Introduction: some reflections in these promising and challenging times

Sundari Anitha and Ruth Lewis

This collection comes in the midst of some promising and challenging times for activists, students and academics in the UK and beyond who have been researching and campaigning on the issue of gender based violence (GBV) in university communities. In the context of emerging research evidence and in the face of increasing public awareness of and media attention on this problem, these are indeed the first steps towards acknowledging and addressing it in countries including the UK and Australia. This chapter explores the context and contours of some of the recent and emerging debates on GBV in university communities within which this collection is located.

We understand GBV as behaviour or attitudes underpinned by inequitable power relations that hurt, threaten or undermine people because of their (perceived) gender or sexuality. This definition recognises that GBV is influenced by and influences gender relations and problematises violence premised on hierarchical constructions of gender and sexuality. Women and girls constitute the vast majority of victims of GBV, and men the overwhelming majority of perpetrators (Watts and Zimmerman, 2002; Hester, 2009). GBV includes a continuum of behaviours and attitudes such as domestic violence, sexual violence, sexist harassment on the streets, trans/homophobic expressions and behaviours, and expressions on social media which normalise sexism and sexual objectification. These expressions and behaviours are connected through what Kelly (1988) described as a continuum of incidents and experiences. The continuum of incidents (Kelly, 1988, 1989) refers to the conceptual connections between acts that constitute the wallpaper of violations – the behaviours and expressions so commonplace that they often recede into the minutiae of everyday life – and the less common 'sledgehammer' events (Stanko, 1985) that are more widely recognised as harm, which are both underpinned by and reinforce gendered power hierarchies. The everyday expressions and behaviours scaffold a culture of gender inequalities that sustains and enables the rarer acts. The associated

concept of a continuum of experiences (Kelly, 1988) captures the subjective perceptions and the commonalities in how women and sexual minorities experience these expressions and behaviours as violations. Hence this conceptualisation suggests that we cannot address one end of the continuum – for example, rape and domestic homicide – without problematising the everyday manifestations of sexism and gendered hierarchies (Bates, 2014).

This concept of a continuum provides a useful framework for reflecting on the nature of the problem, with associated implications for how we perceive harm and craft responses to it. Feminist analysis of policymaking draws attention to the importance of explicating the framing of social problems, of 'making politics visible' (Bacchi, 2012). Such an approach enables analysis that goes beyond a focus on the impact or effectiveness of policies to one that can critically examine how a social issue has come to be defined as a problem and what are the exclusions and silences in this construction. For example, it has been argued that how GBV is conceptualised can enable or inhibit the naming of the problem and help-seeking (DeKeseredy and Schwartz, 2011). In the context of university communities, this approach can be applied to examine what the problem is represented to be – sexual assault with a narrow focus on individual victims and perpetrators (incidentalism), or a broader focus on GBV that recognises a continuum of harms, problematises the underpinning cultures that scaffold acts and attitudes, recognises disadvantage and inequalities on the basis of gender and sexuality, and tackles student-on-student, staff-on-student, and staff-on-staff GBV. A tendency to focus on particular acts, on particular countable manifestations of GBV and on particular individuals as the problem, can be critiqued for ignoring the connections between different manifestations of GBV. This elision reflects the broader gap in current theorising on GBV, whereby there is scant research that systematically examines both the empirical and theoretical links between different manifestations of GBV (for exceptions see Stockdale and Nadler, 2012). This failure to make the broader connections has implications – for example, the narrow focus on sexual violence in US campus policies may mean that institutions do not prioritise challenging the broader cultures which foster such acts (see Klein, Chapter Three in this volume).

In his reconceptualisation of domestic violence, Stark (2007) urges a shift from a focus on a corpus of incidents and a calculus of harm whereby the more frequent and severe the incidents, the more dangerous the violence is presumed to be. His concept of coercive control outlines the perpetrator's project of re-inscribing and enforcing

gender inequality and limiting women's freedom and potential, primarily and effectively through isolation, degradation and control and occasionally through physical and other forms of violence. Stark (2007) ponders on the stalled revolution some four decades after the first refuges for 'battered wives' were established in the 1970s, a problem he identifies as stemming from a change in our project. He argues that by focusing on individual acts of physical, sexual, financial and emotional violence, we have taken our attention away from the cause of the problem – the structural inequalities that derive from and scaffold gendered power relations – to particular manifestations or symptoms of the problem. In the context of GBV in university communities, this collection is part of the wider project that seeks to consider how we might turn our attention to the causes while we also deal with the symptoms in the here and now.

The problem

Substantial evidence from the US indicates a high prevalence of GBV in student communities, which includes high levels of sexual violence on university campuses (Cantor et al, 2015; Fisher et al, 2000, 2010). A recent study of 27 institutions of higher education in the US, with responses from 150,000 students (Cantor et al, 2015), found that since enrolling at college, 23% of women students had experienced sexual contact involving physical harm or incapacitation, and 62% had experienced sexual harassment. Research from other countries in Europe and Australia (Feltes et al, 2012; Sloane and Fitzpatrick, 2011; Valls et al, 2016) indicates a similar problem in university communities that is only beginning to be acknowledged and documented.

Unlike the research and policy context in the US, the issue of domestic violence in young people's intimate relationships and GBV in student communities in the UK has been the focus of research only since the mid-2000s. Studies in the UK document the high prevalence of violence in young people's intimate relationships (Barter et al, 2009). Research by Girlguiding – a charity that works with young women and girls in the UK – found that 59% of girls and young women aged 13–21 years had faced some form of sexual harassment at school or college in the previous year (Girlguiding, 2014). The National Union of Students' (NUS) survey of 2,000 students studying in England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland found that, while at university, one in seven female students had been victims of serious sexual assault or serious physical violence, while 12% had been stalked (NUS, 2010). Of those surveyed, 68% had been a victim of one or more kinds of

sexual harassment on campus, with 16% having experienced unwanted kissing, touching or molesting. In the majority of cases in all incident categories surveyed, the perpetrator was known to the victim and was male. There is also evidence that 'lad cultures'[1] on campuses create 'conducive contexts' (Kelly, 2016) for a range of other manifestations of GBV (Phipps and Young, 2012).

GBV also affects other groups of students. Research that surveyed 4,205 LGBT students and support staff found that 31% LGB students had experienced homophobic/biphobic verbal abuse, while 7% received physical abuse (Valentine et al, 2009: 18), while 30% trans students had experienced verbal abuse and a greater percentage – 11.3% – had experienced physical abuse (Valentine et al, 2009: 24). An 'out in sport' report published by the NUS (2012) revealed that 14.3% of LGBT university and college students had experienced homophobia, biphobia or transphobia which put them off participating in sport. Almost a quarter of trans students have been bullied or discriminated against since starting university. Such accounts perhaps help explain why 20% (524) of LGB students and 28.5% (53) of trans students have taken time out of their course (Valentine et al, 2009: 25).

Together, this research indicates that such problematic cultures affect women and sexual minorities' experiences on university campuses, in social spaces such as night clubs surrounding universities (Brooks, 2011; Nicholls, 2015), in online communities and on social media (Lewis et al, 2017; Jane, 2017), and in the teaching and learning contexts within universities (Jackson and Sundaram, 2015; Jackson et al, 2015). There has also been recent attention to the issue of GBV in the broader university community, particularly in the context of the power differentials between staff and students and university practices which are slow to take responsibility for and investigate staff abuses of their power in relation to GBV against students (Ahmed, 2016a, 2016b; Weale and Batty, 2016). However, attention to broader institutional cultures should not take the focus away from the people with decision making power who uphold existing institutional cultures, who could be held accountable for their decisions and can indeed reshape these cultures.

The issue of staff-on-student sexual violence came into sharp focus when Professor Sara Ahmed recently resigned in protest against Goldsmith University's 'failure to address the problem of sexual harassment' (Ahmed, 2016a). Ahmed (2016b) outlined the reasons and context of her resignation in a widely circulated post on her blog called 'Resignation is a feminist issue'. Though aware of the existence of the problem of sexual harassment at universities, the process of

pursuing particular student complaints made Ahmed come to an increasing realisation of the sexist ethos and culture in particular parts of her university. Ahmed argues that as she navigated (unsuccessfully) through the bureaucratic procedures, trying to address the issues raised by students, she 'began to realise how the system was working' and that indeed, '*I began to realise that the system was working*. … I began to realise too my own complicity with that system' (emphasis in original). What Ahmed effectively articulated through her words and actions is the ways in which the neoliberal model of universities as businesses competing for rankings and student numbers has created a context whereby the gaps in addressing GBV effectively are not 'failings' of university policies and practice. In fact, what appears to be bureaucratic ineffectiveness or inefficiency/incompetence of particular staff members designated with redressing complaints can be better understood as the system working exactly as it is intended to do – to manage potential negative publicity, to dissuade potential complainants and thus minimise complaints-making, to deflect attention from the broader and pervasive cultural contexts within which particular acts and violations occur, and to shroud any successful redress by students through secrecy clauses designed to protect the reputations of academics and academic institutions.

Over the past decade, other institutions – in the UK and beyond – have found to their cost that the widespread prevalence of sexual violence and abuse and, more significantly, the subsequent culture of impunity and systematic cover-ups have inflicted irreparable damage to institutional reputations in the military (Alleyne, 2012), churches (BBC News, 2010; Ruhl and Ruhl, 2015; Sherwood, 2016), residential homes for children (HIA, 2017; Morris, 2013), media (Martinson and Grierson, 2016) and sports organisations (Rumsby, 2016). Where universities have been slow to even acknowledge the existence of GBV within their communities for fear of reputational damage, in the context of the increasing scrutiny of institutional cultures in relation to GBV, we may be witnessing a shift towards a normative frame whereby not (being seen to be) doing something about GBV will begin to seem more damaging than doing something about it. In these promising times, it seems apt to reflect on the challenges that lie ahead.

Understanding and responding to the problem: possibilities and challenges

Primary prevention programmes to tackle GBV have been advocated by the United Nations (CEDAW[2]) and the World Health Organization

(WHO and Butchart 2004). Government policy and practice on GBV in the UK have focused on criminal justice sanctions and to a lesser extent service provision, to the neglect of prevention (Walklate, 2008), a policy focus that has been mirrored in Australia (see Durbach and Grey, Chapter Four in this volume). While secondary prevention work with perpetrators has become established in UK government policy over the past decade, primary prevention remains the weakest part of the UK government response to GBV (Coy et al, 2009). GBV or, more narrowly, sexual violence have long been the subject of research, policy directives, and student activism in US universities (Fisher et al, 2010; Klein, Chapter Three in this volume). However, under the Trump administration, uncertainty remains about the extent of commitment to the policies and processes institutionalised by the federal government and courts over the past four decades. Recent wider policy developments in the UK (see Donaldson et al, Chapter Five in this volume) – such as the ratification of the Istanbul Convention with its prevention and monitoring requirements on the UK government and the amendments to the Children and Social Work Bill in March 2017 which will make it a requirement that all secondary schools in England teach relationships and sex education – present a shift in policy.

This policy shift towards a greater focus on prevention has come about following a period of increasing media attention and student activism against GBV in school and university communities. It was within this context that the first bystander intervention programmes in UK universities were piloted at the University of West of England, University of Lincoln, and by Scottish Women's Aid at Scottish universities and higher education institutions in 2014–16 (see Fenton and Mott (Chapter Eight), Jordan et al (Chapter Nine) and Hutchinson (Chapter Ten), in this volume). Around this same period, several initiatives were announced by some universities following negative publicity associated with an incident of GBV (Payne and Green, 2016; Weale and Batty, 2017). In 2015, Universities UK (UUK) – an advocacy organisation for UK universities comprising university vice-chancellors and principals – announced a taskforce to examine the issue of 'violence against women, harassment and hate crime affecting university students, with a focus on sexual violence and harassment' (Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, 2015). The taskforce's report (UUK, 2016a) makes a series of recommendations on addressing these issues through effective responses to complaints and prevention initiatives, which represents an overhaul of previous approaches to this issue (see Donaldson et al, Chapter Five in this volume). Although this report represents a significant first step, it fails to adopt a broad approach of

GBV which recognises a range of harms based on (perceived) gender and sexuality. For example, despite growing evidence about the high levels of domestic violence in young people's relationships, there is little explicit engagement with this issue in the report. The report also exclusively focuses on student-on-student incidents, which represents a missed opportunity to acknowledge and address staff-on-student and staff-on-staff GBV.

In the same period that UUK's taskforce was undertaking its work, Durham University instituted a Sexual Violence Task Force. In a context where few UK universities had stand-alone policies on GBV (Bows et al, 2015) and fewer still had dedicated staff that are trained to support students on this issue, Durham University's taskforce was a pioneering initiative (Durham University, 2015; Towl, 2016). While its recognition of a continuum of sexual violence beyond the limiting framework of sexual assault must be welcomed, the connections between sexual violence and other forms of GBV are elided from the frame. The Durham University initiative, however, has several positive elements such as the provision for anonymous reporting beyond that intended to trigger investigations in order to map the scale and nature of the problem and craft adequate responses to it. In a context where only a small minority of students report their victimisation (Fisher, 2009, NUS, 2012), this must be welcomed. As a result of the taskforce's work, Durham University has committed resources to establish a new dedicated full-time role, believed to be the first in the country, of Student Support & Training Officer (Sexual Violence and Misconduct), which indicates a welcome ongoing commitment to make a real difference at the institution.

At the time of going to press, a few other UK universities are undertaking a review of their policies on GBV, but the absence of a mandatory requirement for universities to address GBV through prevention and through recording of reported incidents means that any progress is likely to depend on individual institutions' commitment. This contrasts with the US, where mandatory requirements have been the basis of long-established initiatives on this issue. This collection comes at this unique moment and seeks to make the most of the rare opportunity to reflect on the US experience, draw upon the missteps and successes there and rethink how those new to the journey might start with somewhat different premises, and take somewhat different routes. In that vein, we discuss two themes that are important for work in this area: the significance of gender and the need to rethink a jigsaw of responses.

Gender in gender based violence: the elephant in the room?

Gender is a lens that is increasingly becoming obscured when considering the causes and consequences of a problem that is paradoxically gaining attention. This elision of gender is taking place in the context of the appeal of post-feminist equalisation discourses that deem gender equality as a *fait accompli* and any acts of violence as residual remnants from a previous era – idiosyncratic and individual rather than rooted in structural inequalities. This obscuring of gender and of the structural inequalities that intersect with gender can perhaps be better understood within prevailing narratives of individual emancipation and micro-politics that are in keeping with a well-documented shift towards neoliberal cultures of individualism where the onus for change is firmly located on the individual.

Within this discourse, concepts such as 'power-based violence' (Katz et al, 2011: 689) have become the means through which GBV is uncoupled from its structural roots while simultaneously becoming re-cast as something that 'could happen to anyone'. Resistance to GBV is framed in appealing terms such as 'equality and diversity' approaches of institutions on one hand, and through a common-sense appeal to the active pro-social bystander on the other. After all, no individual or institution casts oneself as aspiring to be unequal or anti-social. In ideological terms, such a degendering constructs the problem as that of particular (pathological) individuals who abuse their power, and the violence as ephemeral and power-based rather than rooted in historically persistent hierarchies of gender and sexuality. Hence the problem is not framed as arising from structural inequalities or institutional cultures, but as an individual aberration. Underlying this approach is the premise that at a simplistic level, some people are always going to abuse their power, some people hurt others; that the problem is 'bullying' rather than gendered violence that is supported by gendered norms, practices and structures. Particular bystander programmes in the US such as the Green Dot programme have come to adopt discourses of 'power-based violence' as they have evolved and been reshaped by students resistant to the idea that gendered structural inequalities form the basis of violence (Katz et al, 2011). Such framings may also hold appeal for programme designers and anti-violence educators keen to minimise resistance from students – particularly from men but also from women, who can be co-opted into 'lad cultures'.

However, a binary understanding of the problem as either systemic or individual prevents an understanding of the ways in which individual people act in relation to peer groups and how they form

personal and institutional networks which both respond to and enact structural constraints. As Katz et al (2011: 689) argue, social justice-oriented approaches require that 'questions of gender, race, and sexual orientation, especially the role of complicit silence on the part of members of dominant groups' are at the forefront of any efforts to bring about change. As Lewis and Marine (Chapter Six in this volume) highlight, student feminist groups in the UK challenge that 'complicit silence' in an effort to bring about changes on campus. A feminist approach asserts that we must keep naming our activities and politics as feminist, in a bid to give the lie to the stereotypes, to better inform people about what feminism is and is not, and to prevent 'feminism' being co-opted (or 'taken account of' in McRobbie's (2009) terms) by the forces of neoliberalism and its narratives of individual responsibility and 'empowerment' (Lewis et al, 2016; Marine and Lewis, 2014).

Beyond orthodoxies: rethinking the jigsaw of punitive responses, service provision and prevention education

One of the key planks of the US policy directive to universities has centred on punitive responses to complaints of sexual assaults, a focus that was under critical spotlight in the much-acclaimed documentary, *The Hunting Ground*. The public screenings of this documentary on campuses in the UK and Australia were crucial to the shift in the perceptions of this issue and in enabling a conversation about GBV in university communities (see Durbach and Grey, Chapter Four in this volume). The complaints procedure is also a central plank of the UUK's recommendations (2016b).

Feminist scholars have long been critical of criminal justice solutions to the problem of violence against women and girls (VAWG) and have drawn attention to the many ways in which legal institutions, processes and conceptualisations of the legal subject are deeply gendered (for example, Anitha and Gill, 2009; LSE, 2017; Walklate, 2008). While acknowledging the need for robust criminal justice responses to VAWG, they have pointed out the gains and losses, the problems and possibilities incurred by this strategy (Gill and Anitha, 2009; Lewis, 2004; Walklate, 2008). In response to feminist campaigning and activism, we now have moved towards the criminalisation of behaviour that was not so long ago considered acceptable but women and sexual minorities continue to choose not to engage with these mechanisms and reporting rates of GBV remain low (Fisher et al, 2003). The wide chasm (Kelly et al, 2005) between the law in theory and practice raises questions relating to the appropriateness or, at the very least, the limits of devoting most

of our energy to institutional and criminal justice investigatory and punitive mechanisms. However, the very existence of these mechanisms and the codifying of violations nonetheless contains within it the capacity to change social norms. It has been suggested in other contexts that the norms that underpin the perpetration of GBV may have not changed significantly over the past three decades, but women may have a greater sense of *entitlement* to safety and quality of life (Lewis, 2004), an expectation that was evident in account after account outlined by women and sexual minorities in *The Hunting Ground*. Increases in reporting of sexual and domestic violence in the UK over the last few years indicate that a similar expectation may be at work; however, if nothing else changes, then this risks even lower levels of satisfaction with the criminal justice system. In the university context, we risk a re-run of similar issues if our focus remains narrowly on reporting mechanisms and complaints policies and procedures. A crucial part of the jigsaw of responses also includes robust and gender-specific service responses and prevention education initiatives.

Post-violence community service provision has long been a key plank of responses to GBV in a range of countries in a context where the vast majority of survivors do not seek recourse to criminal justice or punitive responses, because of a combination of the costs of engaging with them (see Whitfield, Chapter Seven in this volume) including the risk of secondary victimisation (Laing, 2016). A range of community services such as women's refuges and support services for survivors of rape recognise the harm inflicted by the violence and work towards restoring survivors' sense of personal integrity and civil and political selves.

The impact of the ongoing dismantling of the welfare state across the UK and other industrialised democracies such as the US and Canada on women and children's equality and safety needs to be recognised and challenged (Sanders-McDonagh et al, 2016). These broader policy landscapes for service provision have an inevitable impact on potential responses to GBV in university communities, as they may well hinder collaborative efforts to bring together existing expertise in challenging GBV in a holistic manner that recognises universities' location within broader communities. But beyond these immediate and pressing problems, there has also been a longer term shift from a potentially more transformative focus that seeks to address both the violence and the root causes of such violence to a more individualistic project within a neoliberal context that seeks to provide support to the survivor to enable recovery from the violence and to restore them to the position they were in prior to the violence. This replaces the

project of recognising the structural basis of the violence that might lead to a questioning of the contexts that sustain that violence for oneself and for others. A similar shift can be observed in feminist activism in other contexts from a collective project of empowerment to individualist service provision and rehousing; from the politics of refusal to 'request politics' (Alwis, 2009). In the context of GBV in university communities, when support is recognised as the crucial second plank of the responses to violence, we also need to reflect on the contours of this support. When structured around a punitive, individualistic response to GBV, such support risks becoming a means of managing expectations in the contexts of complaints made or anticipated, a means to student retention rather than a means of empowerment, resistance and indeed prevention of violence.

Prevention education has rightly drawn attention of anti-violence activists as a potential counterpoint to an individualistic focus on particular signal acts and individual perpetrators – the opportunity to reconceptualise a broader range of expressions and behaviours and the cultures underpinning them as harm, and of interrogating one's complicity in these cultures. Rather than pursuing such an inevitably challenging goal, the focus of bystander programmes may come to rest on tangible interventions in others' inflictions and expressions of violence. In this no doubt positive project of garnering bystanders as active citizens, the perpetrators seem to be missing, as do those who may be complicit and derive benefits from a culture that sustains such violence. How do we engage men in the project to call out and give up their gendered privilege? An approach which limits responsibility to individual men, rather than broader cultures of inequality that scaffold GBV and implicate rather more of us and the cultures we inhabit, may prove to be an effective strategy that seems to appeal to men and women, as well an institutions. But what do we lose in such a framing? What constitutes an intervention needs further interrogation, as does the possibility of defining/measuring 'success'. In addition, programmes must not become a tool used by institutions to hold students responsible for their own safety and must not shift scrutiny away from institutional cultures and institutional responsibility.

Organisation of this volume

The first section explores conceptualisations of violence and the role of gender norms in these. In the first of the two chapters in this section, Sundaram investigates young people's understandings of violence and the factors which influence their acceptance, and use,

of violent behaviour. She argues that gender norms mediate young people's understandings of GBV and discourses around the perceived acceptability of such violence. Sundaram argues that young people's attitudes towards violence exist on a continuum, rather than in binary terms of the violence being perceived as 'right' and 'wrong'. This contribution points to the need to address broader gender norms as part of any prevention intervention.

Phipps' chapter on lad cultures continues this engagement with gender norms – as they intersect with social structures such as class – in order to examine forms of sexualised banter, 'everyday' sexism and sexual harassment in student communities, which has been termed 'lad cultures'. In exploring the links between 'lad cultures' and other forms of sexual violence, this chapter theorises 'lad cultures' in order to better understand them and develop effective interventions. It also offers a critical perspective that locates such aggressions and violence within the institutional cultures of neoliberal competitively-driven universities, and offers suggestions for interventions that can create cultural change and provide new tools for researchers wishing to theorise this issue.

The second section of this collection brings together an overview of policy and practice in various countries: the US, where responses to particular forms of GBV in university communities have been well established, as well as Australia and the UK, where these issues have only recently come under scrutiny. The contributions in this section locate recent debates in the UK within wider international debates and action on tackling GBV in student communities.

Klein's critical historical overview of US activity charts the early research which overlooked the gendered nature of the phenomenon it investigated and the initial efforts that sought to 'teach women how to stay safe' and were critiqued for implicit victim-blaming to more recent prevention approaches which focus on bystander intervention and the role of friends, peers and social networks in preventing violence. Three interrelated issues are examined in this chapter: the limitations of existing framing of campus sexual violence as sexual misconduct among individual students that takes little account of the interlocking structures of gender inequality and exploitation; the lack of institutional responses in terms of fundamental changes to university governance; and the limitations in university treatment of victims and perpetrators.

Durbach and Grey outline the limited attention to prevention within Australian policy responses to GBV in general and particularly within student communities. In the context of recent policy and media attention to these issues, they present the findings of the first nationwide survey directed at collating data on prevalence, student

reporting experiences and preferred responses to sexual violence in university settings. This chapter provides a historical and political context for the survey, and considers how the survey results and analysis can inform the development of effective responses to sexual assault and sexual harassment in Australian universities and the shift of a culture that enables (and even encourages) harmful sexual behaviour.

Decades later than other countries, the UK is waking up to the fact that GBV blights the experiences of many students. Donaldson, McCarry and McCullough's chapter presents a critical analysis of the theoretical foundations of the dominant policy frameworks on GBV in the different nations in the UK and locates recent developments in universities' approaches to GBV within their national context. This chapter offers some observations on the opportunities and challenges facing the UK Higher Education sector as it develops its approach to GBV prevention.

The next section of this collection brings together some recent initiatives that seek to challenge GBV in UK universities, thereby documenting an emerging area of practice and research. In doing so, it addresses the complexities and challenges of developing, implementing and evaluating GBV prevention and educational initiatives.

Lewis and Marine's chapter draws on data from a qualitative study of young women feminists in UK and US universities to examine how they are creating communities of resistance to GBV. The university has a historical and contemporary role in providing important opportunities to create communities and networks, formal and informal, where activism against GBV can flourish, but structural and cultural changes in universities may threaten their scope to foster such developments. The chapter argues that feminist communities are vital in the struggle against GBV in universities.

Alongside activism and campaigning against GBV in universities, resistance to this troubling issue has also drawn on legal approaches. Whitfield's chapter explores the progressive potential of the existing legal frameworks such as the human rights and equality legislation to protect and provide justice for survivors of GBV and to hold institutions to account. Written by a leading public lawyer with unique expertise and experience of representing survivors of GBV at university communities, it demonstrates the limitations of existing university responses to sexual violence against students and reflects on the potential of existing legislation to bring universities to account, as well as the inherent challenges and tensions in such approaches.

Fenton and Mott's chapter outlines the history of the development of *The Intervention Initiative*, an evidence-based programme predicated

on bystander and social norms theories and public health criteria for effective prevention programming, which incorporates skills-based training to enable participants to intervene safely and effectively when they witness problematic behaviours along the continuum of violence. It presents the evidence base and the theoretical rationale for the programme to demonstrate how it takes participants through each stage of change required for bystanders to intervene. The chapter ends with a discussion of the policy recommendations for further implementation of the programme in the context of current agendas for the university sector.

Jordan, Anitha, Jameson and Davy's chapter draws upon research conducted as part of a bystander intervention programme and reflects on some of the key challenges and potential of prevention education in a university context. It explores the possibilities and complexity of challenging gendered attitudes, behaviours and the broader cultural norms underpinning GBV in two sites where gender norms and everyday forms of GBV are re-inscribed, negotiated and resisted – social media and the night-time economy. Given the complexity of realising effective responses to GBV, it interrogates the possibilities for crafting activist responses to problematic campus cultures within neoliberal institutional contexts of UK universities.

Hutchinson's contribution is based on her experiences of developing the 'Get Savi' (students against violence initiative) prevention education programme while working for Scottish Women's Aid, the Scottish branch of a leading national charity that works to tackle domestic abuse. It outlines the role of a shifting policy context in Scotland in shaping particular responses to GBV more broadly, and to prevention education in particular. Hutchinson discusses the practical process of the development of 'Get Savi' and reflects on the conceptual basis of the programme in her engagement with themes relating to local policy contexts, institutional cultures, collaborative working and a gendered approach to GBV.

A final chapter consolidates some key themes of this volume, and considers the future directions of activism, policy, practice and research on the issue of GBV in university communities. We present some suggestions about the nature of activism and action that can address this problem as well as the role that academic research can play in this process.

Notes

[1] 'Lad culture' has been defined as 'a group mentality articulated through activities such as sport and heavy alcohol consumption, and characterised by sexist and

homophobic 'banter'" (Phipps and Young, 2012: 28). Broader terms such as 'sex object culture' (popularised by the campaign Object!) and 'rape culture' (developed by US feminists in the 1970s) have also been utilised to describe this phenomenon. The latter refers to a set of general cultural beliefs supporting men's violence against women.

2 See www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw/

References

Ahmed, S. (2016a) 'Resignation', feministkilljoys, 30 May, https://feministkilljoys.com/2016/05/30/resignation/

Ahmed, S. (2016b) 'Resignation is a feminist issue', feministkilljoys, 27 August, https://feministkilljoys.com/2016/08/27/resignation-is-a-feminist-issue/

Alwis, M. (2009) 'Interrogating the 'political': feminist peace activism in Sri Lanka', Feminist Review, 91: 81–93.

Alleyne, R. (2012) 'Judge fears 'Deepcut' culture remains after 'cover up' of army recruit sexual abuse', *Telegraph*, 26 November, www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/9703451/Judge-fears-Deepcut-culture-remains-after-cover-up-of-army-recruit-sexual-abuse.html

Anitha, S. and Gill, A. (2009) 'Coercion, consent and the forced marriage debate in the UK', *Feminist Legal Studies*, 17 (2): 165–84.

Bacchi, C. (2012) 'Why study problematizations? Making politics visible', *Open Journal of Political Science*, 2(1): 1–8.

Barter, C., McCarry, M., Berridge, D. and Evans, K. (2009) *Partner Exploitation and Violence in Teenage Intimate Relationships*, London: NSPCC, www.nspcc.org.uk/inform/research/findings/partner_exploitation_and_violence_report_wdf70129.pdf

Bates, L. (2014) *Everyday Sexism*, London: Simon & Schuster.

BBC News (2010) 'Catholic Church sex abuse scandals around the world', 14 September, www.bbc.co.uk/news/10407559

Bows, H., Burrell, S. and Westmarland, N. (2015) *Rapid Evidence Assessment of Current Interventions, Approaches, and Policies on Sexual Violence on Campus*, Durham: Durham University Sexual Violence Task Force, www.dur.ac.uk/resources/svtf/DUSVTFRAEfinalpdfversion.pdf

Brooks, O. (2011) "'Guys! Stop doing it!" Young women's adoption and rejection of safety advice when socializing in bars, pubs and clubs', *British Journal of Criminology*, 51: 635–51.

Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall S., Townsend, R., Lee, H., Bruce, C. and Thomas, G. (2015) *Report on the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct*, Maryland: Association of American Universities, www.aau.edu/sites/default/files/%40%20Files/Climate%20Survey/AAU_Campus_Climate_Survey_12_14_15.pdf

Coy, M., Kelly, L. and Foord, J. (2009) *Map of Gaps 2 – The Postcode Lottery of Violence against Women Support Services in Britain*, London: End Violence Against Women Coalition and Equality and Human Rights Commission.

DeKeseredy, W. and Schwartz, M.D. (2011) 'Theoretical and definitional issues in violence against women', in C. Renzetti, J.L. Edleson and R.K. Bergen (eds) *Sourcebook on Violence Against Women*, London: Sage, pp 3–20.

Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (2015) 'Business Secretary calls on universities to tackle violence against women on campus', Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, 6 September, www.gov.uk/government/news/business-secretary-calls-on-universities-to-tackle-violence-against-women-on-campus

Durham University (2015) *Durham University's Sexual Violence Task Force: A Higher Education Initiative to Address Sexual Violence and Misconduct on Campus – A guide for staff and student HE leaders in how the issue of sexual violence and misconduct may be addressed in a university environment*, Durham: Durham University, www.neevawg.org.uk/sites/default/files/SVTF%20brochure%20PROOF%20(1).pdf

Feltes, T., Balloni, A., Czapska, J., Bodelon, E. and Stenning, P. (2012) *Gender-Based Violence, Stalking and Fear of Crime*, Final report to European Commission, Directorate General Justice, Freedom and Security (Project JLS/2007/ISEC/415), https://vmits0151.vm.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/gendercrime.eu/pdf/gendercrime_final_report_smaller_version.pdf

Fisher, B.S. (2009) 'The effects of survey question wording on rape estimates: Evidence from a quasi-experimental design', *Violence Against Women*, 15 (2): 133–47.

Fisher, B.S, Cullen, F. and Turner, M. (2000) *The Sexual Victimization of College Women*, Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice and Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Fisher, B.S., Daigle, L.E. and Cullen, F.T. (2010) *Unsafe in the Ivory Tower: The Sexual Victimisation of College Women*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fisher, B.S., Daigle, L.E., Cullen, F.T. and Turner, M.G. (2003) 'Reporting sexual victimization to the police and others: Results from a national-level study of college women', *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 30 (1): 6–38.

Gill, A. and Anitha, S. (2009) 'The illusion of protection? A policy analysis of forced marriage legislation in the UK', *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 31 (3): 257–69.

Girlguiding (2014) *Girls' Attitudes Survey*, London: Girlguiding, www.girlguiding.org.uk/globalassets/docs-and-resources/research-and-campaigns/girls-attitudes-survey-2014.pdf

Hester, M. (2009) *Who Does What to Whom? Gender and Domestic Violence Perpetrators*, Bristol: University of Bristol.

HIA (2017)' Historical Institutional Abuse Inquiry. The Inquiry into Historical Institutional Abuse 1922 to 1995 and The Executive Office', www.hiainquiry.org/historical-institutional-abuse-inquiry-report-chapters

Jackson, C. and Sundaram, V. (2015) *Is 'Lad Culture' a Problem in Higher Education? Exploring the Perspectives of Staff Working in UK Universities*, Society for Research into Higher Education, Lancaster University, University of York, www.srhe.ac.uk/downloads/JacksonSundaramLadCulture.pdf

Jackson, C., Dempster, S. and Pollard, L. (2015) 'They just don't seem to really care, they just think it's cool to sit there and talk': laddism in university teaching-learning contexts', *Educational Review*, 67 (3): 300–14.

Jane, E.A. (2017) *Misogyny Online: A Short (and Brutish) History*, London: Sage.

Katz, J., Heisterkamp, H.A. and Fleming, W.M. (2011) 'The social justice roots of the mentors in violence prevention model and its application in a high school setting', *Violence Against Women*, 17 (6): 684–702.

Kelly, L. (1988) *Surviving Sexual Violence*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Kelly, L. (1989) 'The continuum of sexual violence', in M. Maynard, and J. Hanmer (eds) *Women, Violence and Social Control*, London: Macmillan, pp 46–60.

Kelly, L. (2016) 'The conducive context of violence against women and girls', *Discover Society*, 30, 1 March, https://discoversociety.org/2016/03/01/theorising-violence-against-women-and-girls/

Kelly, L., Lovett, J. and Regan, L. (2005) *Gap or Chasm: Attrition in Reported Rape Cases*, Home Office Research study 293, London: HMSO.

Laing, L. (2016) 'Secondary victimization: Domestic violence survivors navigating the family law system', *Violence Against Women*, published online 23 August.

Lewis, R. (2004) 'Making Justice Work: Effective Interventions for Domestic Violence', *British Journal of Criminology*, 44: 204–24.

Lewis, R., Marine, S and Keeney, K (2016) '"I get together with my friends and I change it": Young feminist students resist 'laddism', 'rape culture' and 'everyday sexism"', *Journal of Gender Studies*, 27 (1): 56–72, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2016.1175925

Lewis, R., Rowe, M. and Wiper, C. (2017) 'Online abuse of feminists as an emerging form of violence against women and girls', *British Journal of Criminology*, 57 (6): 1462–81.

LSE (2017) *Confronting Gender Inequality: Findings from the LSE Commission on Gender, Inequality and Power*, London: London School of Economics and Political Sciences, http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/66802/1/Confronting-Inequality.pdf

Marine, S. and Lewis, R. (2014) '"I'm in this for real": Revisiting young women's feminist becoming', *International Women's Studies Forum*, 47: 11–22.

Martinson, J. and Grierson, J. (2016) '"Serious failings' at BBC let Jimmy Savile and Stuart Hall go unchecked', *Guardian*, 25 February, www.theguardian.com/media/2016/feb/25/serious-failings-bbc-jimmy-savile-abuse-72-woman-children-report

McRobbie, A. (2009) *The Aftermath of Feminism: Gender, Culture, and Social Change*, London: Sage.

Morris, S. (2013) 'Jillings report confirms 'extensive' abuse at North Wales children's homes', *Guardian*, 8 July, www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2013/jul/08/jillings-report-north-wales-child-abuse

National Union of Students (NUS) (2010) *Hidden Marks: A Study of Women Students' Experiences of Harassment, Stalking, Violence and Sexual Assault*, London: NUS.

Nicholls, E.M.L. (2015) 'Running the Tightrope: Negotiating femininities in the night time economy in Newcastle', PhD Thesis, Newcastle University, UK.

NUS (2012) *Out in Sport: LGBT Students' Experiences of Sports*, London: NUS, www.nus.org.uk/global/final%20out%20in%20sport_new_web.pdf

Payne, F.M. and Green, D. (2016) 'Alison Smith speaks out on domestic abuse scandal', *The Badger*, 12 October, http://thebadgeronline.com/2016/10/alison-smith-speaks-out-on-domestic-abuse-scandal-students-will-feel-safe/

Phipps, A. and Young, I. (2012) *'That's What She Said': Women Students' Experience of 'Lad Culture' in Higher Education*, London: NUS.

Phipps, A., Ringrose, J., Renold, E. and Jackson, C. (2017) 'Rape culture, lad culture and everyday sexism: researching, conceptualizing and politicizing new mediations of gender and sexual violence', *Journal of Gender Studies*, 27 (1): 1–8.

Ruhl, J. and Ruhl, D. (2015) 'NCR research: Costs of sex abuse crisis to US church underestimated', *National Catholic Reporter*, 2 November, www.ncronline.org/news/accountability/ncr-research-costs-sex-abuse-crisis-us-church-underestimated

Rumsby, B. (2016) 'English football's child sexual abuse scandal set to spread to other sports', *Telegraph*, 26 November, www.telegraph.co.uk/football/2016/11/26/english-footballs-child-sexual-abuse-scandal-set-spread-sports/

Sanders-McDonagh, E., Neville, L. and Nolas, S. (2016) 'From pillar to post: Understanding the victimisation of women and children who experience domestic violence in an age of austerity', *Feminist Review*, 112: 60–76.

Sherwood, H. (2016) 'Damning report reveals Church of England's failure to act on abuse', *Guardian*, 15 March.

Sloane, C. and Fitzpatrick, K. (2011) *Talk About It Survey*, National Union of Students, Australia, https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/nus/pages/33/attachments/original/1435818157/talk-about-it-survey-results-and-recommendations.pdf?1435818157

Stanko, B. (1985) *Intimate Intrusions: Women's Experience of Male Violence*, London: Unwin Hyman

Stark, E. (2007) *Coercive Control: How Men Entrap Women in Personal Life*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stockdale, M.S. and Nadler, J.T. (2012) 'Situating sexual harassment in the broader context of interpersonal violence: Research, theory and policy implications', *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 6 (1): 148–76.

Towl, G. (2016) 'Tackling sexual violence at UK universities: a case study', *Contemporary Social Science*, 11 (4): 432–7.

UUK (2016a) *Changing the Culture: Report of the Universities UK Taskforce Examining Violence Against Women, Harassment and Hate Crime Affecting University Students*, Universities UK, www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Documents/2016/changing-the-culture.pdf

UUK (2016b) *Guidance for Higher Education Institutions: How to Handle Alleged Student Misconduct Which May Also Constitute a Criminal Offence*, Universities UK, www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Documents/2016/guidance-for-higher-education-institutions.pdf

Valls, R., Puigvert, L., Melgar, P. and Garcia-Yeste, C. (2016) 'Findings from the first study of violence against women on campuses in Spain', *Violence Against Women*, 22 (13): 1519–39.

Valentine, G., Wood, N. and Plummer, P. (2009) *The Experience of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Trans Staff and Students in Higher Education*, Equality Challenge Unit, www.ecu.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/Experiences-of-LGBT-staff-and-students-in-he.pdf

Walklate, S. (2008) 'What is to be done about violence against women?', *British Journal of Criminology*, 48 (1): 39–54.

Watts, C. and Zimmerman, C. (2002) 'Violence against women: global scope and magnitude', T*he Lancet*, 359 (9313): 1232–7.

Weale, S. and Batty, D. (2016) 'Sexual harassment of students by university staff hidden by non-disclosure agreements', *Guardian*, 26 August, www.theguardian.com/education/2016/aug/26/sexual-harassment-of-students-by-university-staff-hidden-by-non-disclosure-agreements

Weale, S. and Batty, D. (2017) 'New sexual harassment claims at Goldsmiths spark calls for inquiry', *Guardian*, 6 March, www.theguardian.com/education/2017/mar/06/new-sexual-harassment-claims-goldsmiths-university-of-london-calls-inquiry

WHO and Butchart, A. (2004) *Preventing Violence: A Guide to Implementing the Recommendations of the World Report on Violence and Health*, Geneva: World Health Organisation.