

SCREAMing to Prevent Violence:



A Model for Peer Educational Theater Programs

Laura Johnson, MSW

Sarah McMahon, PhD (Principal Investigator)

Judy L. Postmus, PhD (Co-Principal Investigator)

Center on Violence Against Women and Children,
School of Social Work

Ruth Anne Koenick, Director
Office for Violence Prevention and Victim Assistance

Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to extend gratitude to Sharon Zucker, Melanie Lowe Hoffman, Brady Root, Laura Luciano, Lisa Smith and Paul Herman for their assistance with this manual.

This research was supported by a grant from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) to the Center on Violence Against Women and Children at Rutgers University, School of Social Work (grant number: 5R01CE001855-03). Its contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the CDC.

Table of Contents

What is the Purpose of this Manual?	4
History of SCREAMing to Prevent Violence Curriculum	5
Background: Why use Peer Education Theater and Bystander Intervention Education?	6
SCREAMing to Prevent Violence (STPV): An Overview	11
STPV Detailed Session Descriptions	14
STPV1: Performance	14
STPV2: You Choose	19
STPV3: Acting Makes a Difference	22
STPV4: What Would You Do?	25
Getting Started	26
Cultural Considerations	28
Program Evaluation	29
SCREAMing to Prevent Violence Curriculum Program Evaluation	31
References	32
About:	34
Center on Violence Against Women and Children	34
Office for Violence Prevention and Victim Assistance	34

What is the purpose of this Manual?

This manual provides an overview of the SCREAMing to Prevent Violence (STPV) © curriculum developed by Rutgers Office for Violence Prevention and Victim Assistance (VPVA). This manual is intended to guide university and college administrators when considering using peer education and specifically the SCREAM program to prevent violence on their campuses. SCREAM Theater ©, SCREAM Athletes©, and SCREAMing to Prevent Violence© were created by staff from the VPVA and can be purchased for a reasonable fee. For more information about the full curricula along with detailed support to implement these programs on your campus, please contact VPVA (<http://vpva.rutgers.edu>).

In 2010, Drs. Sarah McMahon and Judy L. Postmus at the Center on Violence Against Women and Children (VAWC) at Rutgers University, School of Social Work received funding from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) to conduct an extensive evaluation of the effectiveness of the SCREAMing to Prevent Violence curriculum. This manual includes key findings from this CDC-funded program evaluation.

The manual begins with an introduction to and history of the STPV curriculum, peer education theater and bystander intervention education, followed by a general description of the SCREAMing to Prevent Violence curriculum. The curriculum is comprised of four sessions. Each session is highlighted individually beginning on page 14. Lastly, results from the program evaluation are presented on page 31.

History of the SCREAMing To Prevent Violence Curriculum

SCREAM (Students Challenging Realities and Educating Against Myths) Theater was developed in 1991 by Rutgers' Office of Sexual Assault Services (now Rutgers' Office for Violence Prevention and Victim Assistance) in response to the recognized need for sexual violence prevention programming on the Rutgers University campus. SCREAM Theater has evolved to include programming on dating violence, stalking, same sex violence, harassment, and bullying, and now also includes the larger SCREAMing to Prevent Violence curriculum.

In 1989, a university task force was appointed to study the issue of campus acquaintance rape at Rutgers. One task force recommendation was to provide programming on sexual assault to all first year students during orientation. Former President Francis Lawrence accepted the recommendation and directed that programming be implemented. As a result, SCREAM Theater was developed and incorporated into the university's orientation for all first year and transfer students.

Since its inception, the SCREAM Theater program has continued to grow. Outreach has expanded to include fraternities and sororities, student-athletes, high schools, state professionals, and national conferences. The primary prevention curriculum utilizing SCREAM Theater, called SCREAMing to Prevent Violence, has expanded to consist of multiple sessions, which can be adapted to educate college and school aged audiences on multiple forms of violence. Additionally, a second curriculum was developed specifically for student-athletes and includes a video, Taking the Lead: SCREAM Athletes Step Up to Prevent Sexual Violence. In response to the program's success, the SCREAMing to Prevent Violence curriculum continues to develop and expand. This manual presents an overview of the full curriculum.

Background: Why use Peer Education Theater and Bystander Intervention?

Why use peer education theater?



Peer education is a tool in which key leaders from a community are selected to teach the community about a particular issue. Peer education is an approach used widely with high school and college students, as well as with community groups, and has been recognized as a promising practice by several governmental agencies, including the CDC and the U.S. Department of Education (Hunter, 2004). There are a number of reasons why peer education has been widely utilized to challenge

social issues. These reasons include its cost-effectiveness, the feeling of empowerment it brings to peer leaders, and that it builds upon previously existing peer relationships (Turner & Shepherd, 1999).

Peer education is an especially effective approach for youth and young adults. Studies have found that students are more likely to pay attention to presentations conducted by their peers and often feel more comfortable discussing challenging issues, such as interpersonal violence, in this context (Kress et al., 2006; White et al., 2009). Research has also found that peer leaders can be very influential in shifting group norms on public health issues (Banyard, Moynihan, & Crossman, 2009). Peer education has been combined with theater in response to the demonstrated effectiveness of each modality in influencing audiences and challenging social norms.

Theater, when used for education, has received increasing recognition as a form of “entertainment education,” with the underlying premise that it is engaging and entertaining, while also delivering educational information to the audience (Singhal & Rogers, 1999). “Parasocial interaction” is a key construct of entertainment education and suggests that members of the audience can connect emotionally with the characters being portrayed (Singhal & Rogers, 1999; Herman, 2008). Research suggests that the emotions stimulated through peer education theater may affect attitudes and behaviors in ways that traditional educational methods do not (Dalrymple & Toit, 1993). Peer education theater is effective in capturing an audience’s attention and creating an environment that fosters open discussion on issues faced by today’s youth. Several studies have found that peer education theater programs have positively changed participants’ attitudes toward the issue of interpersonal violence (McMahon, Postmus, Warrenner, & Koenick, 2014; Black et al., 2000; Kress et al., 2006; Pomeroy et al., 2011). attitudes and behaviors in ways that traditional educational methods do not (Dalrymple & Toit, 1993). Peer education theater is effective in capturing an audience’s attention and creating an environment that fosters open discussion on issues faced by today’s youth.

What is bystander intervention?

Bystander intervention is not a new concept; however, it is only recently being researched and utilized as an effective strategy in the primary prevention of sexual violence. In fact, SCREAM Theater has been implementing bystander intervention education since its inception, long before there was a name to describe the behavioral model.

A bystander is an individual who is located in close proximity to an occurrence, but is not personally involved. In the context of violence prevention, bystanders are those individuals who have the ability to intervene before, during, or after a concerning event, such as a sexual assault. In order for bystander intervention to be an effective prevention model, individuals must become engaged in the activities and situations occurring around them. The concept of bystander intervention is a very important prevention strategy because it shifts the way that communities look at issues such as interpersonal violence. While past prevention strategies placed blame on the victim, bystander intervention places responsibility on entire communities to protect each other (Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2004).

The decision to intervene is based on a number of factors, including the accepted social norms of an individual or community. In order to understand why bystander education is necessary, it is important to understand why individuals may choose not to intervene in a given situation. In many cultures, there is a strong belief that one should not interfere in the private activities of another individual. Therefore, when individuals observe potentially concerning situations,

they may not feel personally responsible for getting involved (Banyard, Moynihan, Cares & Warner, 2014), believing “It isn’t my business,” or “It’s just an argument.” In other instances, an individual may want to do something, but be uncertain about how to proceed (Karakashian, Walter, Christopher, & Lucas, 2006).

Studies have found that an individual must pass through a number of phases before acting as an engaged bystander. The steps to becoming a positive active engaged bystander are outlined below in Figure 1.

Figure 1.

Steps to Becoming a Positive Active Engaged Bystander

1. Notice the event
 2. Identify the situation as intervention-appropriate
 3. Take responsibility
 4. Decide how to help
 5. Act to intervene
-

From Latane & Darley, 1970

As individuals move through the stages to becoming an engaged bystander, there are also a number of barriers they may encounter. For this reason, bystander intervention education models teach positive bystander behaviors and help individuals overcome barriers to intervening. The chart below in Figure 2 outlines some barriers to bystander intervention in pre-assault situations that college students may face and ways in which a rape prevention program, such as SCREAMing to Prevent Violence, can help students overcome them.

The decision to intervene becomes even more challenging when the situation is related to issues of interpersonal violence. The promotion of strict gender norms and “prejudicial, stereotyped, or false beliefs about rape, rape victims and rapists” in society promote a rape-supportive culture (Burt, 1980, p. 217). Studies have found that certain social groups, such as male athletic teams, fraternities, and the military, engage in practices that permit or even encourage violence against women (McMahon, 2007; Sanday, 2007; O’Toole, 1994).

Even when individuals recognize a situation to be wrong, they may feel it would socially unacceptable to challenge it. These factors make bystander intervention education particularly important for high school and college students, as they may be in an environment where there is support for acts of violence against women.

Furthermore, the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (Black et al., 2011) found that 37.4 percent of survivors of sexual violence experienced their first rape between the

ages of 18 and 24 and almost 30 percent experienced their first rape between the ages of 11 and 17. These statistics indicate that adolescents and young adults are at greatest risk for sexual violence victimization. In addition, approximately 20-25 percent of women will experience a completed or attempted rape during their college careers (Karjane, Fisher, & Cullen, 2005). The majority of these assaults will be perpetrated by an intimate partner or acquaintance of the victim (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000; Smith, White & Holland, 2003). Because interpersonal violence is so prevalent on college campuses, it is important that community-level interventions are used to support survivors and prevent future acts from occurring.

Figure 2.

Barriers to Bystander Intervention and Application to Sexual Violence Prevention Programs³

Step	Barrier ¹	Influences ²	Application to sexual violence prevention programs
1. Notice event	Failure to notice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Noise and other sensory distractions •Self-focus 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Encourage students to pay attention and be aware of others, to take care of their friends and community
2. Identify situation as intervention-appropriate	Failure to identify situation as high risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Ambiguity regarding consent or danger •Pluralistic ignorance [no one else sees it as a problem] •Ignorance of sexual assault risk markers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Help students identify what situations/ actions/behaviors lead up to sexual assault •Continuum of violence •What are some “high risk” situations they have noticed?
3. Take responsibility	Failure to take intervention responsibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Diffusion of responsibility (likelihood greater if there are many other possible interveners) •Relationship of bystander to potential victim and potential perpetrator •Attributions of worthiness (affected by perceived choices of potential victim that increased her risk, perception of potential victim’s provocativeness and her intoxication) [rape myths] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Encourage students to see bystander intervention as a responsibility of being a community member •Address rape myths •Increase empathy
4. Decide how to help	Failure to intervene due to skills deficit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Action ignorance (don’t know what to say or do to intervene) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Give students concrete bystander skills and practice
5. Act to intervene	Failure to intervene due to audience inhibition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Social norms running counter to intervention •Evaluation apprehension 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Use peers to demonstrate that others think this is important •Encourage dialogue to reveal that most students think intervening is appropriate •Have discussions about barriers to intervening- what would stop someone? •Discuss gender/masculinity

¹ Latane, B. & Darley, J. M. (1970)

² Burn, S. M. (2009)

³ Please cite this figure as: McMahon, S. (2014). Barriers to Bystander Intervention and Application to Sexual Violence Prevention programs, in Johnson et al., SCREAMing to Prevent Violence: A Model for Peer Education Programs.

Why use bystander intervention education?

Bystander intervention education is being widely incorporated into rape prevention and education programs, especially on college campuses, as a way for all community members to play a role in preventing sexual violence. Through bystander intervention education programs, such as the SCREAMing to Prevent Violence curriculum, participants are taught about the process to becoming an engaged bystander and receive the tools needed to safely intervene in situations that present a risk to someone else.

In order for individuals to successfully intervene, they must first be able to identify both high and low risk situations that may lead to an act of interpersonal violence. Low risk behaviors include using sexually degrading language, while high risk behaviors include trying to move an intoxicated woman to a secluded location to sexually assault her (McMahon & Banyard, 2012). Bystander intervention education has been found to positively influence individuals' intentions to intervene and their confidence or efficacy to intervene as a bystander (Katz & Moore, 2014). The SCREAMing to Prevent Violence curriculum helps participants to identify a variety of bystander intervention strategies that he or she feels comfortable and confident utilizing.

SCREAMing to Prevent Violence (STPV): An Overview

The SCREAMing to Prevent Violence curriculum consists of four sessions. Each of these sessions is outlined within this manual. To maintain fidelity to the program, it is important to conduct the four sessions in order, as each session builds upon lessons learned from the previous one. However, the fourth session may also be used as a booster session. This section contains a basic overview of the full program. The next section contains a more in-depth look at each individual session. For each session outlined below, the topic of interpersonal violence focused on is sexual assault; however, other aspects of interpersonal violence can be incorporated into the program as well.

Session 1: STPV-Performance



The first session consists of a peer education theater performance about sexual assault. This session lasts approximately 60-75 minutes and consists of multiple parts. The session begins with an introduction by a trained facilitator, followed by a 30-minute skit on sexual assault. Once the skit has concluded, the actors and audience engage in an in-character question/answer session, followed by an out-of-character information session and wrap-up. The goal of this session is to portray the events leading up to and the aftermath of a sexual assault. Characters within the skit include the perpetrator, a victim and some of their friends (for example, the bystander, a friend who helps the perpetrator facilitate the rape, a victim blaming friend, and a supportive friend). The skit will enlighten the audience as to what a victim may be experiencing, as well as highlight the variety of ways friends of the victim and the perpetrator may react. This session can be conducted for as few as 10 participants or as many as 500 depending on the room, access to microphones, and the ability of student actors. It has been presented to mixed-gender groups and can be used as a stand-alone educational program with proven effectiveness (see SCREAMing to Prevent Violence Curriculum Program Evaluation).

Session 2: STPV-You Choose

The second session lasts 60 minutes and provides a basic introduction to bystander intervention as a strategy for preventing violence. The first half of the session is facilitated lecture-style, followed by actors re-creating six of the scenes from the STPV-Performance skit presented in session one. Each re-created scene features a bystander who did not act positively to intervene. However, in this performance, the audience will have the opportunity to vote on one of three possible bystander interventions they would like to see performed. The conclusion of the scene will be determined by which intervention is chosen by the audience. The goal of this session is to begin the discussion of what positive active bystanders can do to prevent sexual violence. By providing a range of possible alternative endings to each scene, the audience learns that there are many possible ways to intervene. A primary message is that as long as you do something, it can make a difference. Like the performance in session one, this session can also be conducted with a large audience, as long as there is a means of allowing participants to anonymously weigh in on the alternative endings. SCREAMing to Prevent Violence used clicker technology⁴ to vote so there was some anonymity, but Poll Everywhere is another option to use that is easy and less expensive.

Session 3: STPV-Acting Makes a Difference

Session three lasts 60 minutes and provides participants with the space to come up with their own bystander interventions for the situations presented to them in the two previous STPV sessions. This session continues to build upon what was taught in the previous sessions. In the first session, participants observed a high-risk and violent situation. In the second session, participants learned possible ways in which they could intervene. In this third session, participants are encouraged to identify new and original ways to intervene in the situations they have observed. Participants are then asked to act out their interventions in front of their peers. This exercise gives participants the opportunity to practice the language and behaviors of bystander intervention.

As participants enter the training room, they are provided with a number between one and six. At the beginning of the session, the facilitator provides an introduction to the activity and asks participants to divide into groups based on their number. Each group is assigned a peer educator and a scenario. The audience previously viewed the scenarios presented during the first and second sessions of the STPV curriculum. The peer educator works with the participants to develop new and appropriate interventions for their assigned scenario. Next, the group works together to act out their favorite intervention before presenting it to the other groups. For this session, an audience of between 10 and 50 individuals would be ideal, but with flexibility, it could work with smaller or larger numbers.

Session 4: STPV-What Would U Do?

In the fourth and final session of the SCREAMing to Prevent Violence curriculum, participants are asked to decide whether they would “intervene” or “not intervene” in a number of situations. In this session, peer educators act out a series of short vignettes on a range of behaviors that contribute to a culture of violence. Participants are asked to physically move to either the side of the room labeled “intervene” or the side of the room labeled “not intervene.” Participants are also encouraged to practice acting out interventions to the different scenarios. After each vignette, there is a facilitated discussion regarding why individuals decided to intervene or not intervene. Again, an audience of between 10 and 50 individuals would be ideal, but with flexibility, it could work with smaller or larger numbers.

⁴ Clickers are devices that allow group surveying to occur in real-time. The device enables an instructor to pose a question to an audience and using clicker technology, participants are able share their answers. A program then collects and tabulates participants’ responses so they can be presented immediately to the audience.

STPV Detailed Session Descriptions

STPV1: Performance

The goals of this session are to:

- Teach accurate information about sexual violence and how participants can help to address the issue on their campus.
- Help participants to empathize with a victim of sexual violence and begin to understand the role of the bystander.
- Explain which responses are helpful and which are harmful when addressing sexual assault with someone who has been victimized.
- Help participants to understand the complex views and opinions that arise when talking about sexual violence.
- Discuss how sexual violence is a community issue.

Typically, the first skit lasts approximately 30 minutes. A trained facilitator begins the presentation by introducing SCREAM, sexual assault, and what the participants can expect to see during the presentation. The facilitator also provides a trigger warning to the audience, letting them know that they will see a reenactment of a sexual assault and directing them to counselors or other professional staff who can talk with them, if necessary.

The skit portrays a male student and his friends, and a female student and her friends. There is a party scene followed by two separate “bedroom scenes.” Bedroom scene #1 shows two people who go to the bedroom and start to become intimate, but quickly stop and head back to the party when one of them expresses discomfort.

Bedroom scene #2 is the re-enactment of the sexual assault and ends with the lights going out and the victim yelling “NO!” multiple times, even begging the rapist to stop with promises to return another time. During this scene, the inactive bystander accidentally walks in and chooses to leave without doing anything. The skit concludes with “he said/she said” scenes, in which both the victim and the perpetrator re-tell their versions of the previous night’s events. The victim’s friends have a strong reaction to hearing what happened and the victim, who is not ready to do anything, gets upset and leaves. The inactive bystander discusses what he or

she witnessed the night before but is reluctant to get involved further. The last scene usually involves one or two character(s) challenging the rapist about his behavior. After the skit, the facilitator leads an “in-character” question/answer session with the audience, followed by the actors “coming out of character” to introduce themselves and talk more about the issue of sexual violence and the role they each played.

The actors portray a variety of perspectives on what happened based on eight distinct character roles:

1. Perpetrator
2. Perpetrator’s friend who “facilitates” the assault
3. Perpetrator’s friend who confronts him about his behaviors
4. Inactive bystander
5. Victim
6. Victim’s friend who blames the victim for her actions
7. Victim’s friend who pushes the victim into getting help and taking action
8. Victim’s friend who is supportive to the victim’s needs

At the conclusion of the skit, the actors remain in-character for a facilitated question and answer session with the audience. Audience members are encouraged to challenge the characters and ask them questions about what they saw during the skit. The performers answer these questions in a manner they believe their characters would. This is done in order to give the audience members a glimpse into what those involved might be thinking. This is a very unique opportunity to create a dialogue that includes very real questions about sexual violence.

Examples of in-character questions:

Perpetrator:

- Why do you think (victim) is so upset?
- What is your definition of sexual assault?
- Did you hear (victim) say no?
- Were you planning to have sex at the party?
- Why didn’t you listen to (victim)?

Facilitator of the Assault:

- What do you think happened between (perpetrator) and (victim) last night?
- Does (perpetrator) do this kind of thing all the time?
- Why were you trying to get the girls so drunk?

Confronting Friend:

- How did it feel to confront (perpetrator) about such a difficult topic?
- Do you think you're still going to be able to be friends with (perpetrator)?
- What are you going to do next?
- Do you think (perpetrator) heard what you had to say?

Inactive Bystander:

- Why didn't you want to get involved?
- You mentioned that you were concerned-don't you think you should help (victim)?
- Have you ever heard of (perpetrator) doing something like this before?

Victim:

- How are you feeling now?
- Are you going to stay in school?
- Why don't you want to tell anyone about what happened to you?
- What if you are pregnant?
- Why did you go upstairs with (perpetrator) in the first place?
- What did you think was going to happen?
- What are you going to do if you see him on campus?

Victim-Blaming Friend:

- Why don't you believe that (victim) was sexually assaulted?
- Why don't you want to help your friend?
- What if this happened to you? Wouldn't you want your friends to believe you?

Pushy Friend:

- Are you going to get help for (victim), even if she doesn't want to talk to anyone?
- Don't you think you should let your friend decide what she wants to do?

Supportive Friend:

- What do you think (victim) should do now?
- How can you help your friend?
- Are you going to go to the police?

Note to person facilitating the program: The purpose of the In-Character Question and Answer session is to allow the audience to inquire about what they have just seen. The audience will learn that the majority of sexual offenders plan and premeditate sexual assault, including activities prior to a sexual assault occurring. Activities can include physically isolating victims, providing victims with alcohol to render them vulnerable to attack, or sharing such plans with peers (Lisak & Roth, 1990; Lisak & Miller, 2002).

Often, an audience remains quiet for a short time before the first brave person asks a question. Once the first question is asked, it is common for many more hands to go up. However, in the event that no one asks a question, the facilitator may need to have a few provocative questions to fall back on so that it sparks additional conversation from the audience (for example, ask the perpetrator what his definition of sexual assault is—the question and response should raise more questions with the audience). It may also be helpful for the facilitator to start off the conversation by asking each character one question to warm the audience up to this process. If someone asks a question that is silly or irrelevant, it is the facilitator’s responsibility to either redirect the question or move on to the next person who has his or her hand raised. Also, remind the audience that the only way this part of the program can work is if they are asking real questions and are being respectful of the audience and the actors on stage. There are times that an audience might focus only on the victim and ask victim-blaming questions. In these situations, the facilitator needs to bring attention to other characters, perhaps by asking “Does anyone have any questions for Ryan [or any alternate character]?”

Out-of-Character Introductions

The purpose of this section is to introduce the audience to the actors as people. Because SCREAMing to Prevent Violence is portrayed realistically, it is important to differentiate truth (student actors) from fiction (characters they are playing on stage). This segment also wraps up the loose ends of the program by providing the actors the opportunity to teach something about the role they played in the skit.

It is important that the facilitator leave at least 15 minutes for the Out-Of-Character Introductions. After the audience has had the opportunity to ask the actors some in-character questions, the facilitator should ask the actors to “come out of character” and introduce themselves to the audience. It is not uncommon for the actors to take a deep breath and laugh a little bit, while the audience begins to realize that the actors are no longer playing their roles. The actors then stand up, introduce themselves, and talk about the character they played in the skit. This provides each actor with an opportunity to address important issues related to his/her character. Sometimes the actor also apologizes for how he/she answered a question when in character, not wanting the person asking the question to feel picked on.

Examples of what each actor should address:

Perpetrator:

- Power, control, and entitlement
- Enthusiastic consent (consent is the presence of a yes, not the absence of a no)
- Sexual violence crosses all boundaries (race, gender, sexual orientation, etc.)

Victim:

- Self-doubt and blame
- Reasons a victim may not come forward

Victim-Blaming Friend:

- Damage of victim-blaming language and behavior
- Importance of redirecting the questions to the perpetrator

Pushy Friend:

- Important to empower the victim to make his/her own decisions
- Not to take power and control away from victim, especially because the perpetrator has already done that

Supportive Friend:

- The importance of offering options to the victim
- Supporting the victim even if they choose to do nothing
- Offer options to the audience including local resources for victims of sexual violence

Confronting Friend:

- Lack of role models
- Nonviolent confrontation – violence leads to more violence
- Respect – this character respects his partner's decision not to go any further

Facilitator:

- Derogatory language and the impact objectifying women has
- Alcohol as a weapon – alcohol is not the cause of the assault

Inactive Bystander:

- The importance of intervening
- No innocent bystanders
- There are other ways to intervene – some may challenge the problem directly, while others may ask for help or find a way to diffuse the situation indirectly

STPV2: You Choose

The goals of this session are to:

- Provide definitions and background information related to bystander intervention.
- Provide reasons why people do not intervene in certain situations.
- Explain steps for effective bystander intervention.
- Help participants understand the connection between sexual violence and prevention.
- Review STPV-Performance, including a scene-by-scene recap.

Scene Re-creation

The objective of this session is to begin a conversation regarding bystander intervention and what motivates individuals to intervene. This session is divided into two parts. During the first part of the session, the facilitator educates the audience on the basics of bystander intervention, including Latane and Darley's (1970) steps to becoming an active bystander (see page 8). Participants also have an opportunity to practice the clicker technology that will be used later in the workshop by answering survey questions regarding the impact that domestic violence and sexual violence have had on them personally. This activity brings the material to life for participants by demonstrating the impact that interpersonal violence has had on the audience.

During this session, actors briefly re-create six scenes from STPV-Performance. The scene re-creation is done one at a time. At a designated point within each scene, the facilitator stops the actors. The facilitator presents the audience with three possible bystander interventions. The audience is given the opportunity to vote on which intervention they would like to see the actors perform. Participants vote using the clicker technology discussed previously (see page 12). The actors then continue the scene based on the intervention selected by the audience. There are two types of scenes within the activity. The first are "freeze" scenes, in which the facilitator pauses the scene and gives the audience an opportunity to discuss what should happen next. The second type of scene is the "do-over" scene, where the audience watches the scene all the way through and then makes a group decision regarding how to change it from the beginning.

The scene re-creation skits serve several purposes. The first is to expose participants to bystander intervention. The second is to demonstrate that there are multiple ways to intervene in any one given situation. Thirdly, the actors model specific interventions and highlight potential outcomes that may develop as a result of a particular intervention.

Note: Throughout this section, the characters are referred to by name. The following is a list of the characters' names and the roles they play:

Characters Names:

- Sam – Inactive bystander
- Corey – Confronting friend
- Alex - Facilitator
- Ryan - Perpetrator
- Jess - Victim
- Elena – Supportive friend
- Rachel – Pushy friend
- Liz – Victim-blaming friend

Scenario 1 (freeze): Sam, Corey, Alex, and Ryan are getting ready for the party

Question facilitator asks the audience: What should Sam do?

1. Take Corey aside and tell him that Alex and Ryan are going to ruin the party—Corey should say something to them
2. Tell Alex and/or Ryan they have gone too far
3. Change the topic of conversation

Scenario 2 (freeze): Everyone is at the party

Question facilitator asks the audience: What should Sam do?

1. Tell Alex to stop pouring and take over the game
2. Suggest that one of the girls take her friends to go dance
3. Tell Alex that a fight broke out outside the party

Scenario 3 (do-over): Sam enters the bedroom and sees Ryan sexually assaulting Jess

Question facilitator asks the audience: What should Sam do?

1. Leave the room and get Jess's friends to check on her
2. Carry on into the bedroom, acting really drunk and sitting down with them to chat
3. Ask Jess if she is ok and wait to hear an answer

Scenario 4 (freeze): Corey asks Sam to go with him to confront Ryan about what he saw

Question facilitator asks the audience: What should Sam do?

1. Tell Corey “I got your back and will go with you to talk to Ryan”
2. Tell Corey “I got your back but I don't really want to say anything”
3. Suggest that Corey calls Liz to see if she knows anything

Scenario 5 (do-over): Jess and Elena tell Rachel and Liz about what happened

Question facilitator asks the audience: What should Elena do?

1. Ask Rachel and Liz to take their conversation outside
2. Ask Jess if she wants to leave and go somewhere more quiet to figure things out
3. Ask Rachel and Liz to quiet down, and suggest some options for what Jess can do next

Scenario 6 (freeze): Corey tries to confront Ryan about what happened with Jess

Question facilitator asks the audience: What should Sam do?

1. Tell Ryan and Alex what he/she really thinks
2. Find a way to talk to Ryan alone
3. Back Corey up and help him challenge Ryan and Alex

STPV3: Acting Makes a Difference

The goals of this session are:

- Review information from previous STPV sessions on bystander intervention.
- Help participants brainstorm a multitude of potential bystander interventions and create ways to put them into practice.
- Have participants “act out” the interventions they deem most helpful and realistic.
- Encourage dialogue between participants and peer educators in order to both challenge and encourage future acts of bystander intervention.

This session offers participants an opportunity to think about how they might intervene in a given situation, rather than choosing from presented interventions, as in the You Choose session. The intervention that participants may choose to use will depend on their own comfort level and life experiences, which is one of the strengths of bystander intervention. As such, this exercise provides participants with the opportunity to brainstorm a multitude of possible bystander interventions and practice those interventions that feel most comfortable.

The session begins with a brief refresher on bystander intervention. Participants are then divided into six groups. Each group is assigned one actor (peer educator) who will serve as a group leader; participants are also assigned a scene from You Choose, session 2, to work through. The groups are tasked with brainstorming as many bystander interventions as possible. One person in the group records these interventions on a large piece of paper. Once the list is complete, the group chooses one intervention to act out for the larger group. The room then re-convenes and each scene is presented to the larger group for discussion.

Scene Assignments:

Scenario 1:

Ryan, Sam, Alex, and Corey are getting ready for a party at their house. Their conversation basically revolves around getting drunk and hooking up. Ryan describes Jess according to Alex’s “ranking system.” Ryan assumes he is going to have sex with Jess at the party, and the rest of the people in the conversation are either egging him on or not saying anything. Sam and Corey are uncomfortable with the situation.

Ask participants to include interventions addressing the usage of degrading language and Ryan’s “grooming” of Jess in preparation of having sex with her later that night.

Scenario 2:

Everyone is enjoying the party, and Alex suggests playing a drinking game. Alex is trying to make the women at the table drink more and faster than everyone else, in order to render them more vulnerable.

Ask participants to include interventions addressing Alex's intention to get the women drunk and his language toward them.

Scenario 3:

Ryan and Jess are "hooking up" in Ryan's room during the party. Ryan is getting forceful with Jess, and Jess is making it clear that she does not want to be there with him anymore. Sam enters the room to bring them food, and Ryan yells at Sam to leave. Sam realizes that something isn't right and wants to do something about it.

Ask participants to include interventions that address Ryan's behavior, as well as ways to get Jess out of the bedroom. Make it clear that you do not expect the group to actually act out the "sexual assault scene." Acting out this scene can be as simple as Ryan and Jess sitting next to each other while Jess says, "No!" and Ryan holds her arms/hands down or as Ryan yells at her.

Scenario 4:

Jess, Rachel, Elena, and Liz are together the morning after the party. When Jess discloses that she was sexually assaulted, Rachel and Liz react very strongly. Rachel insists that Jess needs to get help right away and Liz begins to question whether what Jess is saying actually happened. Elena wants to help Jess and tries to fix the situation.

Ask participants to include interventions that address Liz's victim-blaming attitude, the importance of Jess making her own decisions, and the various options that Jess has in the situation.

Scenario 5:

Corey and Sam are cleaning up after last night's party and Corey mentions that Ryan was involved in something questionable the night before. Jess left the party crying after being with Ryan. Corey has noticed that girls who often come by to be with Ryan never return to the house. Corey and Sam have both heard rumors about Ryan forcing girls to have sex, but they've tried to ignore them.

Ask participants to include interventions that address why Sam and Corey can no longer ignore the problem and how they might be able to confront Ryan.

Scenario 6:

Ryan, Sam, Alex, and Corey are talking about last night's party. Ryan is telling them the details about what went on between him and Jess. Corey suspects that Jess said she wanted to leave and that Ryan forced her to have sex with him.

Ask participants to include interventions that address Ryan's repeated attempts to "hook up" with women who refuse to talk to him again, and his change in attitude toward Jess over the course of the evening.

STPV4: What Would You Do?

The goals of this session are:

- Review important terminology on bystander intervention.
- Help foster an environment in which participants can openly and honestly discuss why they would or would not intervene in a variety of situations.
- Challenge cultural norms around gender, race, and other –isms.

Prior to the start of this session, the two sides of the room should be marked in some way to designate one side as “Intervene” and the other side as “Don’t Intervene.” Before beginning the activity, the facilitator conducts a final review of the material covered during session 2, which includes positive active bystander interventions, high and low risk interventions, proactive/reactive interventions, reasons why people choose not to intervene, and the steps to effective bystander intervention. Participants are then asked to get up and move toward the center of the room.

In this session, the actors act out “mini-scenes” in front of the participants. The participants will then have to decide whether the scenario is one they would intervene in. Depending on the participant’s response, he or she would move to the “Intervene” side of the room or to the “Don’t Intervene” side of the room.

The mini-scenes in this session are meant to be fluid and changing, depending on the actors and the participants. The activity will challenge gender norms, so it is important to facilitate the conversation around each scene by asking why participants chose one side versus the other and whether or not a small change in the scene would cause them to move back to the other side. If they move to the “Intervene” side, ask the participants what they would do to intervene? Then provide participants with other prompts regarding their responses - What if you changed the gender of the people doing the actions in the scenes? Would the participants change sides?

Examples of mini-scenes include:

- Catcalling at a woman by a man
- Catcalling at a man by a woman
- Hugging someone you just met
- Telling a racist joke
- Telling a sexist joke
- Saying “I raped that exam”
- Grabbing your dating partner by the arm
- “Hitting on” someone who doesn’t want to be hit on
- “Hitting on” someone who does want to be hit on
- Logging into your dating partner’s Facebook account
- Kissing your partner in public

Getting Started

SCREAMing to Prevent Violence is a four-session program that educates participants on the impact of sexual violence and provides them with the tools they need to become positive active bystanders able to prevent incidences of sexual violence and other forms of interpersonal violence from occurring. However, to get started, it is important to think about how you plan to implement the STPV curriculum within your community. Keep in mind that you need to recruit, at a minimum, eight actors who can perform the initial sessions of STPV and a facilitator who has a strong understanding of sexual violence prevention. If your agency is not a direct service provider for survivors of interpersonal violence, it might be helpful to partner with one. In addition, the actors need to be trained as peer educators and work closely with the facilitator to conduct each of the four STPV sessions.

Consider the following questions as you put together a program using the SCREAMing to Prevent Violence curriculum. It might be helpful to include your key stakeholders in this discussion:

What are your basic goals?

- Is this a one-time program or will it be offered on an ongoing basis?
- Who will be in your audience(s)?
- What administrative support will you require?

Who will be involved?

- Do you have a program coordinator?
- Who will facilitate the programs?
- Do you have an expert on the issue(s) you will be addressing?
- Who will coordinate the logistics? Logistics may include identifying and reserving space for practices and performances and scheduling participants to attend the performances.
- How will you train peer educators? What will be included in the training?
- Will you recruit any student who is interested in the issue of sexual violence prevention or focus on those with theater training?

What is your financial situation?

- Are there funds in your budget that can be allocated for program development?
- Will you require additional money to hire a consultant or expert on the chosen topic(s)? Or a theater consultant who can help the actors learn how to use improvisational theatre?
- Will you need money for space (for meeting, rehearsing, or performing) and for audio/visual needs?

How will you be staffing the program?

- What percentage of time will your agency spend on the program?
- How much time will you need to develop the initial program? To sustain the program?
- What activities will require staff time? Student time?

Once you have answered these questions, the next step is to start thinking about how you will format your program.

Cultural Considerations

The SCREAMing to Prevent Violence curriculum is most effective when cultural considerations are made. Please keep the following points in mind as you begin to put together your program:

- Do your best not to cast participants in roles that may further perpetuate a stereotype. The objective of the STPV curriculum is to challenge cultural norms around gender, race, and other –isms. For example, casting an African American male actor as the rapist and a Caucasian woman as a victim would perpetuate stereotypical beliefs surrounding perpetrators and victims.
- Make the skits relevant to your audience. In order to truly connect to the audience, the skits must seem “real.” Conduct focus groups with members of the target community to identify trends worth including, such as specific locations the audience would be familiar with. However, do not use a location that might immediately isolate a specific group of individuals. For instance, it would be more desirable to feature a generic house party in a skit, rather than a fraternity party. Referencing a fraternity party may cause audience members from the Greek community to feel targeted, causing the program to be ineffectual for that social group.
- Have actors utilize the language of their community. While the language may seem shocking or offensive to coordinators, it is the language that the audience is familiar with and can relate to. A peer education theater performance written in full sentences and proper grammar will seem scripted and unauthentic. For example, using the phrase “we hooked up last night” would seem more authentic to college students than saying “we had sexual intercourse last night.”

Program Evaluation

Evaluation is an important piece of prevention because it helps to examine the effectiveness of a program, as well as the fidelity of the implemented strategy. A rigorous evaluation of the effectiveness of the SCREAMing to Prevent Violence curriculum was conducted by the Center on Violence Against Women and Children at the Rutgers University, School of Social Work and the Rutgers Office for Violence Prevention and Victim Assistance with funding from the Centers on Disease Control and Violence Prevention. The results from this study can be found in the next session.

However, there are a number of different ways to evaluate the effectiveness of a program. Here are some things to reflect on when considering a program evaluation:

1. Who has a stake in the program?

It is often helpful to consider who the stakeholders are in your program, and to include them in the design and implementation of your evaluation. There may be specific questions that funders or other key stakeholders want answered.

2. What key questions do you want to answer?

Asking if the program works is important, but this needs to be defined into more specific terms. For example, do you want to know if your program decreases beliefs in rape myths, increases bystander intentions, bystander efficacy, or bystander behaviors? Do you want to know it works as well for women and men? Or, do you want to know more about how the program impacts the peer educators who deliver the intervention? All of these questions are valid, and there are obviously many more questions that can be asked, but they will require different types of evaluation efforts.

3. What methodology will you use?

This includes questions about what type of design you will use (qualitative or quantitative), what instruments you will use, how you will select your sample, how you will administer the evaluation, how you will recruit (and possibly retain) participants, and how data will be analyzed. Additionally, most institutions require approval from the Institutional Research Board (IRB) when conducting research with any human subjects. If possible, it is helpful to

partner or consult with those who have expertise in program evaluation and research. If you are on campus, you can seek the assistance of faculty from your institution. If you are in the community, you can approach faculty at a nearby university to collaborate.

4. How feasible is this project for you?

It is important to consider how feasible the project is given potential costs, time requirements, research expertise, and support from key stakeholders. This may provide parameters for designing your evaluation.

There are many resources available on the web to assist with planning and implementing program evaluations. For example, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention provides A Framework for Program Evaluation, which can be accessed by visiting <http://www.cdc.gov/eval/framework/index.htm>.

SCREAMing to Prevent Violence Program Evaluation

The SCREAMing to Prevent Violence curriculum was evaluated through funding provided by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The study used a randomized control trial, longitudinal design to examine the impact of the curriculum on undergraduate student attitudes and behaviors related to sexual violence and bystander intervention over an 18 month period during 2010-2011.

All students in the study took a pre-test survey and then received Session 1 of STPV during New Student Orientation. Students were then randomized to one of three groups: No further doses, two additional doses (STPV Sessions 2 and 3), or two additional doses plus a booster session (STPV Session 4). Each session that participants attend is considered one dose. The program was evaluated for both short term and long term impact. A total of 1390 students were included in the final analysis.

Overall, the study demonstrated that participation in STPV resulted in a number of positive outcomes for students who participated. Students in the one session, three session, and booster groups all presented a number of positive changes over time. For example, all groups showed a decrease in rape myth beliefs. Additionally, over time, students from all groups demonstrated an increase in bystander behaviors. This is a significant finding, as many programs only assess for increases in bystander intentions or attitudes, rather than actual behaviors.

For many outcomes, increased dosage resulted in better outcomes in the short and long term. In the short term, the three dose groups demonstrated significantly better bystander intentions, bystander efficacy, and perceptions of pro-social bystander norms than the one dose group. The booster group was able to better sustain gains in bystander intentions, efficacy, and peer norms than the three dose and one dose groups.

The research findings suggest that many of these key variables work together- including bystander efficacy, bystander intentions, perceptions of peer norms, and bystander behavior. The study indicated that these variables influence one another, although more research is needed to fully understand how and why. Nonetheless, these results provide support for programs to address all of these key constructs together in prevention programming.

For more information about the study findings, please visit the VAWC website:

<http://socialwork.rutgers.edu/CentersandPrograms/VAWC/researchevaluation/SCREAMingtoPreventViolence.aspx>

References

- Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., Cares, A. C. & Warner, R. (2014). How do we know if it works? Measuring outcomes in bystander-focused abuse prevention on campuses. *Psychology of Violence*, 4(1), 101-115.
- Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., & Crossman, M. T. (2009). Reducing sexual violence on campus: The role of student leaders as empowered bystanders. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(4), 446-457.
- Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., & Plante, E. G. (2007). Sexual violence prevention through bystander education: An experimental evaluation. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 35, 463-481.
- Black, B., Weisz, A., Coats, S., & Patterson, D. (2000). Evaluating a psychoeducational sexual assault prevention program incorporating theatrical presentation, peer education, and social work. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 10(5), 589-606.
- Black, M.C., Basile, K.C., Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Walters, M.L., Merrick, M.T., ... Stevens, M.R. (2011). National intimate partner and sexual violence survey: 2010 summary report. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Burn, S. M. (2009). A situational model of sexual assault prevention through bystander intervention. *Sex Roles*, 60, 779-792.
- Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 217-230.
- Dalrymple, L., & Du Toit, M. K. (1993). The evaluation of a drama approach to AIDS education. *Educational Psychology*, 13(2), 147-154.
- Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). The sexual victimization of college women. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Herman, K. (2008). Art, violence, and social change: Challenging violence against women and girls through entertainment-education. Germany: VDM Verlag.
- Hunter, D. (2004). Peer to peer: Effective college learning: About alcohol and other health issues. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 36(3), 40-45.
- Karjane, H. M., Fisher, B., & Cullen, F. T. (2005). Sexual assault on campus: What colleges and universities are doing about it. US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.
- Karakashian, L. M., Walter, M. I., Christopher, A. N., & Lucas, T. (2006). Fear of negative evaluation affects helping behavior: The bystander effect revisited. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 8, 13-32.

- Katz, J. & Moore, J. (2014). Bystander education training for campus sexual assault prevention: An initial meta-analysis. *Violence & Victims, 28*(6), 1054-1067.
- Kress, V. E., Shepherd, J. B., Anderson, R. I., Petuch, A. J., Nolan, J. M., & Thiemeke, D. (2006). Evaluation of the impact of a coeducational sexual assault prevention program on college students' rape myth attitudes. *Journal of College Counseling, 9*, 148-157.
- Latane, B., & Darley, J. M. (1970). *The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help?* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lisak, D. & Roth, S. (1990). Motives and psychodynamics of self-reported unincarcerated rapists. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 60*(2), 268-280.
- Lisak, D. & Miller, P. M. (2002). Repeat rape and multiple offending among detected rapists. *Violence and Victims, 17*(1), 73-84.
- McMahon, S. (2007). Understanding community-specific rape myths. *Affilia: Journal of Women and Social Work, 22*(4), 357-370
- McMahon, S. & Banyard, V. L. (2012). When can I help? A conceptual framework for the prevention of sexual violence through bystander intervention. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 13*(1), 3-14.
- McMahon, S., Postmus, J. L., Warrener, C., & Koenick, R. A. (2014). Utilizing peer education theater for the primary prevention of sexual violence on college campuses. *Journal of College Student Development, 55*(1), 78-85.
- O'Toole, L. (1994). Subculture of rape revisited. In L. O'Toole & J. Schiffman (Eds.), *Gender violence: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 214-221). New York, NY: NYU Press.
- Pomeroy, E., Parrish, D. E., Bost, J., Cowlagi, G., Cook, P., & Stepura, K. (2011). Educating Students about Interpersonal Violence: Comparing Two Methods. *Journal of Social Work Education, 47*(3), 525-544.
- Sanday, P. R. (2007). *Fraternity gang rape* (2nd ed.). New York: New York University Press.
- Singhal, A., & Rogers, E. M. (1999). *Entertainment-education: A communication strategy for social change*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- Smith, P. H., White, J. W., & Holland, L. J. (2003). A longitudinal perspective on dating violence among adolescent and college-age women. *American Journal of Public Health, 93*(7), 1104-1109.
- Turner, G., & Shepherd, J. (1999). A method in search of a theory: Peer education and health promotion. *Health Education Research, 14*, 235-247.
- White, S., Park, Y. S., Israel, T., & Cordero, E. D. (2009). Longitudinal evaluation of peer health education on a college campus: Impact on health behaviors. *Journal of American College Health, 57*, 497-506.



About the Center on Violence Against Women and Children

The Center on Violence Against Women and Children (VAWC) is housed within the Rutgers University School of Social Work. Founded in 2007, the mission of the Center on Violence Against Women and Children is to strive to eliminate physical, sexual, and other forms of violence against women and children and the power imbalances that permit them. This mission will be accomplished through the use of a collaborative approach that focuses on multidisciplinary research, education, and training that impacts communities and policy in New Jersey, the U.S., and throughout the world.

For more information about the Center on Violence Against Women and Children, please visit: <http://vawc.rutgers.edu>

About the Office for Violence Prevention and Victim Assistance

The Office for Violence Prevention and Victim Assistance is part of the Division of Student Affairs and reports directly to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs. We are committed to creating a community free from violence. We provide services designed to raise awareness of and respond to the impact of interpersonal violence and other crimes. Through a combination of direct service, education, training, policy development, and consulting to the University and broader community, we serve as a critical voice in changing prevailing beliefs and attitudes about violence.

For more information about the Office for Violence Prevention and Victim Assistance, please visit: <http://vpva.rutgers.edu>