have emerged in the questionnaire.

Program content and delivery. Overall, students enjoyed the program and said that it was valuable for their learning and personal growth. Participants said they enjoyed the program because it went more in-depth than previous school-based bullying prevention programs. Multiple participants indicated that having someone outside the school facilitate the program and an all-male setting was invaluable, as it allowed them to be freer with their thoughts and feelings about this topic without being judged. However, participants noted that girls would benefit from a similar program, and that the best structure for a program would be to have girls and boys learn separately and then come together for a final session at the end.
Skills learned. In terms of learning about sexualized violence, many of the participants stated that one of the most important things they learned in this program was how common sexualized violence is in their life, and their increase in awareness of the types of sexualized violence after completing the program. Several participants noted that learning that a man can also be a victim of sexualized violence was eye-opening and important. From a theoretical perspective, a prominent answer that repeatedly came up was that the most valuable discussion they had in this project was the discussion about the concept of gender and subsequent gender stereotypes.

When discussing bystander strategies, many participants still said that their first action would be to report it to a teacher or another adult authority figure. Although this strategy was given by both middle school and high school students, high school students recognized that teachers are sometimes unable to help in these situations, especially in situations of cyberbullying. In the older groups, another prominent bystander strategies given include taking the victim away from the situation in order to talk to them. Overall, it was noted by both researchers and facilitators that there was inconsistency between what the participants said about the prevalence of sexualized violence on the questionnaire, the exit interviews, and what was said in group (i.e., youth reported essentially not being a bystander to sexualized violence, yet talked about its pervasiveness).

Facilitator feedback. All facilitators felt that they learned from their experience running groups, and that this learning will be helpful for future project development. When reflecting about the participating youth, facilitators noted that participants still have discomfort and inexperience when talking about sexual issues, including what is sexual harassment and misconduct, and that there are few places for students to learn how to address bullying realistically. Rather, participants appeared to have begun the project with the understanding that “bullying is bad and harmful” but could not realistically identify bullying nor had strategies for responding to it.

When answering questions about group success, facilitators mentioned that group size was very important, as it affects the dynamic, which in turn, affects the quality of program delivery. Buy in from participants was an important characteristic for a successful group as facilitators said that there was a difference in genuinely interested boys and boys who were there only for the compensation. Having all male participants was also thought of as a strength, as it
was perceived as enhancing the openness and quality of the groups’ conversations. However, some facilitators thought that the age of the participants might influence the success of the program, as younger boys might not have the attention and cognitive abilities to comprehend the ideas being discussed and that facilitators also need to act in an assistive role in order to ensure that the program is being understood and internalized.

All facilitators acknowledged that having the sessions in an after school setting is the best way to deliver this program. Some thought that lunch might be a better time to run this program, as it could reach a wider audience. However, it was unanimous that the ideal setting for the delivery of the course material would be within the curriculum itself, when it is attached to a compulsory class (health, social studies etc.), as people who need this type of program the most would receive it. Yet, in this ideal situation, it would be guest facilitators running the program.

Suggestions were also given about improving the program for next time. Facilitators suggested adding more structure to the sessions for middle school participants, but keeping the flexibility for the high school students. Another suggestion included having lists of bystander interventions prepared so the participants are not stuck brainstorming. Related to this idea, one facilitator suggested inviting a boy who has been bullied to comment about which interventions they think would work the best. Other things that were recommended included using certain videos based on the age group, more realistic examples of cyberbullying and sexual violence, and a cap of 12 participants per group.
Discussion

The current study aimed to evaluate a sexualized violence prevention program using a feminist framework and definition and bystander models for middle school and high school students. Overall, the results suggest that this program is able to shift bystander attitude in high school students, as there was a positive change in the Intention to Confront Sexualized Violence and Bystander Efficacy in these students. Likewise, this program was able to positively change knowledge about bystander strategies in both middle school and high school students. Similarly, the results suggest that one attitude towards sexualized violence, Victim Blaming, improved in high school participants. In regards to beliefs of bystander and others responsibility, due to the influence of test version on the results, they cannot be used to assess the efficacy of the program in this domain. However, the program did not show change in many sexualized violence measurements, such as the ability to recognize sexualized violence and the perception of sexualized violence in schools, in both middle school and high school participants. This result is partially consistent with the project’s hypothesis that this program will cause significant change in sexualized violence and bystander knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs.

The evidence pointing to the change in knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs about bystander behaviours can been seen in multiple parts of the questionnaire. The first instance of change is present in the video scenario, where change was present was in the question asking participants to list ways they could intervene if they were present at the video scenario. Comparing students’ responses from the beginning to the end of intervention showed that, post-intervention, students were more likely to give appropriate suggestions for bystander intervention. Appropriate suggestions include telling an adult, taking the victim away from the situation, and actively confronting the perpetrator in a respectful manner.

Other evidence for an impact of the program on bystander attitudes over time was shown for student intention to confront sexualized violence. Analysis of the interaction of age and time suggested that program effects for attitudes appear to be present for high school participants’ only. Specifically, over time high school students’ attitudes changes significantly in a positive direction, while over time at post-intervention middle school students’ attitudes remained stable or worsened.

In the post-intervention, in regards to bystander knowledge, attitudes and beliefs, participants expressed that it is important to intervene in situations of sexualized violence,
however, they still noted a reluctance to do so because of fear of physical and social repercussions.

The positive changes in participants’ knowledge about effective bystander behaviours is consistent with the results of other programs that address bystander behaviours in addressing violence, such as *Bringing in the Bystander* (Baynard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007). Although there were a number of positive indications of change in youth’s knowledge, attitudes and intentions as bystanders, some measures showed no change. Specifically, no significant pre to post-intervention changes were noted in youth’s perception of responsibility of bystanders in the video scenario. Moreover, self-reported likelihood of intervening in a situation (in response to a video and written scenario) showed no significant change over time. Regardless, this project is thought to be the first project that shows significant changes in bystander behaviour in adolescent males in a sexualized violence prevention program.

Compared to bystander measurements, there were not as many significant changes in measures assessing knowledge, attitudes and beliefs about sexualized violence. There was one positive finding. In the Victim Blaming attitude subscale, high school students showed a significant positive change from pre- to post-intervention. This change was not seen for middle school students. However, no difference between pre- and post-intervention in participant’s perception of sexualized violence as a problem in school was noted. Similarly, there was no significant difference from pre- to post-intervention in the participants’ ability to identify sexualized violence in a video scenario. Yet, it is important to note that the presented clip in the video scenario influenced this result, and one clip was perceived to be easier than the other. The lack of significant measurable change in the knowledge, attitudes and beliefs about sexualized violence is consistent with the *Shifting Boundaries* program, a dating violence prevention program created for middle schools. A comparison of the results show that Pass it On is similar to *Shifting Boundaries*, as there was no statistically significant difference in youths’ knowledge and attitudes towards sexualized violence after the intervention, aside for the one significant change in attitudes for high school students. Yet, in the exit interviews participants were expressing changes in their knowledge, attitudes and beliefs about sexualized violence. Mostly, participants acknowledged that sexualized violence is a serious problem and occurs more often than they think it does.
In addition to these findings pertaining to the overall efficacy of the program for promoting change, there were a number of interesting and unexpected findings worthy of further discussion. The first concerns differences noted in the impact of intervention on high school youth as compared to those in middle school. In the attitude measure especially, age appeared to play an important role. For most of the attitude measures, high school youth showed positive change over intervention. For middle school students, in contrast, attitude scores remained stable or worsened over time. Overall, these results suggest that Pass it On is a promising sexualized violence prevention program for high school students, but a different approach for sexualized violence prevention is needed at the middle school level.

Differential results in the attitude change of middle and high school students may have a number of explanations. It is important to note that this project had a wide age range, from 11 to 18. This range represents three different stages of adolescence, early adolescence (age 11-13), middle adolescence (age 14-16) and late adolescence (age 17-19) (Harter, 2012). Each of these stages has unique physical, cognitive-developmental and social changes. In regards to cognitive development, those in early adolescents tend to have “all-or-nothing” thinking and often see things as either right or wrong. In contrast, those in late adolescents are able to balance positive and negative and realize that there is nuance to situations (Harter, 2012). Thus, results may reflect a maturity level of high school students compared to middle school students. Specifically, they could reflect the content level of the curriculum, implying that it was more accessible to high school students than middle school students. Likewise, the results could indicate that the questionnaire and measurements influenced the results, as they might have not been developmentally appropriate for some of the participants. These results could mean that in the future, either the curriculum, or evaluation questionnaire should be created in a way that is more accessible to younger students.

A second possible explanation for this result trend is that the participants displayed an “apprehensive participant role” at pre-intervention. An apprehensive participant is a participant who has a strong desire to help the researcher achieve what the participant believes is the desired result, and thus answers the questionnaire in a biased way (Crano, Brewer, & Lac, 2005). In this case, the participants wanted to look good in the eyes of the researcher when they first met, at the pre-intervention session. Thus, younger students in particular may have answered the questions in a way that reflects good character. Yet, at post-intervention, when
trust was established between the participants, facilitators, and researchers, the participants answered the questions more honestly.

A potential third explanation for the results could relate to differences in the opt-in process for middle versus high school students. All participants in this project volunteered for involvement in an after school club. However, anecdotal observations noted that the high school participants self-selected into the groups on the basis of interest, and then encouraged their friends to join. In contrast, it appears that the middle school students were guided towards participating in the project through their teachers and school administrators. Thus, the positive change seems in high school students but not middle school students could have resulted from the high school participants’ willingness to change interest in the program, compared to middle school students who were only participating in the project because they were told to do so by administrators. Perhaps in future research, more detailed data should be collected on recruitment methods and initial motivation, and on whether these factors impact the results.

Another unexpected finding in this study concerned prevalence. Participants in this study reported an extremely low rate of sexualized violence perpetration and victimization. Sexualized violence perpetration was assessed in two sections of the question. It was first assessed in the “Recognizing sexualized violence in peer groups” section that asked youth to answer how often they had been with someone perpetrating sexualized violence and someone who experienced sexualized violence. This set of questions was going to be used as an approximation of the prevalence of sexualized violence victimization and perpetration. Between pre- and post-intervention questionnaires, 4 participants out of 47 (8.5%) indicated that they have seen either scenario. Prevalence was assessed directly with a second set of questions. In this section, students were asked to indicate if they have ever been victims of sexualized violence. In this section, only 1 participant reported being victimized. Due to the floor effect, one could easily assume that sexualized violence is not a problem in this particular school board. Some researchers think that adolescents might view cyberbullying and sexualized violence differently from adults. In some contexts, anything other than physical violence may be normalized in a school context. For instances, girls sometimes refer to cyberbullying and verbal sexual slurs as “drama,” while in the male context, these actions are referred to as “trash talk” (Board of Children, Youth and Families; Committee on Law and Justice; Institute of Medicine; National Research Council, 2014).
Potentially related to this finding, students also reported essentially no tolerance for sexualized violence. Youth were also likely to respond “never” to all items assessing even minor or questionable sexualized behavior that this measure could not be analyzed.

The prevalence results gleaned from this project are not concordant with other prevalence studies into sexualized violence in this age group. In fact, a paper by Wolf and Chiodo (2008), which examined sexualized violence rates at the same school board, concluded that 36% of male grade 9 students have been a victim of a sexual comment, joke, gesture or look and that 24% of male grade 9 students have experienced physical sexual victimization. Perhaps the discrepant result between the Pass it On project and the Wolfe and Chiodo paper could be attributed to how the questions were asked, as the Wolfe and Chiodo questions appear to be more narrowly focused, separating out verbal and physical sexual victimization, while the Pass it On project asked the prevalence question in a broader manner. Alternatively, Wolfe and Chiodo only surveyed high school students (Grades 9 and 11) while this study included middle school students. It is possible that the questions posed for prevalence in the questionnaire were developmentally inappropriate for middle school students to answer. In the future, different ways of assessing for prevalence, aside from the traditional paper-and-pencil method, should be investigated.

In addition to being inconsistent with the Wolfe and Chiodo paper, the low prevalence rates garnered from this study is inconsistent with the results reported from the program development questionnaires and groups that were conducted prior to the creation of the program. As mentioned previously, 68.5% of teachers and 58.5% of students perceived sexualized violence to be a problem at their schools. Yet, participants in the groups, given their low endorsement rate on the prevalence sections, did not express this sentiment. Thus, this disconnection could indicate that the prevalence questionnaires need not capture the reality of what is occurring in the school hallways.

Limitations

Several limitations were present in both the administration and evaluation of the Pass it On project. Three methodological limitations are discussed in detail: reliance on self-report, lack of long-term follow up with participants, and the lack of control group for comparison. The Pass it On project was evaluated using self-report measures. It has been noted that across the social sciences there are concerns about accuracy and validity of self-report measures (Fan,
Miller, Park, Winward, Chritsensen, Grotevant & Tai, 2006). Some issues that could impact the validity and accuracy of self-report measures include participants answering the questions in a socially desirable way, not understanding the questions, and not taking the questionnaire seriously. It has been noted that when self-report measures are completed in a classroom setting there might be an elevated risk of inaccurate answers (Fan et al., 2006). An earlier study by Spirrison, Gordy, and Henley (1996) showed that there was a difference between responses completed in an in-class setting and those in an after-class setting, with the after-school group surveys containing more accurate responses. Thus, one could argue that some of the data might be inaccurate because the questionnaires were administered during class time, and not after the session was completed, and thus participants were more susceptible to peer pressure. Further, working with adolescents and having them attend all sessions can pose a challenge.

Secondly, Pass it On was only evaluated at two time points, immediately pre-intervention and immediately post-intervention. Thus, the changes in knowledge, attitudes and beliefs are only applicable immediately after the program’s conclusion. Since there is no long term follow-up, one is unable to assess the success of the program’s ability to change these knowledge, attitudes and beliefs in the long term, or if these changes are maintained. Lastly, a limitation of this project is the lack of control group for comparison. Since there is no control group, there is less certainty in the conclusion that the program is responsible for the changes in the participants’ knowledge, attitudes and beliefs about sexualized violence, or if the changes observed is caused by some other developmental process.

One section with a limitation was the Video section of the questionnaire. Due to the influence of test version, and not time, on the results indicates that the program did not change their beliefs about victim, bully, or bystander responsibility in a situation. In the future, care should be taken to ensure that the videos used for assessment are of equal difficulty.

Unrelated to the methodological limitations of the Pass it On program, another limitation present is the difference between the answers given on the questionnaires by the participants compared to what was said in the sessions. As discussed prior, on the paper-and-pencil questionnaires students indicated a low prevalence of sexualized violence in their schools, however, when in discussion groups, inevitably a participant would recount and normalize a time they have seen someone being victimized in a sexual way. As one participant noted, “[sexualized violence] does happen more than we think it does.” Generally, the inconsistency
between what was answered for bystander questions was not as great as with the sexualized violence questions. Perhaps when answering the questionnaires, there was a demand characteristic, and that the participants answered what they thought the researchers wanted. Yet, as the participants became more comfortable with the program, the other youth, and the facilitators, they opened up and reported what they really knew and felt about the subject matter.

There are also some minor limitations that could have affected the validity and integrity of the data. These limitations include inconsistencies in group size, the self-selection of participants into taking the program, and small population of students (47) who were eligible for data analysis from all the participants.

**Suggestions and Future Directions**

There are several ways in which the *Pass it On* could be continued in the school system, and for research to be conducted. Some of the suggestions presented here reflect the feedback given by both facilitators and participants at exit interviews/feedback sessions. In regards to the cohort examined in this thesis, a follow-up assessment is recommended six months to one year after the program’s completion to assess if the changes in attitudes, knowledge, and belief are maintained long-term. Likewise, it would be interesting to assess if there is a trickle-down effect of this program on the schools they were conducted, compared to schools where this program was not run. Lastly, a more detailed analysis of the data that takes into account how the participants were selected, and how many sessions they attend should be conducted.

There have been suggestions by facilitators of this project about program improvement and modification. One suggestion that kept on being recommended was increasing the program’s length from five weeks to either seven or eight weeks. This recommendation was made because the facilitators felt that trust and respect need to be built over a longer period of time, and this increase in trust will facilitate a better program and assessment. Other recommendations that they gave were to improve the cyberbullying curriculum with more concrete lessons, and capping the group at a maximum of 12 participants. It would be interesting to assess if changes in the program would impact the results, and if these changes are significant from the initial program assessment.

The participants of the program also noted that girls would benefit from this program. A future study in this topic could examine if girls benefit from this program, and if their response
differs from their male counterpart. Similarly, a mixed-gender group could also be conducted and compared against the results of a gender separate group.

From a methodological standpoint, any future research about this project should, in addition to the quantitative questionnaire, have a formal qualitative data evaluation component. It was noted earlier in this discussion section, that when compared to the pen-and-paper method of evaluation, the verbal responses to questions yielded richer data, is a better indication of the prevalence of sexualized violence among their friends, and a description of how their attitudes changed. Similarly, more sensitive measurements measuring the changes in attitudes, knowledge and beliefs should be when assessing the participants, especially when it comes to sexualized violence knowledge attitudes and beliefs questions. Lastly, the integrity of the data could be improved with the addition of a validity scale in the questionnaire in order to detect if a respondent is either trying to only give socially desirable answers, or not taking the questionnaire seriously.

**Conclusion**

Overall, the *Pass it On* project provides initial evidence of its effectiveness in changing the attitudes and beliefs about bystander behaviours, but not in changing the knowledge, attitudes and beliefs about sexualized violence and cyberbullying. This program is thought to be the first program that is exclusively focused on sexualized violence and bystander behaviours that has been created and implemented in this age group. All in all, this program can act as a foundation to a future program that addresses sexualized violence and bystander behaviours, as it does show promise in changing knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs about sexualized violence and bystander behaviours in high school students. Further revision is required before one can deem this program to be effective for middle school students.

The results of the project are significant as it can help inform the strategies and lessons created for the new sex education curriculum in the province of Ontario. In early 2015, the provincial government of Ontario updated their health and physical education curriculum for the first time since 1998 (Government of Ontario: Ministry of Education, 2015). In this revised curriculum, the topics of gender and sexual identity, cyberbullying and consent are discussed. An informal investigation of the aims, goals, and lessons in this curriculum shows that the *Pass it On* project lessons overlap with the provincial curriculum. Currently, the government intends to implement this curriculum in the upcoming 2015-2016 academic year. Future research could
be conducted to see if there is an impact of this curriculum on student’s baseline knowledge attitudes and beliefs about sexualized violence and bystander behaviours by comparing them to the data collected for this project, as the health curriculum they were previously taught was created in 1998. *Pass it On* should be investigated further and refined in order to actualize its potential as a beneficial program for this age group.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Review of Past Prevention Programs

The 4th R

Developed By:

Aims of Prevention: Decrease physical dating violence, promote healthy relationships

Theory/Orientation (if applicable):

Age Group: High School Students

Delivery of Prevention:
-21-lesson manualized curriculum
  -3 major themes (each of them have 7 lessons)
    1. Personal Safety and Injury Prevention
    2. Healthy Growth and Sexuality
    3. Substance Use and Abuse
-Lessons include video resources, role-playing exercises, rubrics etc.
  -only gendered lessons were lessons in regards to dating violence
-each class was 75 minutes

Sessions with some relation to Sexual Violence

Measurements Used:
-a subscale of 8 items from the Conflict in Adolescents Dating Relationships Inventory (CADRI; Wolfe, Scott et al., 2001)
-physical peer violence was measured using a self-report questionnaire derived from the National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth Delinquent behavior inventory (Human Resources Development Canada, 2001)
-experience with alcohol and drugs was assessed using the National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth

Results of Assessment:
-indicators of a decrease physical dating violence was noted, but the authors posit that the effect may be limited to boys who received the intervention
  -it is important to note that in this study they were only looking at physical dating violence not sexualized violence or coercion
-overall rates of substance use and peer violence were unaffected by the intervention
-boys who received the intervention reported safer sex habits
Other Notes

• Curriculum can be adapted for other groups (i.e. aboriginals, high-risk youth)

Please see this presentation on the internet for more information:

National Institute of Justice Information Centre:
**Expect Respect**

*Developed By:*

*Important note*: this was done with a high risk group

**Aims of Prevention**: Reduce dating violence among at-risk middle and high school students

**Theory/Orientation (if applicable)**: Feminist Theory

**Age Group**: High School Students

**Delivery of Prevention**:  
- Groups are divided into gender groups (i.e. separate groups of boys and a separate group for girls)  
- 24 sessions structured around 5 units  
  - developing group skills (5 sessions)  
  - choosing equality and respect (5 sessions)  
  - recognizing abusive relationships (5 sessions)  
  - learning skills for healthy relationships (5 sessions)  
  - becoming an active proponent for safe and healthy relationships (4 sessions)  
- each session is a highly structured 55 minute session  
  - check in (5 minutes)  
  - educational component (15 minutes)  
  - group activities and discussion (30 minutes)  
  - wrap up (5 minutes)

**Sessions with some relation to Sexual Violence**  
- Session 7: Questioning Gender Stereotypes  
- Session 8: Defining Abuse and Respect  
- Session 9: Recognizing the Use and Abuse of Power  
- Session 12: Naming the Violence in our Lives  
- Session 18: Setting Boundaries  
- Session 19: Asking for Consent

**Measurements Used for Assessment**:  
- Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationship Inventory (CADRI, Wolfe, Scott et al., 2001)  
- Safe Dates Evaluation (Foshee et al., 1998)

**Results of Assessment**:  
- there was self-reported significant increase in healthy relationships for those who participated in the program  
- level of victimization pre-intervention predicted victimization post-intervention  
- levels of perpetration pre-intervention predicted level of perpetration after the intervention
Other Notes:
Some people have criticized the lack of cultural sensitivity in this program, and aspects of this program need to be more culture specific.
Men as Allies

**Developed By:**

**Aims of Prevention:** Changing rape acceptance attitudes, and seeing if they can get people to properly estimate the attitudes of their peers

**Theory/Orientation (if applicable):** Social Norms Theory*
*Social Norms Theory posits that the influence of one’s peers is based more on what one thinks one’s peers do and believe rather than on the actual behaviors and real beliefs of peers.

**Age Group:** High school students

**Delivery of Prevention:**
- 3, 45 minutes sessions delivered by a female professional with knowledge of Sexual violence
- uses 6 activities from the “Working Together” manual (Heppener et al., 2005)
  - not specified in this paper
- there were key themes that were conveyed during the intervention
  a. *Courage of Heroes*--- participants read and discuss acts of courage challenging sexual, coercive behavior
  b. A music video sung by a male rapper about men’s role in prevention of sexual violence against women (Gonna Make it *Pennsylvania Coalition Against Rape*, 2001) Available at: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jOla1t15ej0](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jOla1t15ej0)
  c. Use of language to empower men to be part of the solution
  d. Emphasizing the key role of men in helping female victims of sexualized violence
  e. Incorporation of a male role model
  f. Using “My Strength is Not for Hurting”

**Measurements Used:**
- quasi-experimental research design
- Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale-Short Form (IRMA-SF; Payne, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999) 
  - What Would You Do (WWYD; Hillenbrand-Gunn, 2003)
    - Nine-item measure used to assess male participants behavior is a rape supportive environment
  - Self-Protective Behavior Measures (Schewe, 2002)
    - same as WWYD, but with the instruction “Please respond to the following questions with what you think a typical guy at your school would answer”
  - Discomfort with Sexist Situations—Revised (DSS-R; Kilmartin et al., 1999)
  - Discomfort with Sexist Situations –Revised Typical Guy (DSS-R-T)
  - Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale-C (MCSD-C; Reynolds, 1982)

**Results of Assessment:**
-scores on the IRMA were lower at post-test than pre-test for those who received the intervention
  -for both male and female students
  3
-the willingness of the control group to stop their coercive behavior decreased from pre- to post-test
  -the experimental groups’ willingness remained the same pre to post test
-male students rated their peers as more rape supportive than what students actually rated themselves
  -but after the intervention, the experimental group viewed their peer’s attitudes and behaviors as less rape supportive

Other Notes
More information at: http://www.azrapeprevention.org/summaries_2010_Hillenbrand-Gunn
Bringing in the Bystander (BIB)

**Developed By:**

**Aims of Prevention:** Teaching men and women how to intervene safely and effectively in cases of sexualized violence before, during, and after incidents with strangers, acquaintances, and friends.

**Theory/Orientation (if applicable):** Bystander Prevention Theory

*This is a table conceptualized by McMahon & Baynard (2012) to how bystander intervention should look*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reactive Bystander Opportunities Examples</th>
<th>Primary Prevention</th>
<th>Secondary Prevention (i.e. during an assault)</th>
<th>Tertiary Prevention (after the assault)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Witnessing a group rape</td>
<td>A friend is seeking information for themselves or others on where to go for help for an assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends or classmates blame a victim of sexual violence in conversation</td>
<td>A friend bringing an intoxicated person into their room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Proactive Bystander Opportunities | Taking a course on gender based violence | Changing student organizational policies to reflect sexual assault |

**Age Group:** College Age Students

**Delivery of Prevention:**
- Program is delivered in single-gendered groups
- In this study, two different versions of the intervention were administered
  
  **Version A**
  - One 90 minute session
  - Content covered basic information about prevalence, causes, and consequences of sexualized violence
  - Lead a discussion of how community members play an important prevention role as bystanders
  - Active learning exercises consisted of role playing
    - Personal safety was always emphasized
  - Participants then asked to create a bystander plan and pledge to be an active bystander

**Version B**

60
- Same description as above, except participants attended three 90 minute long programs over the course of a week
- 2 months after the initial intervention, a “booster” session occurred
- here those who received the intervention were placed in groups of no more than 25 people
- 30 minute discussion group
- 5 minutes of watching a skit about a survivor of a sexual assault asking for help
- then a 20 minute open-ended discussion lead by a facilitator to gauge how much people remembered from the program

**Measurements Used:**
- Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (Payne, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999)
- A knowledge test about that specific university’s code of conduct
- College Date Rape Attitude Survey (Lanier & Elliot, 1997)
- Bystander Attitude scale (Baynard, Plate, & Moynihan, 2005)
- Bystander Behavior Scale (Baynard, Plate, & Moynihan, 2005)
- Bystander Efficacy Scale (Baynard, Plate, & Moynihan, 2005)
- Decisional balance scale (Baynard, Plate, & Moynihan, 2005)
- Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960).

**Results of Assessment:**
- participants in both 1 and 3 session interventions showed improvement on all outcomes measures compared to those in control groups
- decrease in rape acceptance, and an increase in knowledge about sexualized violence
- participants who received the intervention self-reported more prosocial bystander behavior
- the more significant changed happened for those who were in the longer program (3 sessions)
- the active bystander behavior measurements were the same post-intervention and 2 months after intervention
- this was attributed to the booster session
- Showed a decline in bystander behavior 4- 12- months post-test

**Other Notes**
This website provides a clear overview of the program:
https://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=159

**The Green Dot**
**Developed By:**

**Aims of Prevention:**
To increase proactive self-reported active bystander behaviors and reduce dating and sexual violence on college campuses
**Theory/Orientation (if applicable):** Bystander Prevention Theory
-meaning, they want to train students to intervene and reduce violence in a way that is safe and effective

**Age Group:** College Age Students

**Delivery of Prevention**
Implemented in 2 phases

**Phase One:**
A 50 minute motivational speech was provided to student, school leaders, faculty, and administrators to introduce the concept of active bystanders behaviors and build the audience members commitment to prevention

**Phase Two:**
An intervention program called SEEDS (Students Education and Empowering to Develop Safety), which was an intervention to provide skills to be a proactive bystander
-students attended small-group intensive sessions and were trained in recognizing and implementing active bystander behavior
-it was voluntary and open to all students
-heard about this training through the speed (self-selection bias?)
-peer leaders were also invited to this part of the intervention
-diffusion of new behaviors is more readily accepted in a community when behaviors are modeled by influential peers

**Topics covered during the session**
- Definitions: Power based personal violence, dating violence, sexual violence, stalking & bullying
- Bystander situations (watch a 13 minute video) and asking to identify problem areas (i.e. Dating Abuse Behaviours)
- Goes over what prevents bystander behavior *(Obstacles to Action)*: Bystander Dynamics, Peer influences, and personality
- Solutions given: Direct, Distract, & Delegate
- There is also an appendix with handouts

**Measurements Used:**
- Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (Payne, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999)
  -was reduced to 20 items in this research
- Acceptance of General Dating violence Scale (Foshee et al., 1996)
- Self-reported observed and actual bystander behaviors
  - Bystander Behaviors Scale (Banyard et al., 2005)

**Results of Assessment:**
-scores on self-reported active bystander behaviors were significantly higher for those who were SEEDS trained
-students who were SEEDS trained had lower scores on the IRMA than those who received no intervention
-self-reported actual bystander behavior scores were significantly higher for those who were SEEDS trained, than those who only heard the speech
    -but those who heard the speech showed higher self-reported active behavior compared to those who did not receive any intervention
Safe Dates  
Developed By  

Aims of Prevention  
Primary Prevention: First perpetration of dating violence is precluded  
  • Changing norms associated with partner violence  
  • Decreasing gender stereotyping  
  • Improving conflict management skills  

Secondary Prevention: Victims stop being victimized or perpetrators stop being violent  
  • Changing beliefs about the need for help  
  • Awareness of services for victims and perpetrators of partner violence  

Theory/Orientation (if Applicable):  

Age Group  
  • Middle school (Grade 8) and High school students (Grade 9)  

Delivery of Prevention  
  • School and Community Activities  
  • School Activities  
    o Primary prevention  
    o Secondary prevention  
      ▪ Theatre production preformed by peers  
      ▪ 10-session curriculum (20 hour training for health teachers)  
      ▪ Poster contest  
  • Community Activities  
    o Special services for adolescents in abuse relationships (weekly support group)  
    o Community service provider training (20 workshops)  

Safe Dates Lessons Relevant to Sexualized Violence  
  • Session 9: Preventing Sexual Assault  
    o Aims of Session 9  
      - Be less likely to blame the victim for sexual assault.  
      - Have an increased acceptance of postscriptive rape norms and a decreased acceptance of prescriptive rape norms.  
      - Be more likely to interpret “NO” cues as “NO” cues.  
      - Know how to protect them in a potential rape situation.
-State their sexual boundaries clearly to their dating partner.
-Describe dating tips to decrease their chances of being a victim or a perpetrator of sexual assault.

**Measurements Used**
- Baseline was collected with a 50 minute self-administered questionnaire
- Outcome Variables
  - Four victimization
    - Psychological abuse victimization
    - Nonsexual violence victimization
    - Sexual Violence victimization
    - Physical
  - Four perpetration
    - Response options from 0(never) to 3 (very often)
  - Mediating Variables (Likert Scale Used)
    - Acceptance of prescribed norms
    - Perceived positive consequences of DV
    - Perceived negative consequences of DV
    - Gender Stereotyping
  - Four Conflict Management Styles (Likert Scale, 0-3)
    - Communication skills
    - Destructive communication skills
    - Constructive response to anger
    - Destructive response to anger

**Results of Assessment**
- Simple pre, post assessment
- Treatment Vs. Control
  - Subsamples of primary prevention (i.e. those who have never committed an act of DV), and victims of past DV
- Adolescents in the treatment conditions reported significantly less psychological abuse perpetration
- Experimental group also reported less perpetration of dating violence than those in control condition
- Those in the primary prevention treatment condition compared to those in control group, reported initiating significantly less psychological abuse perpetration
- At follow up there was no significant differences in the victimization of psychological abuse, non-sexual violence, sexual violence or violence in the current relationship between treatment and control groups
• At follow up, those in the treatment group (compared to controls) were less supportive of proscribed dating violence norms, perceived fewer positive consequences from using DV, used constructive communication skills and responses to anger, were less like to engage in gender stereotyping and were more aware of perpetrator/victim services
• In the primary prevention sub-sample, those in the treatment group were more supportive than controls of proscribed dating violence norms, perceived more negative consequences of DV and engaged in less gender stereotyping
• Treatment group adolescents in the victim subsample were less accepting of proscribed dating norms, less accepting of traditional gender stereo types and more aware of victim services

Other Notes
Shifting Boundaries
Developed By

Aims of Prevention
To decrease dating violence and sexual harassment in middle school students

Theory/Orientation (If applicable)
• Theory of reasoned actions (TRA)
  o Attitudes towards and perceived norms about the desired behavior facilitates the intention to change, modify, or adapt certain behaviours (sounds like social norms theory)

Age Group
• Middle school students in grades 6 and 7

Delivery of Prevention
• Done at middle schools in NYC
• Primary prevention
• 4 groups
  o Classroom based intervention
    ▪ Two components: personal interaction & Law & Justice Treatment
    ▪ 6—10 week intervention
    ▪ 6 session curriculum
      • consequences for perpetrators of DV and SH
      • state and federal laws relating to DV and SH
      • setting and communicating boundaries for one’s interpersonal relationship
      • the role of bystanders as interveners
    ▪ employs both concrete and abstract materials
    ▪ really want to help students develop and communicate personal boundaries
  o Building based intervention
    ▪ Conducted the same amount of time as the classroom based intervention (6-10 weeks)
    ▪ Introduction of temporary building-based restraining orders
    ▪ Placement of posters around the school to raise awareness of both DV and SH
Also contained a component to help students identify unsafe areas in their schools
  • Then they had to plan how to address it
  • Aimed to help students get a better sense of respect for personal boundaries
    o Classroom and building based intervention
    o No intervention

**Measurements Used**
- Paper and pencil measures (made for study)
- Sexual harassment victimization and perpetration (prevalence and incidence questions)
- Sexual and Physical Violence victimization and perpetration
- Sexual violence prevalence
  o All measures also looked at frequency
- Behavioural intentions
  o The intention of students to engage or avoid violence
- DV/SH knowledge
  o Focusing on NY state rape laws, definitions of abuse and harassment, resources for help, and sexual harassment myths

**Results of Assessment**
- 3 times (pre, post, 6 month follow up)
- Classroom only results indicate that it was not effective
- Building only and combined showed a reduction in sexual violence victimization (both peers and partners) and 6 months post intervention
  o Frequency of SH lowered in both building and combined
  o Building only intervention saw increase in reporting of sexual harassment victimization
    ▪ several reasons (could be more aware; could been harassed by grade 8 students who did not receive intervention)
  o 6 months after, no difference in reported prevalence of perpetrating sexual harassment between control and experimental groups
- In sexual harassment by peer, reduction in combined group only when compared to controls
  o Persists into 6 month follow up
- This result also mirrored in building only
  o But those in combined treatment hand overall larger reduction rate
- Building and combined, 6 months after treatment, showed lower prevalence of perpetrating sexual harassment on peers
• building only treatment showed reduction in dating violence (at both post intervention and 6 month follow up)
• no statistically significant evidence for reduction for the perpetration of SV in a dating relationship post-test or 6 months later

Other Notes
KiVa Anti-bullying program on cyberbullying

Developed/Researched By

Aims of Prevention
- Is an intervention to change bystander behavior in the classroom, which hopefully will generalize into an out of classroom context
- enhancing the empathy, self-efficacy, and anti-bullying attitudes of bystanders
- Study to gain empirical evidence on a school based bullying prevention program that can reduce the perpetration of CB.
  - Does KiVa have a unique effect on the frequencies of CB and CV for those who received the intervention
  - To what degree is CB and CV a classroom-level phenomena
  - Do students’ age and gender moderate intervention level

Theory/Orientation (If applicable): Bystander

Age Group
- Elementary (4-6) & Middle School (7-9) youth
  - Remember this is in Finland, and they might/do have a different school system than North America

Delivery of Prevention
- Universal Actions
  - Classroom based lessons with activities
    - Awareness of the role bystanders have
    - Safe strategies to defend and support victimized peers
  - Between lessons, participants have to play a computer game that reinforces classroom activities and lets them practice their new skills
- Indicated Actions
  - These target specific incidents of bullying through adult intervention/peer support
  - Carrying out of group and individual discussions with the bullies/victims
- Delivery modes are different
  - Middle School
    - Four distinct themes, intervention delivered 4 times over the year
  - Elementary School
    - 20 hour classroom based discussion by teacher
      - two 1-hour lesson per month
• KiVa has both a teacher and parent guide
  o Teacher guide has information about CB
  o Parents’ guide does not contain specific guidance for CB, rather general advice for parents on working with the school and child with about how to address CB

Measurements Used
• Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (Olweus, 1996)

Results of Assessment
• Students who received the intervention reported lower frequencies of CV at posttest when compared to controls
• The perpetration of CB was moderated by age
  o The effect of KiVa was significantly different from zero for students that were one standard deviation below the mean age
  o The effect of KiVa on CB was no longer significant when students were 12.87 years of age

Other Notes

http://cbpp-pcpe.phac-aspc.gc.ca/interventions/kiva-antibullying-program/
ConRed Cyberbullying Prevention Program

Developed/Researched by

Aims of Prevention
1. Improve perceived control over information on the internet
2. Reduce the time dedicated to digital device usage
3. Prevent and reduce CB
“…to prevent cyberbullying by raising the level of technical, procedural, and communications expertise and improving social skills in virtual scenarios, especially the internet and social network”

Theory/Orientation (if applicable)
Normative Social Behaviour (Rimal et al., 2005)
• Often used to modify youth attitudes
• Theory argues that behavior and attitudes are influenced by perceived social conventions (this is similar to social norms theory)

Age Group
• School age children (Secondary school in Spain, ages 11-19)

Delivery of Prevention
• Holistic program involving multiple players (children, teachers, parents)
• Program was administrated over 3 months
  o 8 classroom sessions with 3 units
    ▪ 1. Internet and Social networks (focusing on the importance of privacy and control over shared content and processes, highlighting the negative consequences of failing to control or establish safety measures in online communication processes)
    ▪ 2. Benefits of using social networks healthily and intelligently (improving technical skills, prioritize pro-social spaces and practices, exercising moral awareness and fairness by reporting and avoiding cyberbullying)
    ▪ 3. Dealing with problems that may arise (providing students with strategies addressing the problems associated with inappropriate, irresponsible usage. Attention was also paid to the prevention of cyberbullying and internet abuse
      o Same content was discussed in 2 teacher sessions
      o Same content discussed in 1 parent session
        ▪ At the end of parent session, personalized exercises were handed out
• Concurrent awareness raising campaign (booklets, posters, stickers etc.)

**Measurements Used**

- Perceived information control scale (Dinev & Hart, 2004)
- Adaptation of Internet related experiences questionnaire (CERI) (Beranuy et al., 2009)
- European Cyberbullying Intervention Project Questionnaire (ECIPQ) (Brighi et al., 2012a)
- European Bullying Intervention Project Questionnaire (ECIPQ) (Brighi et al., 2012b)
- The Basic Empathy Scale (Jolliffe and Farrington, 2006)
- School Climate Scale (Brand et al., 2003)

**Results of Assessment**

General note: evaluated using a quasi-experimental, ex post facto, longitudinal design with pre-post measurements for two groups (experimental & quasi control)

- Perception of control was lower in the experimental group when compared to controls
  *Experimental group results
- Significant drop in internet addition measures in males, but not females
- Decrease in CB aggression and victimization
  - Decreased in aggression in boys
  - Decreased in victimization in both males and females, but a bigger drop in males
- Increase in empathy for both genders
  - Larger change in females
- Perception of safety problems was lower in boys than in girls
- Overall, the experimental group showed global improvement when compared to controls

**Other Notes**

ConRed is based on the following factors

- Proactive policies, procedures, and practices
  - Implementing a specific action plan to combat risks involved in using the internet and social networks, improving technical and procedural skills with digital devices, and teaching how to use ICT safely and healthily

- School community key understanding and competencies
  - Instructing school children, teachers, and parents and improve their skills to facilitate the safe, healthy use of the internet and social networks.
  - Focuses mainly on raising individuals’ awareness and procedural skills in digital communication, in order to improve students’ online social competence

- Protective school environments
  - ConRed aims to create safe, healthy virtual communication environments for students, fomenting in the culture of mutual support, empathy with the weakest,
and better social relationships (which includes digital communication) with three groups involved in the school (students, teachers, and families)

- School-family-community partnership
  - ConRed encourages cooperation between these 3 groups through joint activities, offering a virtual environment where the school community can meet to discuss the problems of bullying and cyberbullying
References of Tests and Scales Used


Dinev, Tamara and Paul Hart. 2004. Internet privacy concerns and their antecedents - measurement validity and a regression model. *Behaviour and Information Technology* 23(6), 413-422


Appendix B: Program Development Student Questionnaire

1. How big a problem is sexualized violence in your school? (Circle one)
   Not a problem  A bit of a problem  A pretty big problem  A very big problem

2. Has anyone ever discussed sexualized violence with you?  □ No  □ Yes
   If yes, please check all that apply
   □ Parents  □ Brother or sister  □ Friends  □ Teacher  □ Coach
   □ Other (please specify: ______________________)  

3. What do you think that kids your age might like to learn about sexualized violence? (check all that apply)
   □ Getting a better understanding of the definition of sexualized violence. Questions like: How is sexualized violence different than teasing? Flirting?
   □ Talking about what to do if someone is bullying you in a sexualized manner.
   □ Talking about what to do if you see someone else using sexualized violence.
   □ Getting practice in taking action to stop others from using sexualized violence.
   □ Other (please specify: ______________________)  

4. How would kids your age feel comfortable discussing this topic? (check all that apply)
   □ In teacher guided discussions
   □ With peer leaders
   □ In same sex groups of peers (i.e., with all girls or all boys)
   □ In mixed-sex groups of peers
   □ In discussions guided by someone from outside the school

5. What type of learning style do you prefer? (circle all that apply)
   Lecture style  Hands-On  Problem Based  Multimedia  Group discussion

6. What type of incentives would it take for you to come out to an extra-curricular activity on stopping sexualized violence in your school? (circle all that apply)
   Food  Volunteer Hours  Certificate of Completion  Gift Card
   Other? (please specify: ______________________)  

7. How much time would you be willing to spend in extra-curricular activities on stopping sexualized violence in your school? (please circle one)
   30 minutes  45 minutes  1 hour  1.5 hours  2 hours
Appendix C: Program Development Teacher Questionnaire

Educators Opinion Form

There have been recent calls from the media and from communities for schools to do a better job addressing sexualized violence and bullying with students. Sexualized violence may be defined as any sexual act that is perpetrated against someone’s will. Acts of sexual violence include attempted or completed nonconsensual sex acts, as well as bullying and harassment of a sexual nature (e.g., forwarding sexual pictures of someone, using sexualized names to taunt someone) (Center for Disease Control, 2009). We are asking you to help us understand how parents view the subject of sexualized violence and want to know more about your opinion on whether the school has a role in addressing this problem.

1. Have you ever discussed sexualized violence with your student?
   
   YES
   NO
   SOMEWHAT

2. Do you feel that social media plays a role in sexualized violence?
   
   YES
   NO
   SOMEWHAT

3. How would you rate your comfort level in discussing sexualized violence with your student?
   
   1
   2
   3
   4
   5

   Extremely Uncomfortable
   Uncomfortable
   Comfortable
   Very Comfortable
   Extremely Comfortable

4. Can you please explain what makes you comfortable/uncomfortable discussing this topic?

5. Do you feel like you have knowledge to discuss healthy relationships and sexualized violence with your students?
   
   YES
   NO

6. What type of knowledge do you think is needed to discuss sexualized violence with your students?

7. Do you think that sexualized violence is a problem at schools?
   
   YES
   NO

8. Do you feel that teaching youth about sexualized violence is important at school?
   
   YES
   NO

Comments?
Appendix D: Program Development Parent Questionnaire

Parent Opinion Form

With recent cases relational aggression cases, such as Amanda Todd and Retaeh Parsons, schools are interested in beginning to discuss sexualized violence and healthy relationships as part of health class. Sexualized violence is defined as any sexual act that is perpetrated against someone’s will. Acts of sexual violence include attempted or completed nonconsensual sex acts, as well as bullying and harassment of a sexual nature (e.g. forwarding sexual pictures of someone, using taunt someone) (Center for Disease Control, 2009). We are asking you to help us understand how parents view the subject of sexualized violence. We also want to know your opinion on whether the school as a role in addressing this problem.

1. Have you ever discussed sexualized violence with your children?
   
   YES  NO  SOMEWHAT

2. Do you feel that social media (i.e., Facebook, Twitter) plays a role in sexualized violence?
   
   YES  NO  SOMEWHAT

3. How would you rate your comfort level in discussing sexualized violence with your children?

   1  2  3  4  5
   Extremely Uncomfortable Comfortable Very Comfortable Extremely Uncomfortable Comfortable

4. Can you please explain what makes you feel comfortable/uncomfortable discussing this topic?

5. Do you have the knowledge to discuss healthy relationships and sexualized violence with your children at home?

   YES  NO

6. What type of knowledge do you think is needed to discuss sexualized violence with your children?

7. Do you think that sexualized violence is a problem at schools?

   YES  NO

8. Is it important for schools to be teaching kids about sexualized violence?

   YES  NO

Comments?
Appendix E: Wave 1 Pre-Intervention Questionnaire (Version A)

What grade are you in?  7  8  9  10
How old are you?  11  12  13  14  15  16
What Gender do you identify with?  Male  Female  Other (please specify)_________

Do you own a cell phone and/or a personal wireless communication device (i.e., iPod Touch, Cell phone)?
YES  NO

If yes, how many times a day do you send or receive messages (i.e. texts, Facetime, FB message)?
☐ 1-5 Times
☐ 6-10 Times
☐ 11-20 Times
☐ 21-30 Times
☐ 31-40 Times
☐ 41-50 Times
☐ 50+ Times

Do you have a computer at home?  YES  NO

If yes, on an average weekday how many hours a day do you spend on your computer?
☐ Less than an hour
☐ 1-2 Hours
☐ 3-4 Hours
☐ 5-6 Hours
☐ 7-8 Hours
☐ 9-10 Hours
☐ 11-12 Hours
☐ 12+ Hours

If yes, on an average weekend how many hours a day do you spend on your computer?
☐ Less than an hour
☐ 1-2 Hours
☐ 3-4 Hours
☐ 5-6 Hours
☐ 7-8 Hours
☐ 9-10 Hours
☐ 11-12 Hours
☐ 12+ Hours
Note: In this questionnaire, we are asking about bullying that is sexual in nature. Sexual bullying is unwanted and unwelcomed sexual behaviour that interferes with someone’s life. Sexual bullying is NOT behaviours that a person likes or wants or is agreed to between two people (for example, kissing, touching, or flirting that you both agree to).

Video Scenario
After watching this scenario, please answer the following questions
What type of sexualized violence did you see in this scenario, if there was any?
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

2. Please evaluate the following
   A) Jessica
      i) How responsible is Jessica for causing this situation?
         Not Responsible 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Responsible
         Not Responsible at all
   
   B) Billy
      i) How responsible is Billy for causing this situation?
         Not Responsible 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Responsible
         Not Responsible at all

   C) The Blonde Girl
      i) How responsible is the blonde girl for intervening in this situation?
         Not Responsible 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Responsible
         Not Responsible at all
      ii) What actions, if any, could the Blonde Girl have taken to intervene in this situation?
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

3. If you walked by and overheard what was happening, how likely would you have been to “step in”?
   Not Likely Somewhat Likely Likely Very Likely Always Likely
4. A) What would you do if you stepped into this situation?

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

B) What would prevent you from engaging in this situation?

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________
**Scenario**

Imagine that you hear Bob chatting with a group of his friends. You overhear that he and Amy just broke up, and because she dumped him via text-message, he was going to send out a mass text message to all his friends of the naked photos that she sent to him.

How likely are you to say or do something to stop Bob from doing this if…

a) Bob is your good friend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Always Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

b) Bob is not your friend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Always Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

c) Amy is your good friend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Always Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

d) Amy is not your friend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Always Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When is it OK to? (Circle One)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is OK to call a girl a slut/whore/skank etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Sometimes (e.g. when it’s with a close friend, or a joke/flirting)</td>
<td>This is not a Big Deal, pretty much OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is OK to call a boy a fag, fairy, queer, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Sometimes (e.g. when it’s with a close friend, or a joke/flirting)</td>
<td>This is not a Big Deal, pretty much OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is OK to undo another’s bra strap.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Sometimes (e.g. when it’s with a close friend, or a joke/flirting)</td>
<td>This is not a Big Deal, pretty much OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is OK to pull clothing down or off.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Sometimes (e.g. when it’s with a close friend, or a joke/flirting)</td>
<td>This is not a Big Deal, pretty much OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is OK to send a sext.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Sometimes (e.g. when it’s with a close friend, or a joke/flirting)</td>
<td>This is not a Big Deal, pretty much OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is OK to intimately touch someone without his or her permission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Sometimes (e.g. when it’s with a close friend, or a joke/flirting)</th>
<th>This is not a Big Deal, pretty much OK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

It is OK to take pictures of someone without their permission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Sometimes (e.g. when it’s with a close friend, or a joke/flirting)</th>
<th>This is not a Big Deal, pretty much OK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

It is OK to make a rape joke.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Sometimes (e.g. when it’s with a close friend, or a joke/flirting)</th>
<th>This is not a Big Deal, pretty much OK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

It is OK to post something sexual about someone online.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Sometimes (e.g. when it’s with a close friend, or a joke/flirting)</th>
<th>This is not a Big Deal, pretty much OK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
10. Have you been with someone who was bullied in a sexual manner (for example being grabbed in an inappropriate way, being called a whore/manwhore) in the last two months?

☐ I haven’t been with anyone being bullied in a sexual manner in the last two months
☐ It has only happened once or twice
☐ Two or three times a month
☐ About once a week
☐ Several times a week or more

If yes, was it…
☐ Almost always in person
   ☐ Mostly in person
   ☐ About equally in person and online
   ☐ Mostly online
   ☐ Almost always online

If you have been with someone who was being bullied in a sexual manner, what did you do?
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

11. Have you been with someone who was bullying someone else in a sexual manner in the last two months?
☐ I haven’t been with someone who was bullying someone else in a sexual manner in the last 2 months
☐ It has only happened once or twice
☐ Two or three times a month
☐ About once a week
☐ Several times a week or more

If yes, was it…
☐ Almost always in person
   ☐ Mostly in person
   ☐ About equally in person and online
   ☐ Mostly online
   ☐ Almost always online

If you have been with someone bullying others in a sexual manner, what did you do?
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
Rate how strongly you agree with each of these statements (Circle one).

Sexual bullying isn’t a serious problem in school since it only affects a few people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Most sexual bullying is just having fun.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Girls are asking to be sexually harassed when they wear short skirts and tight clothes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Girls lie about being raped just to get back at their dates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I would tell a group of my male friends about their sexist language or behaviours (for example, telling a girl she should get back into the kitchen) if I hear it or see it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I have the skills to support a friend who is being disrespected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If there was a group of guys I don’t know very well making harassing sexual comments to a girl at school, I would not try to stop them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I would tell a group of my female friends about their sexist language or behaviours (for example such as saying that only men can be firefighters) if I hear it or see it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I know how to educate my friends about how to stop bullying of a sexual nature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I can help prevent sexual bullying at my school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Prevalence Questionnaire

Have you been bullied in a sexual manner in the last two months?

☐ I haven’t been bullied in a sexual manner in the last two months
☐ It has only happened once or twice
☐ Two or three times a month
☐ About once a week
☐ Several times a week or more

⇒ If YES what did you experience? (Check all that apply)
☐ Someone making a sexual joke directed at you
☐ Someone showing, giving, or leaving you sexual photographs, messages, or notes
☐ Someone spreading sexual rumors about you
☐ Someone spying on you as you dressed or showered at school
☐ Someone flashing or mooning you
☐ Someone pulling your clothes in a sexual way
☐ Someone touching, grabbing or pinching you in a sexual way
☐ Someone pulling your clothing off or down
☐ I was sexually bullied through emails
☐ I was sexually bullied in chat rooms
☐ I was sexually bullied through instant messages
☐ I was sexually bullied through social networking websites (Facebook, Twitter, etc.)
☐ I was sexually bullied through file sharing websites (YouTube, Flickr, etc.)
☐ I was sexually bullied through a blog (blogger, blogspot, LiVEJOURNAL, etc.)
☐ Other, please specify ____________________________

2. If you have been bullied in a sexual manner was it…
☐ Almost always in person
☐ Mostly in person
☐ About equally in person and online
☐ Mostly online
☐ Almost always online
☐ This hasn’t happened to me
How do you feel when someone bullied you in a sexual manner in the last two months? (Check all that apply)

☐ I haven’t been bullied in a sexual manner in the last two months
   ☐ Embarrassed
   ☐ Worried
   ☐ Upset
   ☐ Afraid and scared
   ☐ Alone and isolated
   ☐ Defenseless, no one can do anything about it
   ☐ Depressed
   ☐ Stressed
   ☐ It doesn’t bother me
   ☐ Angry
   ☐ Other (Please write here).................................................................................................................................

4. How long did the sexualized bullying last?
   ☐ I haven’t been sexually bullied in the last two months
   ☐ It lasted one or two weeks
   ☐ It lasted about a month
   ☐ It has lasted about six months
   ☐ It has lasted about a year
   ☐ It has gone on for several years

5. What have you done if someone bullied you in a sexual manner in the last two months? (For this question you can check all that apply)
   ☐ I haven’t been bullied in a sexual manner in the last two months
   ☐ I felt helpless
   ☐ I ignored what was happening, hoping it would stop
   ☐ I stopped using the Internet
   ☐ I told a friend
   ☐ I told a teacher
   ☐ I told a parent
   ☐ I asked the person directly to stop bullying me
   ☐ I blocked the person who was bullying me
   ☐ I contacted an internet server and reported the bully
   ☐ I tried to do to them what they had done to me
   ☐ Other (Please write here)........................................................................................................................................
Interview Question (s) one per person
A) Let’s talk about physical bullying, including grabbing peoples’ clothes, touching someone in inappropriate places, and being hugged or kissed without permission. Does that ever happen when you are around/are you aware of this happening?

Is it a big deal? Is it ever a big deal?
B) Let’s talk about sexualized bullying in a verbal manner, including calling people names (for example, whore/manwhore, pimp/slut, queer etc.), spreading rumors about who is dating who/is pregnant etc., Does that ever happen when you are around/are you aware of this happening?

Is it a big deal? Is it ever a big deal?
C) Let’s talk about cyberbullying, including taking (nude) pictures of someone without their permission, sending sexts, and posting something sexual about someone else online on social media. Does this ever happen when you are around/are you aware of this happening?

Is it a big deal? Is it ever a big deal?
Appendix F: Wave 1 Post-Intervention Questionnaire (Version B)

**Note:** In this questionnaire, we are asking about bullying that is sexual in nature. Sexual bullying is unwanted and unwelcomed sexual behaviour that interferes with someone’s life. Sexual bullying is NOT behaviours that a person likes or wants or is agreed to between two people (for example, kissing, touching, or flirting that you both agree to).

**Video Scenario**
After watching this scenario, please answer the following questions
What type of sexualized violence did you see in this scenario, if there was any?

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

2. Please evaluate the following
A) Danny
   i) How responsible is Danny for causing this situation?
   Not Responsible at all
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Responsible

B) The Blond Girl
   i) How responsible is the Blonde Girl for causing this situation?
   Not Responsible at all
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Responsible

C) The Girl in Red
   i) How responsible is the girl in the red for intervening in this situation?
   Not Responsible at all
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Responsible

   ii) What actions, if any, could you have taken to intervene in this situation?
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
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3. If you walked by and overheard what was happening, how likely would you have been to “step in”?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Always Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. A) What would you do if you stepped into this situation?

_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________

B) What would prevent you from engaging in this situation?

_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
Scenario
You are passing by a group of boys in the computer lab. One boy, Roger, is telling his friends that he is creating a “Katie is a Whore” group on Facebook, where he plans on posting photos and rumors about her because Katie refused to go out with him.
How likely are you to say to do something to try to stop Roger from doing this if…
Roger is your good friend

Not Likely  Somewhat Likely  Likely  Very Likely  Always Likely

Roger is not your friend

Not Likely  Somewhat Likely  Likely  Very Likely  Always Likely

Katie is your good friend

Not Likely  Somewhat Likely  Likely  Very Likely  Always Likely

Katie is not your friend

Not Likely  Somewhat Likely  Likely  Very Likely  Always Likely
**When is it OK to? (Circle One)**

It is OK to call a girl a slut/whore/skank etc.

| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes (e.g. when it’s with a close friend, or a joke/flirting) | This is not a Big Deal, pretty much OK |

It is OK to call a boy a fag, fairy, queer, etc.

| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes (e.g. when it’s with a close friend, or a joke/flirting) | This is not a Big Deal, pretty much OK |

It is OK to undo another’s bra strap.

| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes (e.g. when it’s with a close friend, or a joke/flirting) | This is not a Big Deal, pretty much OK |

It is OK to pull clothing down or off.

| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes (e.g. when it’s with a close friend, or a joke/flirting) | This is not a Big Deal, pretty much OK |
It is OK to send a sext.

| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes (e.g. when it’s with a close friend, or a joke/flirting) | This is not a Big Deal, pretty much OK |

It is OK to intimately touch someone without his or her permission.

| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes (e.g. when it’s with a close friend, or a joke/flirting) | This is not a Big Deal, pretty much OK |

It is OK to take pictures of someone without their permission.

| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes (e.g. when it’s with a close friend, or a joke/flirting) | This is not a Big Deal, pretty much OK |

It is OK to make a rape joke.

| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes (e.g. when it’s with a close friend, or a joke/flirting) | This is not a Big Deal, pretty much OK |

It is OK to post something sexual about someone online.

| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes (e.g. when it’s with a close friend, or a joke/flirting) | This is not a Big Deal, pretty much OK |
10. Have you been with someone who was bullied in a sexual manner (for example being grabbed in an inappropriate way, being called a whore/manwhore) in the last two months?
   - I haven’t been with anyone being bullied in a sexual manner in the last two months
   - It has only happened once or twice
   - Two or three times a month
   - About once a week
   - Several times a week or more

   If yes, was it…
   - Almost always in person
   - Mostly in person
   - About equally in person and online
   - Mostly online
   - Almost always online

   If you have been with someone who was being bullied in a sexual manner, what did you do?
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

11. Have you been with someone who was bullying someone else in a sexual manner in the last two months?
   - I haven’t been with someone who was bullying someone else in a sexual manner in the last 2 months
   - It has only happened once or twice
   - Two or three times a month
   - About once a week
   - Several times a week or more

   If yes, was it…
   - Almost always in person
   - Mostly in person
   - About equally in person and online
   - Mostly online
   - Almost always online

   If you have been with someone bullying others in a sexual manner, what did you do?
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
Rate how strongly you agree with each of these statements (Circle one)

Sexual bullying isn’t a serious problem in school since it only affects a few people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Most sexual bullying is just having fun.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Girls are asking to be sexually harassed when they wear short skirts and tight clothes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Girls lie about being raped just to get back at their dates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I would tell a group of my male friends about their sexist language or behaviours (for example, telling a girl she should get back into the kitchen) if I hear it or see it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I have the skills to support a friend who is being disrespected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If there was a group of guys I don’t know very well making harassing sexual comments to a girl at school, I would not try to stop them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I would tell a group of my female friends about their sexist language or behaviours (for example such as saying that only men can be firefighters) if I hear it or see it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I know how to educate my friends about how to stop bullying of a sexual nature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I can help prevent sexual bullying at my school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix G: Wave 2 Pre-Intervention Questionnaire (Version A)

**What grade are you in?**  7  8  9  10

**How old are you?**  11  12  13  14  15  16

What Gender do you identify with? Male  Female  Other (please specify)________

Do you own a cell phone and/or a personal wireless communication device (i.e., iPod Touch, Cell phone)?
YTE  NO

If yes, how many times a day do you send or receive messages (i.e. texts, Facetime, FB message)?
☐ 1-5 Times
☐ 6-10 Times
☐ 11-20 Times
☐ 21-30 Times
☐ 31-40 Times
☐ 41-50 Times
☐ 50+ Times

Do you have a computer at home? : YES  NO

If yes, on an average weekday how many hours a day do you spend on your computer?
☐ Less than an hour
☐ 1-2 Hours
☐ 3-4 Hours
☐ 5-6 Hours
☐ 7-8 Hours
☐ 9-10 Hours
☐ 11-12 Hours
☐ 12+ Hours

If yes, on an average weekend how many hours a day do you spend on your computer?
☐ Less than an hour
☐ 1-2 Hours
☐ 3-4 Hours
☐ 5-6 Hours
☐ 7-8 Hours
☐ 9-10 Hours
☐ 11-12 Hours
☐ 12+ Hours
Note: In this questionnaire, we are asking about bullying that is sexual in nature. Sexual bullying is unwanted and unwelcomed sexual behaviour that interferes with someone’s life. Sexual bullying is NOT behaviours that a person likes or wants or is agreed to between two people (for example, kissing, touching, or flirting that you both agree to).

Video Scenario
After watching this scenario, please answer the following questions

What type of sexualized violence did you see in this scenario, if there was any?

_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

2. Please evaluate the following

A) Jessica
   i) How responsible is Jessica for causing this situation?
      Not Responsible at all
      1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10  Totally Responsible

B) Billy
   i) How responsible is Billy for causing this situation?
      Not Responsible at all
      1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10  Totally Responsible

C) The Blonde Girl
   i) How responsible is the blonde girl for intervening in this situation?
      Not Responsible at all
      1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10  Totally Responsible

   ii) What actions, if any, could the Blonde Girl have taken to intervene in this situation?
      ____________________________________________________________
      ____________________________________________________________
      ____________________________________________________________
      ____________________________________________________________
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3. If you walked by and overheard what was happening, how likely would you have been to “step in”?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Always Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. A) What would you do if you stepped into this situation?

_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

B) What would prevent you from engaging in this situation?
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
**Scenario**
Imagine that you hear Bob chatting with a group of his friends. You overhear that he and Amy just broke up, and because she dumped him via text-message, he was going to send out a mass text message to all his friends of the naked photos that she sent to him.

How likely are you to say or do something to stop Bob from doing this if…

a) Bob is your good friend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Always Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

b) Bob is not your friend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Always Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

c) Amy is your good friend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Always Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

d) Amy is not your friend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Always Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
5. Have you been with someone who was bullied in a sexual manner (for example being grabbed in an inappropriate way, being called a whore/manwhore) in the last two months?

☐ I haven’t been with anyone being bullied in a sexual manner in the last two months
☐ It has only happened once or twice
☐ Two or three times a month
☐ About once a week
☐ Several times a week or more

If yes, was it…
☐ Almost always in person
    ☐ Mostly in person
    ☐ About equally in person and online
    ☐ Mostly online
    ☐ Almost always online

If you have been with someone who was being bullied in a sexual manner, what did you do?
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

6. Have you been with someone who was bullying someone else in a sexual manner in the last two months?
☐ I haven’t been with someone who was bullying someone else in a sexual manner in the last 2 months
☐ It has only happened once or twice
☐ Two or three times a month
☐ About once a week
☐ Several times a week or more

If yes, was it…
☐ Almost always in person
    Mostly in person
    About equally in person and online
    Mostly online
    Almost always online

If you have been with someone bullying others in a sexual manner, what did you do?
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
Rate how strongly you agree with each of these statements (Circle one).

Sexual bullying isn’t a serious problem in school since it only affects a few people.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Not Sure  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

Most sexual bullying is just having fun.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Not Sure  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

Girls are asking to be sexually harassed when they wear short skirts and tight clothes.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Not Sure  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

Girls lie about being raped just to get back at their dates.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Not Sure  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

I would tell a group of my male friends about their sexist language or behaviours (for example, telling a girl she should get back into the kitchen) if I hear it or see it.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Not Sure  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

I have the skills to support a friend who is being disrespected.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Not Sure  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

I would tell a group of my female friends about their sexist language or behaviours (for example, such as saying that only men can be firefighters) if I hear it or see it.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Not Sure  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

I know how to educate my friends about how to stop bullying of a sexual nature.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Not Sure  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

I can help prevent sexual bullying at my school.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Not Sure  Disagree  Strongly Disagree
Prevalence Questionnaire

Have you been bullied in a sexual manner in the last two months?

☐ I haven’t been bullied in a sexual manner in the last two months
☐ It has only happened once or twice
☐ Two or three times a month
☐ About once a week
☐ Several times a week or more

⇒ If YES what did you experience? (Check all that apply)
☐ Someone making a sexual joke directed at you
☐ Someone showing, giving, or leaving you sexual photographs, messages, or notes
☐ Someone spreading sexual rumors about you
☐ Someone spying on you as you dressed or showered at school
☐ Someone flashing or mooning you
☐ Someone pulling your clothes in a sexual way
☐ Someone touching, grabbing or pinching you in a sexual way
☐ Someone pulling your clothing off or down
☐ I was sexually bullied through emails
☐ I was sexually bullied in chat rooms
☐ I was sexually bullied through instant messages
☐ I was sexually bullied through social networking websites (Facebook, Twitter, etc.)
☐ I was sexually bullied through file sharing websites (YouTube, Flickr, etc.)
☐ I was sexually bullied through a blog (blogger, blogspot, LiVEJOURNAL, etc.)
☐ Other, please specify ____________________________

2. If you have been bullied in a sexual manner was it…
☐ Almost always in person
☐ Mostly in person
☐ About equally in person and online
☐ Mostly online
☐ Almost always online
☐ I have NEVER been bullied in a sexual manner
How do you feel when someone bullied you in a sexual manner in the last two months? (Check all that apply)

☐ I haven’t been bullied in a sexual manner in the last two months
  ☐ Embarrassed
  ☐ Worried
  ☐ Upset
  ☐ Afraid and scared
  ☐ Alone and isolated
  ☐ Defenseless, no one can do anything about it
  ☐ Depressed
  ☐ Stressed
  ☐ It doesn’t bother me
  ☐ Angry
  ☐ Other (Please write here).................................................................

4. How long did the sexualized bullying last?

☐ I haven’t been sexually bullied in the last two months
  ☐ It lasted one or two weeks
  ☐ It lasted about a month
  ☐ It has lasted about six months
  ☐ It has lasted about a year
  ☐ It has gone on for several years

5. What have you done if someone bullied you in a sexual manner in the last two months? (For this question you can check all that apply)

☐ I haven’t been bullied in a sexual manner in the last two months
  ☐ I felt helpless
  ☐ I ignored what was happening, hoping it would stop
  ☐ I stopped using the Internet
  ☐ I told a friend
  ☐ I told a teacher
  ☐ I told a parent
  ☐ I asked the person directly to stop bullying me
  ☐ I blocked the person who was bullying me
  ☐ I contacted an internet server and reported the bully
  ☐ I tried to do to them what they had done to me
  ☐ Other (Please write here).........................................................................
Appendix H: Wave 2 Post-Intervention Questionnaire (Version B)

Note: In this questionnaire, we are asking about bullying that is sexual in nature. Sexual bullying is unwanted and unwelcomed sexual behaviour that interferes with someone’s life. Sexual bullying is NOT behaviours that a person likes or wants or is agreed to between two people (for example, kissing, touching, or flirting that you both agree to).

Video Scenario
After watching this scenario, please answer the following questions
1. What type of sexualized violence did you see in this scenario, if there was any?

2. Please evaluate the following
A) Danny
   i) How responsible is Danny for causing this situation?
   Not Responsible at all
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Responsible

B) The Blond Girl
   i) How responsible is the Blonde Girl for causing this situation?
   Not Responsible at all
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Responsible

C) The Girl in Red
   i) How responsible is the girl in the red for intervening in this situation?
   Not Responsible at all
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Responsible

   ii) What actions, if any, could the girl in the red have taken to intervene in this situation?
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
3. If you walked by and overheard what was happening, how likely would you have been to “step in”?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Always Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. A) What would you do if you stepped into this situation?

________________________________________

________________________________________

B) What would prevent you from engaging in this situation?

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________
Scenario
You are passing by a group of boys in the computer lab. One boy, Roger, is telling his friends that he is creating a “Katie is a Whore” group on Facebook, where he plans on posting photos and rumors about her because Katie refused to go out with him.

How likely are you to say to do something to try to stop Roger from doing this if…

a) Roger is your good friend

Not Likely  Somewhat Likely  Likely  Very Likely  Always Likely

b) Roger is not your friend

Not Likely  Somewhat Likely  Likely  Very Likely  Always Likely

c) Katie is your good friend

Not Likely  Somewhat Likely  Likely  Very Likely  Always Likely

d) Katie is not your friend

Not Likely  Somewhat Likely  Likely  Very Likely  Always Likely
5. Have you been with someone who was bullied in a sexual manner (for example being grabbed in an inappropriate way, being called a whore/manwhore) in the last two months?

☐ I haven’t been with anyone being bullied in a sexual manner in the last two months
☐ It has only happened once or twice
☐ Two or three times a month
☐ About once a week
☐ Several times a week or more

If yes, was it...

☐ Almost always in person
☐ Mostly in person
☐ About equally in person and online
☐ Mostly online
☐ Almost always online

If you have been with someone who was being bullied in a sexual manner, what did you do?

_______________________________________________________________________

6. Have you been with someone who was bullying someone else in a sexual manner in the last two months?

☐ I haven’t been with someone who was bullying someone else in a sexual manner in the last 2 months
☐ It has only happened once or twice
☐ Two or three times a month
☐ About once a week
☐ Several times a week or more

If yes, was it...

☐ Almost always in person
☐ Mostly in person
☐ About equally in person and online
☐ Mostly online
☐ Almost always online
If you have been with someone bullying others in a sexual manner, what did you do?
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
Rate how strongly you agree with each of these statements (Circle one)

7. Sexual bullying isn’t a serious problem in school since it only affects a few people.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. Most sexual bullying is just having fun.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. Girls are asking to be sexually harassed when they wear short skirts and tight clothes.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. Girls lie about being raped just to get back at their dates.
    
    | Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
    |----------------|-------|----------|----------|-------------------|

11. I would tell a group of my male friends about their sexist language or behaviours (for example, telling a girl she should get back into the kitchen) if I hear it or see it.
    
    | Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
    |----------------|-------|----------|----------|-------------------|

12. I have the skills to support a friend who is being disrespected.
    
    | Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
    |----------------|-------|----------|----------|-------------------|

13. I would tell a group of my female friends about their sexist language or behaviours (for example such as saying that only men can be firefighters) if I hear it or see it.
    
    | Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
    |----------------|-------|----------|----------|-------------------|

14. I know how to educate my friends about how to stop bullying of a sexual nature.
    
    | Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
    |----------------|-------|----------|----------|-------------------|

15. I can help prevent sexual bullying at my school.
    
    | Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
    |----------------|-------|----------|----------|-------------------|
Appendix I: Exit Questionnaire

Exit Questionnaires

1) What was your favourite exercise/session? Why?

2) What was your least favourite exercise/session? Why?

3) What is the most important thing you learned about what gender based bully?

4) What are some ways to get involved (intervene) without pulling the focus onto you/me when you see Gender Bullying happen?

5) We did this group with all boys. What do you think would happen if girls and boys were part of the group?
Appendix J: Facilitator Feedback Form

General Questions

How many groups did you teach?

At which schools were you a facilitator?

How many participants in each group?

1. What was your overall impression on the program?

2. In what way can this program be improved?
   a. What session(s) could be added?
   b. What session(s) could be taken away?
3. What do you think was the best session for the participants?
   a. Why do you think this?

4. What session do you think could be improved?
   a. How would you improve it?

5. Were there any characteristics of the groups that you felt facilitated the program? Why do you think that was the case?

6. Were there any characteristics of the groups that you felt was a barrier to the delivery of the program?
   a. Why do you think that was the case?
   b. What could be done in order to mitigate this barrier in the future?
7. Did you feel that this program achieved its goal of changing knowledge, attitudes and beliefs on sexualized violence and gender bullying in this population?

8. What would you like to see happen during the next wave?
Appendix K: Coding Schema

Question 1-What type of Sexualized Violence did you see in this video, if any?
-1 No Sexualized violence
0-Irrelevant or No Answers
1-Vague Answer (i.e. “sexual violence”)
2-Simple descriptions
3-Describes act and person’s emotions/reaction to it (implies some consent is needed)

Question 2- What actions, if any, could X have taken to intervene in the situation
-1--Not do anything/Join in
0-Irrelevant or No Answer or I don’t know
1-Vague Response (“she could have intervened” not actively intervening)
2a—Appropriate response
2b()—Inappropriate Response (such as physical/escalating tactics)

Question 3- What would you do if you stepped into this situation?
-1—Not do anything/Join in
0-Irrelevant or No answer
1—Vague Response
2a—Appropriate Response
2b (-2?)-- Inappropriate Response (such as physical/escalating tactics)

Question 4- What would prevent you from engaging in this situation?
-1 I would not intervene (no reason given)
0-No answer/cannot be coded/irrelevant/not a reason to not intervene.
1-“Nothing” (nothing would stop them from intervening)

-Then we go to individual categories and count the number of reasons at the end
Appendix L: Thames Valley District School Board Ethics Approval

September 10, 2014

Dear Dr. Scott:

Your project, entitled "Engaging students in sexualized violence prevention through awareness and bystander intervention strategies" has been approved by Learning Support Services at the Thames Valley District School Board. You are welcome to begin data collection for your study.

As you are no doubt aware, the continued willingness of our faculty to participate in these studies is greatly enhanced by pertinent feedback of findings. I would suggest, therefore, that you make definite plans to provide the appropriate feedback to the school(s) involved.

The system also expects a copy of your final report for our research files.

Best of luck with your study. If I can be of further assistance, please feel free to call me.

Sincerely,

Steve Killip, Ph.D.
Manager - Research and Assessment Services Thames Valley District School Board

Cc: M. Deman, Superintendent of Student Achievement

Thames Valley District School Board - Research and Assessment
1250 Dundas Street, P.O. Box 5888, London, Ontario N6A 5L1 Tel: 519-452-2000 Fax: 519-452-1499
website: www.tvdsb.ca