

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL PREDICTORS OF
BYSTANDER INTERVENTION
IN THE CONTEXT OF MALE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

EZGİ TÜRKÇELİK TÜRKEL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

MARCH 2023

Approval of the thesis:

**SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL PREDICTORS OF
BYSTANDER INTERVENTION
IN THE CONTEXT OF MALE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN**

submitted by **EZGİ TÜRKÇELİK TÜRKEL** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy in Psychology, the Graduate School of Social Sciences of Middle East Technical University** by,

Prof. Dr. Sadettin KİRAZCI
Dean
Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Mine MISIRLISOY
Head of Department
Department of Psychology

Prof. Dr. Nuray SAKALLI
Supervisor
Department of Psychology

Examining Committee Members:

Prof. Dr. Ayda BÜYÜKŞAHİN SUNAL (Head of the Examining
Committee)
Ankara University
Department of Psychology

Prof. Dr. Nuray SAKALLI (Supervisor)
Middle East Technical University
Department of Psychology

Assist. Prof. Dr. Banu CİNGÖZ ULU
Middle East Technical University
Department of Psychology

Assist. Prof. Dr. Canay DOĞULU
TED University
Department of Psychology

Assist. Prof. Dr. Leman KORKMAZ KARAOĞLU
Middle East Technical University
Department of Psychology

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name: Ezgi Türkçelik Türkel

Signature

ABSTRACT

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL PREDICTORS OF BYSTANDER INTERVENTION IN THE CONTEXT OF MALE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Türkçelik Türkel, Ezgi
Ph.D., Department of Psychology
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Nuray Sakallı

March 2023, 127 pages

Recently, there has been a growing interest in bystander behavior in the context of male violence against women. Most of the prior studies focused on cases of sexual violence on US university campuses. It is important to study bystander intervention in Türkiye since there is no research on the issue in this context. The proposed research aimed to fill this gap by investigating the role of bystander characteristics (gender and past experiences of bystander intervention), perceived contextual variables (perceived peer norms and perceived effectiveness of referrals), and bystander model variables (bystander self-efficacy, feelings of personal responsibility) on bystander's intention to intervene in MVAW cases in the context of universities. To reach this aim, two studies were conducted. Since there were no measures in Turkish for studying bystander intervention, in Study 1, measures for each study variable were developed, and their validity and reliability were tested. In Study 2, the hypotheses of the study were tested. It was found that bystander characteristics, perceived contextual variables, and bystander model variables significantly correlated with bystander intervention. According to the hierarchical regression analysis, the bystander model variables explained significant variance beyond the perceived contextual variables and

bystander characteristics in predicting bystander intervention. In the final model, gender, feelings of personal responsibility, and bystander self-efficacy were the crucial factors underlying the relationship with bystanders' intention to intervene. Considering the existing literature on bystander intervention and male violence against women, the findings were discussed.

Keywords: violence against women, bystander intervention, bystander self-efficacy, feelings of personal responsibility, perceived peer norms

ÖZ

KADINLARA YÖNELİK ERKEK ŞİDDETİ BAĞLAMINDA TANIKLARIN MÜDAHALESİNİN SOSYAL PSİKOLOJİK YORDAYICILARI

Türkçelik Türkel, Ezgi

Doktora, Psikoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Nuray Sakallı

Mart 2023, 127 sayfa

Son yıllarda, kadınlara yönelik erkek şiddeti bağlamında olaya tanık olanların müdahalesine (seyirci müdahalesi) yönelik artan bir ilgi söz konusudur. Yapılan çalışmaların çoğu ABD üniversite kampüslerindeki cinsel şiddet vakalarına odaklanmıştır. Türkiye bağlamında bu konuda herhangi bir araştırma bulunmadığından, tanık olanların müdahalesini Türkiye'de incelemek önemlidir. Bu araştırma, seyirci modeli değişkenlerinin (seyirci öz-yeterliliği, hissedilen kişisel sorumluluk), algılanan bağlamsal değişkenlerin (algılanan akran normları ve bildirim yapılan kurumların algılanan etkililiği), seyirci özelliklerinin (cinsiyet ve geçmiş müdahale deneyimleri), üniversite bağlamında gerçekleşen kadınlara yönelik erkek şiddeti olaylarına müdahale etme niyeti üzerindeki rolünü araştırarak bu boşluğu doldurmayı amaçlamıştır. Bu amaca ulaşmak için iki çalışma yürütülmüştür. Öncelikle, seyirci müdahalesini kadına yönelik erkek şiddeti bağlamında incelemek için Türkçe'de herhangi bir ölçek bulunmadığından, Çalışma 1'de her bir çalışma değişkeni için ölçekler geliştirilmiş ve bunların geçerliliği ve güvenilirliği test edilmiştir. Çalışma 2'de ise çalışmanın hipotezleri test edilmiştir. Seyirci özellikleri, algılanan bağlamsal değişkenler ve seyirci modeli değişkenlerinin seyircilerin

müdahale etme niyetleri ile anlamlı şekilde ilişkili olduğu bulunmuştur. Hiyerarşik regresyon analizine göre, seyirci modeli değişkenleri, seyircilerin müdahale etme niyetlerini yordamada algılanan bağlamsal değişkenler ve seyirci özelliklerinin ötesinde anlamlı varyans açıklamaktadır. Nihai modelde, cinsiyet, hissedilen kişisel sorumluluk ve seyirci öz-yeterliliği, tanıkların müdahale etme niyetleri ile anlamlı olarak ilişkili bulunan önemli faktörlerdir. Bulgular, seyirci müdahalesi ve kadınlara yönelik şiddetle ilgili mevcut alanyazın ışığında tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: kadınlara yönelik şiddet, seyirci müdahalesi, seyirci öz-yeterliliği, hissedilen kişisel sorumluluk, algılanan akran normları

*In memory of my beloved grandmother, Fatma Gürpınar
whose songs and cheerful voice still echo in my ears...*

*and to the thousands of people who lost their lives in the earthquakes of Pazarcık
and Elbistan*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

For many Ph.D. students, writing a thesis is a lengthy process, but in my case, it has been a decade-long journey. I began my Ph.D. studies ten years ago, and although I proposed my thesis in 2016, life had other plans. There were moments when I thought I would never complete this dissertation, and now, having finally finished writing it and successfully defended it, I had hoped to write this acknowledgment with a sense of joy and accomplishment. On the contrary, I am writing it with a deep sense of pain. On 6 February 2023, two earthquakes in Pazarcık (7.7) and Elbistan (7.6) caused terrible devastation and plunged the whole country into deep grief. Unfortunately, the final touches to this dissertation were made under these conditions and in mourning. I need to mention these catastrophes as a note to my own personal history and for those who will find this thesis worth reading.

As I take this opportunity to express my heartfelt gratitude to those who have contributed to making this thesis possible, I am acutely aware that my words may lack the depth of feeling that I truly wish to convey. Please know that any shortcomings in my expression are not a reflection of insincerity, but rather a reflection of the deep despair that has overshadowed me in recent days.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my thesis supervisor, Prof. Dr. Nuray Sakallı, for her kind and patient support throughout this long journey. She has consistently been responsive and readily available whenever I required her input. Her insightful feedback and contributions have been immensely valuable to me. I would express my gratitude to my thesis supervising committee, Assist. Prof. Dr. Banu Cingöz Ulu and Prof. Dr. Ayda Büyüksahin Sunal, for their valuable feedback, input, and for their understanding. I would also extend my thanks to other thesis examining committee members, Assist Prof. Dr. Canay Doğulu and Assist Prof. Dr. Leman Korkmaz Karaoğlu for their advice, insightful comments, and sharing excitement about my research.

I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Ayşe Akın, with whom I have been working for more than 10 years. As an academician, she has been a role model, and I learned a lot from her professionally. I deeply appreciated her guidance and her compassion throughout my life.

I would like to thank the other professors and my working partners at Başkent University Public Health Department; Dr. Nihal Bilgili Aykut, Sevgi Balcı, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sare Mihçioğur, Prof. Dr. Rengin Erdal, and Assist. Prof. Dr. Cihangir Özcan, who supported me during my professional life. I would like to extend my thanks to Ayşegül Akkaya who turns our office into a warm and cheerful place.

It was difficult to collect data for my research, thanks to Assist. Prof. Dr. Pınar Uğurlar, Assist. Prof. Dr. Gülçin Akbaş Uslu, Assist. Prof. Dr. İlker Dalgıç, Assist. Prof. Dr. Öznur Öncül, Assist. Prof. Dr. Beril Türkoğlu, Dr. Merve Fidan, Dr. Türküler Erdost, Gülser Doğan, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Evrim Türkçelik, Assist. Prof. Dr. Hilal Arslan, Oğulcan Demiroğlu, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Leyla Kahraman, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şule Çeviker Ay, Prof. Dr. Lale Taşkın, Prof. Dr. Ayşe Akın, Prof. Dr. Türkan Günay, Dr. Nihal Bilgili Aykut, Dr. Aytaç Köktürk, Instructor Muammer Sarugan, several associations and organizations that gave me a hand with collecting my data. I also want to extend my thanks to all the participants who took the time to participate in my research.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Canay Doğulu for her enthusiastic support of this study and her responsiveness and willingness to provide feedback and guidance whenever I needed it. I am also deeply grateful to Beril Türkoğlu and Gülden Sayılan for their support and feedback throughout the entire process.

I want to express my heartfelt gratitude to my dear friend Merve Fidan for her unwavering support throughout this journey, even during difficult times. Her presence and persistence have been a source of courage and hope for me.

I owe special thanks to my dear friend Pınar Uğurlar for pushing me to finish this dissertation "in spite of myself" and for her unconditional support whenever I needed it. I am deeply grateful for her friendship and the invaluable role she played in helping me navigate this challenging endeavor.

I owe a huge debt of gratitude to Zafer Köroğlu, who was always there for me and my family whenever we needed support. Her dedication and attention to me and our children enabled me to complete this dissertation.

I would like to thank my brother Evrim Türkçelik, I am grateful for your presence, and support throughout the very beginning of my life, and my dear friend and sister Gülser Doğan Türkçelik; your presence always brings joy and serenity.

I also owe my mother, Reyhan Türkçelik, and my father, Mehmet Türkçelik, I am feeling so lucky to have you, and I will be grateful for the lovely childhood you provided me for the rest of my life. I owe special thanks to my mom; only with her love, compassion, and caring for Toprak Alaz in my most hectic times it was possible to focus on my work.

I would like to thank my life partner Akif Türkel. From the beginning, we know that our road would not be easy; *Laistrygonians*, *Cyclops*, and angry *Poseidon* may appear on our way. Keeping *Ithaka* in my mind and heart, I hope our road is a long one with joy and pleasure.

To my dearest children, Çınar and Toprak Alaz, words cannot express the depth of my love for you. While I was riding up and down of becoming a mother, writing this dissertation, and working at the university; Çınar, your infectious excitement, unwavering joy, and clever humor have illuminated even the darkest of moments. And Toprak Alaz, it feels as though it took me this long to write this thesis so that your name would appear on these pages. Your presence and love have been a constant source of gratitude in my life, and I hope to fill your childhoods with cherished memories that will last a lifetime.

Finally, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to all those who tirelessly work to provide humanitarian aid, saving lives and restoring hope amidst the chaos and devastation we are facing. To those who show unwavering solidarity and refuse to be mere *bystanders* in the face of catastrophe, your efforts have made all the difference in the world.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
DEDICATION	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xii
LIST OF TABLES	xv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xvi
CHAPTERS	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Bystander Intervention and Bystander Intervention Model	5
1.1.1 Early Bystander Research in the Context of MVAW	7
1.1.2 Recent Bystander Research in the Context of MVAW	9
1.2 Types of Bystander Behaviors and the Spectrum of Bystander Situations....	11
1.2.1 Bystander Behaviors & Bystanders’ Intention to Intervene.....	13
1.3 Bystander Intervention and Bystander Model Variable	13
1.3.1 Personal Responsibility	14
1.3.2 Bystander Self-Efficacy	14
1.4 Perceived Contextual Variables and Bystander Intervention.....	15
1.4.1 Perceived Peer Norms	16
1.4.2 Perceived Effectiveness of Referrals in MVAW Prevention	17
1.5 Bystander Characteristics and Bystander Intervention	18
1.5.1 Past Experiences of Being a Bystander and Intervening in MVAW Cases.....	18
1.5.2 Bystander Gender	19
1.6 The Overview of the Current Research	20
2. THE FIRST STUDY: DEVELOPING THE STUDY MEASURES TO EXPLORE BYSTANDER INTERVENTION IN THE CONTEXT OF MVAW IN UNIVERSITY SETTINGS	23

2.1 Method	24
2.1.1 Participants	24
2.1.2 Measures	24
2.1.3 Procedure.....	31
2.2 Results	32
2.2.1 Exploratory Factor Analyses for Bystanders’ Intention to Intervene Scale	33
2.2.2 Exploratory Factor Analyses for Feelings of Personal Responsibility .	34
2.2.4 Exploratory Factor Analyses for Perceived Peer Norms Scale.....	36
2.2.5 Exploratory Factor Analyses for Perceived Effectiveness of Referrals Scale	37
2.2.6 Descriptive Information and Correlations Among Study Variables	38
2.3 Conclusion	39
3. THE SECOND STUDY: TESTING THE HYPOTHESIS TO EXPLORE BYSTANDER INTERVENTION IN THE CONTEXT OF MVAW IN UNIVERSITY SETTINGS	41
3.1 Method	41
3.1.1 Participants	41
3.1.2 Measures	43
3.1.3 Procedure.....	45
3.2 Results	47
3.2.1 Descriptive Information and Correlation Analysis	48
3.2.2 Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Predicting Bystanders’ Intention to Intervene.....	50
4. GENERAL DISCUSSION	53
4.1 The Role of Bystander Characteristics in Predicting Bystanders’ Intention to Intervene.....	54
4.1.1 Gender	54
4.1.3 Past Experiences of Bystander Intervention	56
4.2 The Role of Perceived Contextual Variables in Predicting Bystanders’ Intention to Intervene	57
4.2.1 Perceived Peer Norms	57
4.2.2 Perceived Effectiveness of Referrals	58

4.3 The Role of Bystander Model Variables	60
4.3.1 Personal Responsibility	60
4.3.2 Bystander Self-Efficacy	60
4.4 Limitations of the Study	61
4.5 Contributions of the Study and Future Directions for Research	63
REFERENCES	66
APPENDICES	82
APPENDIX A: BYSTANDERS' INTENTION TO INTERVENE	82
APPENDIX B: PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY	83
APPENDIX C: BYSTANDER SELF-EFFICACY	84
APPENDIX D: PERCEIVED PEER NORMS REGARDING BYSTANDER INTERVENTION	85
APPENDIX E: PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS OF REFERRALS	86
APPENDIX F: PAST BYSTANDER EXPERIENCES OF VIOLENCE	87
APPENDIX G: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM	88
APPENDIX H: APPROVAL OF METU HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE	90
APPENDIX I: INFORMED CONSENT FORM	91
APPENDIX J: DEBRIEFING FORM	92
APPENDIX K: VAW SUPPORT SERVICES INFORMATION	93
APPENDIX L: SURVEY FLOW IN QUALTRICS	94
APPENDIX M: TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET	95
APPENDIX N: CURRICULUM VITAE	121
APPENDIX O: THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU	127

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Demographic Profile of Participants	25
Table 2	Factor Loadings and Univariate Summary Statistics of Bystanders’ Intention to Intervene Scale	33
Table 3	Factor Loadings and Univariate Summary Statistics of Bystanders’ Feelings of Personal Responsibility	35
Table 4	Factor Loadings and Univariate Summary Statistics of Bystanders’ Self- Efficacy Scale	36
Table 5	Factor Loadings and Univariate Summary Statistics of Perceived Peer Norms Scale	37
Table 6	Factor Loadings and Univariate Summary Statistics of Perceived Effectiveness of Referrals in Violence Prevention Scale	38
Table 7	Descriptive Statistics, Internal Consistency Coefficients, and Zero-Order Correlations between Variables	40
Table 8	Demographic Profile of Participants	42
Table 9	Descriptive Statistics, Internal Consistency Coefficients, and Zero-Order Correlations between Variables	50
Table 10	Hierarchical Regression Results for Bystanders’ Intentions to Intervene	51

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BII	Bystanders' Intention to Intervene
BSE	Bystander Self-Efficacy
IPVAW	Intimate partner violence against women
MAP	Velicer's Minimum Average Partial
MVAW	Male Violence Against Women
PEoBB	Past Experiences of Being a Bystander
PEoBI	Past Experiences of Bystander Intervention
PER	Perceived Effectiveness of Referrals
PR	Feelings of Personal Responsibility
VAW	Violence Against Women
WHO	World Health Organization

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

“The absence of a hearing is reproductive. Silence enables the reproduction of the culture of harassment and abuse. When we don’t speak about violence, we reproduce violence. Silence about violence is violence.”

Sara Ahmed, *Speaking Out*, 2016

Ayşegül, Zeliha, Bahar, Leyla, Yeter, Figen, Sevim, Canan, Adara, Fatma. These are the names of women killed violently in the first few days of 2023 in Türkiye (Anıt Savaş, 2023). In Türkiye, every single day, women are killed brutally by men, and thousands of them are harassed, assaulted, or exposed to physical, sexual, emotional, and economic forms of violence. “We” women are either survivors or potential victims of these violent acts¹. At the same time, we are *bystanders* of the male violence against women (MVAW): watching from the windows of our cozy apartments, hearing the noises coming from neighbors, coming across while walking on the street, or witnessing in our universities or workplaces. Some of us are passive; some of us are active bystanders. Some of us think that it’s not our business to be involved; some are paralyzed and do not know what to do, and some of us immediately step into the situation.²

¹ The concept of victim is used throughout this dissertation to recognize violence as a crime and to emphasize that women exposed to violence need their rights to be identified. The concept of survivor is also used interchangeably to remind us that women who are exposed to violence are not passive victims but active agents who try to struggle against violence (Women Against Violence Europe [WAVE], 2008).

² I intentionally use the “we” language here. I do not perceive violence that happens to “other” women or only to a specific type of woman. I position myself as a woman who has been exposed to violence or living under the risk of violence in their lifetime. Although some factors increase the risk of violence, violence affects all women irrespective of educational level, socio-economic status, ethnic origin,

MVAW is a significant social problem that persists not only in Türkiye but also worldwide. Devastating numbers of women have been exposed to physical, psychological, economical, or sexual violence (World Health Organization [WHO], 2005; WHO, 2013; WHO, 2021). An analysis of prevalence data across 161 countries between the years 2000 and 2018 demonstrates that, globally, 30% of women have experienced physical and/or sexual intimate partner violence against women (IPVAW) or non-partner sexual violence or both during their lifetime (WHO, 2021). In some countries, the prevalence rates are even higher. For instance, in Türkiye, 38% of ever-married women experienced physical and/or sexual violence by their intimate partners (Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies, 2015).

Furthermore, survivors of MVAW suffer from various health problems, from physical injuries to chronic pains, gynecological problems to HIV, and from depression to posttraumatic stress disorder (Antai, 2011; Bonomi et al., 2006; Jina & Thomas, 2012; Sillito, 2012). Depending on its severity, MVAW may even result in the victim's death. According to We Will Stop Femicide Platform, in Turkey 334 women were killed by men in 2022, and most of them were killed by their partners. Besides 245 women found suspiciously dead (Kadın Cinayetlerini Durduracağız Platformu, 2023).

Despite high prevalence rates and severe health consequences of MVAW, studies revealed that most of these cases go unreported (Felson & Paré, 2005; Gracia, 2004). Fifty-five percent to 95% of women exposed to violence never applied to any formal institutions or women's organizations to get help or report their victimization (WHO, 2005). In Türkiye, only 11% of women reported their victimization to institutions (Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies, 2015).

Due to underreporting of the MVAW cases, most of the cases went unknown, and consequently, women rarely receive help from relevant authorities (e.g., the police, health institutions, and social services). These authorities, by their profession, are involved in MVAW situations when the cases are reported to them. Some people, however, have been aware of the victimization by their proximity to the victim. Studies showed that MVAW is mostly known by victims' social networks (European

political stance, religion, or sexual orientation. Furthermore, beyond dispute, we are all bystanders in one way or another.

Commission, 2010; Gracia, 2004; Gracia & Herrero, 2006a). According to the US Bureau of Justice statistics, between 1993 and 1999, virtually one in three cases of IPVAW had occurred in the presence of third parties (Planty, 2002). Nevertheless, third parties who witness these cases are hesitant to intervene in such situations or to report these cases to the authorities (European Institute for Gender Equality [EIGE], 2020; Felson & Paré, 2005; Gracia, 2004). Although research and national surveys on MVAW have questioned and pointed out the factors behind the victim's reluctance to report their victimization for many years (e.g., Andersson et al., 2010; Felson et al., 2002), intervening behavior (including reporting) of bystanders in cases of violence against women have recently started drawing attention from MVAW researchers.

The growing interest in bystander intervention regarding MVAW is part of the efforts to develop more effective prevention programs to end MVAW, particularly sexual assaults, on US college campuses (Ahrens et al., 2011; Banyard et al., 2004; Coker et al., 2011; Gidycz et al., 2011; Moynihan et al., 2015). Women are exposed to violence everywhere, and universities are no exceptions. It has been estimated that in the USA, each year, one in four women students is sexually assaulted (Franklin et al., 2017). In addition to health consequences, survivors' academic life has been adversely affected. They have difficulties concentrating on schoolwork, they are academically disengaged, and their performance declines (Huerta et al., 2006). In the US, because of the high rates of sexual violence in universities, *The White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault* highlighted the significance of prevention through coordinated national response (Franklin et al., 2017). In addition, approval of the *Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act* mandated universities to implement bystander education programs. To fulfill the mandate, various universities have implemented bystander education programs (Franklin et al., 2017; Hoxmeier, Acock, et al., 2020).

In these programs, from a broader community perspective, the emphasis is on the role of bystanders, so all students, irrespective of their gender, are targeted as potential bystanders who have the capacity and opportunity to intervene/engage in the situation. These research and prevention programs have their roots in the bystander behavior tradition that has been one of the high-interest topics of social psychology since the late 1960s (Darley & Latané, 1968; Latané & Darley, 1968, 1969; Latané & Nida,

1981). However, until the 2000s, neither bystander literature nor violence research has emphasized bystander intervention in the context of MVAW. After the 2000s, gradually bystander research on the issue has proliferated. Majority of the studies which has been conducted so far focused on sexual assaults and dating violence that students have experienced on university campuses (Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Bennett et al., 2014; Brown et al., 2014; Franklin et al., 2017; Hoxmeier, Acock, et al., 2020; Potter et al., 2009; Yule et al., 2022).

In the context of MVAW research in Türkiye, even though there is much research, even nationally representative studies on violence against women, to the best of my knowledge, there is not any research on bystander interventions in the context of MVAW and particularly MVAW experienced in university settings. Moreover, a recent systematic review calls on research on bystander intervention out of the US context since the majority of research in this field was conducted in the US, which limits the generalizability of the results (Mainwaring et al., 2022). Therefore, I focused on bystander intentions to intervene in the cases of MVAW in Türkiye to fill this gap in the literature and contribute to social psychological research. Hopefully, the findings of my dissertation may be helpful for applied social psychologists to develop prevention programs for bystander intervention in the context of MVAW on university campuses in Türkiye.

Following the recent lines of research in bystander intervention in the context of MVAW, the purpose of the study was to investigate the role of bystander model variables (bystander self-efficacy, feelings of personal responsibility), perceived social-contextual factors (peer norms regarding intervention, effectiveness of referrals in violence prevention) and bystander characteristics (gender, past bystander experiences of MVAW) in predicting bystander intentions to intervene in MVAW cases. To reach this aim, primarily, I developed the measures for assessing the bystanders' intention to intervene, bystander self-efficacy, feelings of personal responsibility, perceived peer norms, and perceived effectiveness of referrals in violence prevention in the dissertation because there were no particular measures in Türkiye to assess these variables. Then, I tested the hypothesis of the study.

To this end, in this chapter, firstly, I will present how social psychological research on bystander intervention developed and how the early and recent bystander studies evolved in the context of MVAW. Secondly, I will mention the spectrum of bystander situations and types of bystander intervention behaviors. Thirdly, depending on the literature, I will address bystanders' intention to intervene (DV) and the role of social psychological factors in bystanders' intention to intervene (IVs) in the context of MVAW. Finally, I will remind the main objective and hypotheses of the study.

1.1 Bystander Intervention and Bystander Intervention Model

Bystanders are defined as “individuals who are not directly involved in the situation as a victim or perpetrator but, by their very presence, have the potential to do nothing, to step in and diffuse a high-risk situation and help and make it better, or to make the situation worse by condoning a perpetrator's behavior” (Banyard, 2011, p.216). Bystander behaviors in emergency and/or helping situations have a long history of exploration in social psychology (Latané & Nida, 1981).

Bystander research was proliferated after a well-known story of Kitty Genovese, who was raped and killed by a man on New York Street in 1964, in the presence of 38 silent witnesses (Rosenthal, 1964/1999). It was reported that the event had lasted thirty minutes, and only after it was too late did one of the neighbors call the police (Rosenthal, 1964/1999). Following the event, newspapers disclosed the lack of intervention by the witnesses. They asked several questions: Why did people not intervene in the brutal crime of Kitty Genovese? What prevented them from helping this young woman or calling the police? These questions influenced many researchers and eventually opened the way to the development of the bystander decision-making model (Darley & Latané, 1968; Latané & Darley, 1968, 1969; Latané & Nida, 1981).

The bystander intervention model (Latané & Darley, 1969) consists of five steps that explain how bystanders may intervene in emergency/helping situations. According to the model, bystanders must (1) notice the situation, (2) perceive it as an emergency that demands intervention, (3) feel personally responsible for the ongoing event, (4) decide how to help, and finally, (5) act to intervene. Bystander intervention can be

either direct (e.g., stopping the perpetrator or acting to protect the victim) or indirect (e.g., calling the police).

According to Latané and Darley (1969), the presence of others witnessing the event can inhibit helping or lead to delayed intervention of the bystanders; this is called the bystander effect. Latané and Darley proposed that three psychological processes prevent people from acting in emergencies when an individual is in the company of others. These are “audience inhibition,” “social influence,” and “diffusion of responsibility.” Audience inhibition occurs when the bystanders avoid helping when they are concerned with negative evaluations of others regarding their actions. Social influence occurs when the situation is ambiguous, and the bystander reads others’ inaction as if the situation is not problematic and decides not to intervene. Diffusion of responsibility refers to a decrease in the bystander intervention due to reductions in the sense of responsibility when the bystander knows that other bystanders are present and can intervene in the situation. While some more recent studies have raised doubts about the precise number of witnesses to the Kitty Genovese crime and the extent of their inaction, particularly as a result of the size of the group (Levine & Crowther, 2008; Manning et al., 2007), they have not sought to negate the significance of the bystander intervention model.

Latané and Darley (1969) developed the model after a series of empirical research tested the helping behaviors of bystanders in emergencies. Experiments included diverse emergency situations such as simulations of smoke filling the room when the participants were completing a survey (Latané & Darley, 1968), someone was heard having an epileptic seizure next door (Darley & Latané, 1968), and cries of a woman who fall and hurt herself coming from a nearby room (Latané & Darley, 1969). These studies contributed to understanding some important factors (e.g., the number of people, ambiguity, and diffusion of responsibility) as predictors of bystander inaction (Latané & Nida, 1981).

What is noteworthy about these studies is that researchers focused on the factors influencing general helping behavior, and none of the experimental conditions (Latané & Darley, 1968; Latané & Darley, 1969; Latané & Nida, 1981) examined the bystander behavior in a case of MVAW despite the fact that the brutal murder of Kitty Genovese,

which paved the way for the bystander approach, is an extreme example of it (see Cherry, 1995). In the next part, I will briefly review the studies that focus on helping in the context of MVAW.

1.1.1 Early Bystander Research in the Context of MVAW

Until the 2000s, only three studies (Borofsky et al., 1971; Harari et al., 1985; Shotland & Straw, 1976) examined the gendered nature of the violence and explored the factors that might be operating in the specific context of MVAW. These studies are a few exceptions in early bystander research, which experimentally studied helping behavior in MVAW and sexual violence situations.

Borofsky and colleagues (1971) conducted a study performing a psychodrama of an interpersonal attack in which either a man was attacking a woman, a man attacking a man, or a woman attacking a man. Participants witnessed all the episodes in the presence of confederates. Researchers found that when a man attacked a woman, none of the male participants intervened, whereas those participants tried to help in other attacks. This study was the first attempt to demonstrate how the bystander effect operates when the situation involves an issue of MVAW. Yet, the factors behind bystander behaviors were not well conceptualized in the study, and researchers' interpretation of male bystanders' non-intervention as having a sexually aggressive pleasure from the event was not well grounded.

In another experiment, relying on the indication that bystanders did not help Kitty Genovese because they thought it was a "lover's quarrel" (Rosenthal, 1999, p. 34), Shotland and Straw (1976) conducted a series of experiments to explore how bystanders' helping behaviors are affected by the assumed relationship between the victim and the perpetrator in a situation where a man was witnessed while attacking a woman. They found that bystanders intervened less when the perpetrator and victim were regarded as married than when they were regarded as strangers. Participants in the stranger condition felt more responsibility to intervene. Participants perceived the woman in the married condition as hurt less, less likely to demand help from others, and would have felt more embarrassed if the bystander intervened than the woman in

the no relationship condition. Besides, virtually all the participants who did not intervene in the situation regarded the issue as not their responsibility.

In another experiment (Harari et al., 1985), a rape scenario was simulated in a parking area of a university campus. Most of the participants intervened in the situation, and they intervened more when there were other observers and preferred direct intervention more than indirect intervention. The increased intervention in the presence of others was controversial to the typical bystander effect, which Latané and Darley proposed as a consistent phenomenon of bystander behavior (Latané & Nida, 1981).

These exceptional studies exploring bystander behavior in the context of MVAW have been quite limited in number for a long time. Almost after 30 years of research on bystander behavior, Cherry (1995) wrote a chapter criticizing the mainstream bystander approach for decontextualizing the Genovese event. She pointed out all the studies, but two (i.e., Borofsky et al., 1971; Shotland & Straw, 1976) conceptualized the event as a regular emergency rather than a case of violence against women. She discussed that this resulted from “culturally embedded theorizing” (1995, p.16) because, in the late 1960s, violence against women was not yet recognized as a significant social problem. It was emphasized that only after the uprising of the feminist movement in the 1970s in the United States and Europe was MVAW publicized and became a visible problem in society. Therefore, she argued that this social and cultural context also influenced the researchers to conceptualize bystander behavior merely as a result of situational factors (i.e., the number of people present). Cherry’s interpretation is quite essential to understand why earlier attempts of creating an experimental equivalent of the Kitty Genovese event were unstudied in the context of MVAW.

In the last ten to fifteen years, the bystander approach, however, has been increasingly utilized to understand the intervention behaviors specifically in the context of sexual assaults and MVAW (e.g., Banyard, 2011; Banyard et al., 2007; Bennett et al., 2014; Burn, 2009; Labhardt et al., 2017; Mainwaring et al., 2022). In the following parts, I will further review the recent studies on helping in the context of violence against women.

1.1.2 Recent Bystander Research in the Context of MVAW

Even though bystander research tradition contributed to some extent to figuring out the possible factors, which are relevant in MVAW cases as well, intervention behaviors of bystanders vary depending on the helping situation (Laner et al., 2001; Nicksa, 2013). The MVAW cases in certain aspects are very different from other emergency and helping situations, so they require specific attention. For instance, in mainstream/regular bystander situations, helping behaviors under exploration are generally in line with social norms of the society (e.g., everybody approves of helping a person who is having a seizure). However, MVAW has usually been regarded as a private issue and/or has been surrounded with victim blaming attitudes and violence myths that may function as barriers to intervention (e.g., Burn, 2009; West & Wandrei, 2002). Therefore, in MVAW situations, different factors might be involved, or similar predictors may have effects in different directions and should be studied in different cultural and institutional settings.

With the increasing number of studies since the 2000s, two lines of research on bystander behaviors can be identified in the context of MVAW. In the first line of research, the focus has been chiefly on immediate situational and individual level variables (e.g., the ambiguity of the emergency, gender, and attitudes) that might have influenced bystanders and their decisions to intervene (e.g., Banyard 2008; West & Wandrei, 2002). In this line of research, there are also studies which applied the bystander intervention model to VAW cases (e.g., Burn, 2009). The second line of research has mainly adopted a more comprehensive community perspective (e.g., social norms and neighborhood characteristics) in addition to individual factors and has generally based its arguments on ecological models, which focus not only personal level factors but also community and social level aspects (Banyard, 2011; Gracia & Herrero, 2006b; Moylan & Javorka, 2020).

In the first line of research, the main attempt was to see whether the bystander model and the critical intervention steps/aspects in the model could apply to the specific case of MVAW (Bennett et al., 2014; Burn, 2009; Casey & Ohler, 2012). One of the most influential studies is the application of Latané and Darley's model to sexual assault cases by Burn (2009). In this study, the five stages described in the bystander

intervention model were tested to explore whether they operate as barriers to bystander intervention in the context of sexual assault. That is, the study investigates whether the participant's failure to 1) notice the situation, 2) perceive it as risky, 3) feel responsible for intervention, 4) step in due to skill deficit, and finally, 5) fail to act due to audience inhibition are associated with bystander intervention decisions. It was found that all barriers in the model were negatively correlated with self-reported intervention behaviors in cases of sexual assault.

The research so far demonstrated that the situational model applies to the specific context of MVAW. Through the decisional steps of the bystander intervention model, several variables, such as feelings of personal responsibility, and bystander self-efficacy, were found to be the most relevant individual correlates of bystander intervention (Mainwaring et al., 2022). More recently, in a qualitative study in the context of intimate partner violence and sexual violence, in line with the decisional steps in bystander intervention, feeling responsible was expressed by participants as the central aspect which made them step in. Besides, low bystander efficacy and lack of sense of responsibility were mentioned as the most ubiquitous barriers (Bennett et al., 2014).

When the socio-contextual variables were considered and evaluated, mainly social norms were studied regarding intervention, and it was found that positive social norms regarding intervention (both descriptive and injunctive norms) were associated with higher bystanders' intention to intervene or higher bystander behaviors (Banyard et al., 2014; Brown et al., 2014; Brown & Messman-Moore, 2010; Gidycz et al., 2011; Reynolds-Tylus et al., 2019; Savage et al., 2017).

In light of the research so far, in the current research, I chose to study feelings of responsibility and bystander self-efficacy from the bystander model variables; perceived peer norms and perceived effectiveness of referrals as perceived contextual variables; gender, and prior experience of being a bystander and previous experiences of bystander intervention in relation to bystander' intentions to intervene in the context of Türkiye. The study variables will be elaborated further in the following parts of this chapter.

1.2 Types of Bystander Behaviors and the Spectrum of Bystander Situations

When bystanders decide to intervene in MVAW situations, there are various options regarding how to intervene. The researchers have mentioned several distinctions between bystander behaviors (Dovidio et al., 2006). Some researchers classified bystander interventions as direct and indirect (e.g., Chabot et al., 2009). In this distinction, direct intervention refers to confrontation with the perpetrator, offering direct support to the victim, or pulling the victim out of the violent situation. On the other hand, indirect intervention refers to involving other bystanders or official authorities to intervene in the cases, such as calling law enforcement or other relevant authorities or asking for help from other bystanders (Burn, 2009).

Some Bystander Education Programs (Green Dot Violence Prevention Strategy, Bringing in the Bystander, Breaking the Silence, etc.) have also classified bystander interventions (Coker et al., 2015; Moschella & Banyard, 2020). These programs proposed 3D or 4D strategies for students who are trained to be active bystanders in these programs. In these programs, each D refers to a different possible bystander behavior. *Direct* refers to directly involving yourself in a violent act by interacting with the perpetrator or the victim to stop the violent act. *Delegate* means asking someone to help in the situation (calling the police); *Distract* means distracting the perpetrator's attention to some other issue by requesting direction, etc.). Some of the programs propose another "D" action, which is Delay. Delay refers to the actions where bystanders approach the victim after the incident to see if they are feeling okay and if they can do something to support the survivor. This can be accompanying the victim to report or guiding them where to report the violent act (Coker et al., 2015).

Bystander intervention has become more complex when taken into different dimensions with various possible types of intervention. Bowes-Sperry and O'Leary-Kelly (2005) presented "a typology of observer intervention behaviors" for sexual harassment taking place in the workplace. Although the context of the violent act differs (university vs. workplace environment), this typology is also essential to consider because it proposes a range of behaviors by taking two domains of bystander intervention into account: level of immediacy and level of involvement. In this typology, high immediacy actions refer to intervening during the assault, and increased

involvement refers to intervening personally and directly to stop the violent act. Low immediacy cases refer to involvement after sexual harassment, and low involvement involves not involving yourself personally to report the issues.

Besides, McMahon and Banyard (2012) have proposed a conceptual framework that primarily focuses on various bystander opportunities. The framework gives insights to bystanders about when they can intervene in sexually violent situations. In their framework, bystander opportunities are conceptualized and organized parallel to the feminist understanding of the “continuum of sexual violence” (Kelly, 1987).

According to McMahon and Banyard (2012), bystander opportunities might arise not only during the assault (by witnessing a physical and/or sexual assault) but also before and after the assault. Pre-assault situations can occur just prior to a sexual assault (seeing a drunk woman surrounded by men); or beforehand (e.g., hearing sexually humiliating language). Post-assault situations include situations in which bystanders learn about the event later or find an opportunity to act after the occurrence of MVAW cases. For example, learning a friend had been exposed to sexual violence and referring her to relevant authorities.

Among the many possible dimensions and spectrum of interventions presented here, in this dissertation, I chose to study the more overt forms of MVAW that bystanders can easily detect and recognize as emergencies (cases of physical and sexual violence in a university setting) which requires intervention. Therefore, hypothetical scenarios, including clearly visible forms of MVAW, were presented to the participants. After the presentation of scenarios to measure participants’ intentions to intervene, some bystander intervention options were presented. Similarly, the given bystander intervention options included only direct and indirect interventions during the violence. Consequently, the current study preferred more overt forms among the continuum of violence and possible bystander intervention options. As in most previous studies, bystander behaviors in this current study have been investigated and measured under the generic concept of *intervention*, which involves both direct and indirect intervention behaviors.

1.2.1 Bystander Behaviors & Bystanders' Intention to Intervene

It would be ideal to study bystander behaviors as they occur in an actual MVAW context. Due to fundamental ethical reasons and resource limitations, it is not practical for many researchers to assess actual bystander behavior in real-life contexts (Labhardt et al., 2017). This was identified as a “major challenge” in the field (Hoxmeier, Acock, et al., 2020). Because of similar reasons, in the current study, I studied bystanders' intention to intervene (DV) rather than actual bystander behaviors. Although many researchers question the use of intentions rather than the actual behaviors, a considerable number of studies focused on bystanders' intentions to intervene as an outcome variable rather than actual behavior (Brown & Messman-Moore, 2010; Foubert et al., 2010; Franklin et al., 2017; Lamb & Attwell, 2019; Mainwaring et al., 2022; Nicksa, 2013; Orchowski et al., 2022; Paziienza et al., 2022).

Bystanders' intention to intervene in MVAW cases can be defined as the “self-reported likelihood of bystanders to intervene” in such cases (Banyard & Moynihan, 2011). Intentions are conceptualized as close antecedents of behaviors (Ajzen, 1991), and they have been shown to correlate with actual bystander intervention behaviors. Thus, it is vital to understand the possible factors associated with bystanders' intention to intervene to increase intervention intentions and behaviors (McMahon, 2015). In the following part, I will present the social psychological factors (which were studied in the scope of the current research) associated with bystanders' intention to intervene in the context of MVAW in three categories: Bystander model variables, perceived contextual variables, and bystander characteristics.

1.3 Bystander Intervention and Bystander Model Variable

The first category of variables I will present is bystander model variables. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, noticing the event, defining the situation as an emergency, feeling responsible, having appropriate skills, and taking action are the essential steps of the bystander model. Among the influential variables within the model, in the following part, I will elaborate on the sense of responsibility and bystander self-efficacy as critical variables, which are also expected to be significant predictors of bystander intervention in the current study.

1.3.1 Personal Responsibility

Feeling personal responsibility for intervention is one of the most critical steps (third step) in the bystander model. Burn (2009) and Banyard and Moynihan (2011) found that responsibility measures were one of the most significant correlates of self-reported bystander behavior in relation to MVAW. Moreover, research constantly showed that bystanders who feel more responsibility regarding intervention or who have lower levels of failure to take responsibility are more likely to intervene or report more intentions to intervene (Banyard et al., 2021; Bennett et al., 2014; Burn, 2009; Debnam & Mauer, 2021; Gracia et al., 2009; Katz et al., 2015). For example, in a recent study that investigated the impact of perceived severity and personal responsibility on intervention in hypothetical scenarios of IPVAV, it was found that perceived severity did not have a direct effect on intervention. However, the participants who felt a greater sense of personal responsibility were more willing to intervene (Gracia et al., 2009). Further, a qualitative review about students' perspectives and bystander intervention pointed out that participants who intervened in MVAW cases mentioned that they felt the intervention was their responsibility, moral imperative, or duty (Robinson et al., 2022).

Research exploring the potential barriers of bystander intervention also showed that higher perceived barriers of taking responsibility correlated with lower levels of intervention (Bennett et al., 2014; Burn, 2009). When participants were not certain of their responsibility to intervene, they reported lower likelihood to help the victim (Katz et al., 2015). In addition, in recent studies, as a reason for their non-intervention, the participants reported that "it wasn't their business" or they didn't want to "get themselves involved in other people's business" which indicated feeling no responsibility for intervention (Hoxmeier, McMahon, et al., 2020; Lamb & Attwell, 2019). Additionally, among men who prefer not to intervene, Yule and Grych (2020) found that not feeling responsible for intervening was the most common barrier.

1.3.2 Bystander Self-Efficacy

Bystander self-efficacy refers to having appropriate skills, feeling confident to intervene or perceived ease or difficulty of intervention. It is positively correlated with

bystander intervention and an important step (following the feeling of personal responsibility) in decisions to intervene (Burn, 2009; Darley & Latané, 1968). This definition of bystander self-efficacy is also parallel with Ajzen's (2002) clarification of the concept, which is defined both in terms of confidence and perceived easiness or difficulty in performing specific behavior.

As it was in the case of personal responsibility, studies mainly have consistent results for bystander self-efficacy in the context of sexual violence and intimate partner violence. Participants who reported higher levels of bystander efficacy reported more willingness to engage in helping and higher actual behaviors in intimate partner violence situations and in sexual assaults (Banyard, 2008; Banyard et al., 2007; Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Frye, 2007; Lazarus & Signal, 2013; Savage et al., 2017). Further, students who failed to intervene mentioned their lack of skills and low self-efficacy (Hoxmeier et al., 2018; Hoxmeier et al., 2020). The higher the number of perceived barriers, the higher the skill deficit scores and lower the perceived responsibility (Yule & Grych, 2020). Recent studies also showed that there was a significant positive association between bystander self-efficacy and bystander intent to intervene (Pazienza et al., 2022).

Feelings of personal responsibility and self-efficacy were the most commonly explored variables in their relation to bystander intervention or intentions in MVAW situations in the US context (Mainwaring et al., 2022). It is essential to study the role of these variables in different cultures and contexts. Therefore, I included these variables as the bystander model related variables (self-efficacy and feelings of personal responsibility) in my dissertation to explore their predictive power on bystander intentions to intervene in MVAW cases in Turkey.

1.4 Perceived Contextual Variables and Bystander Intervention

The second category of variables I will present is perceived contextual variables which refer to wider social context surrounding the individual bystander. These might be social/peer norms, cultural values, neighborhood disorder, trust in law enforcement, sense of community, etc. (Banyard, 2011; Moylan & Javorka, 2020). In the following I will elaborate the perceived peer norms and perceived effectiveness of referrals from

this category of variables that are expected to be significant predictors of bystander intervention in the current study.

1.4.1 Perceived Peer Norms

Based on the premises of social norms theory, group norms were found to be quite influential in decisions to intervene (Banyard et al., 2021; Brown et al., 2014; Brown & Messman-Moore, 2010; Gidycz et al., 2011; Reynolds-Tylus et al., 2019; Savage et al., 2017). Bystander research conducted in the context of university/campus life, conceptualized social norms as perceptions of peer helping which are descriptive norms of how participants viewed their friends as active bystanders or their friends' attitudes or approval regarding bystander intervention.

There were several studies demonstrating the importance of social norms/peer norms in intervention decisions most of which were conducted in the context of sexual violence and with male participants. These studies showed that male participants' self-reported intervention likelihood to a sexual assault was associated with their perception of others' intervention likelihood (Brown & Messman-Moore, 2010; Fabiano et al., 2003). Interviews with men regarding the hypothetical scenarios of sexual assault also showed that concerns about masculinity norms plays a significant role in men's decisions to intervene (Carlson, 2008; Casey & Ohler, 2012). In qualitative studies, participants openly reported that they did not intervene because of their fear of social exclusion and disapproval by friends (McMahon & Dick, 2011). Similarly, the higher the fear of exclusion, the lower the bystander intentions to intervene (Allnock & Atkinson, 2019; Reid & Dundes, 2017). However, when peers are supportive of taking action, then, bystanders are more likely to intervene and report more bystander behaviors (Banyard et al., 2014). Additionally, when group norms regarding IPVAV are manipulated, bystanders' intervention decisions change with the changes in the group norms (Baldry & Pagliaro, 2014).

Although there are many research presenting the positive associations among bystander intervention and social norms, Hust et al. (2019) have found no significant relationship between bystander intervention and peer norms. Consequently, these

findings generally suggest peer norms regarding intervention play an important role in encouraging or hindering bystander intervention in different contexts.

Social norms regarding MVAW, tolerance to MVAW and acceptance of perpetrator behavior vary significantly across cultures (Ceylan-Batur et al., 2021; Sakallı-Uğurlu & Akbaş, 2013). These wider social norms may also influence the peer norms, shaping what is seen as acceptable regarding bystander behavior. Therefore, in the current dissertation I consider peer norms as an important contextual variable to examine its relationships with bystander intervention in the context of MVAW in Turkey.

1.4.2 Perceived Effectiveness of Referrals in MVAW Prevention

Perceived effectiveness of referrals in MVAW prevention is regarded as one of the perceived contextual factors in the current study, which refers to perceptions of how effective it is to report MVAW cases to the relevant authorities in MVAW prevention. Perceived effectiveness of referrals in MVAW prevention may influence bystanders' intention to intervene in several ways. For example, bystanders who think reporting MVAW cases to relevant authorities does not provide any help, may have low levels of intention to intervene. Besides, bystanders who think reporting ensures that the perpetrator is given the necessary punishment or reporting eventually results in a decrease in MVAW cases may intend to intervene more.

Studies showed that individuals with higher trust in authorities' efforts to prevent IPVAW might have more positive attitudes toward reporting (Felson et al., 2002). Sulkowski (2011) showed that students with greater trust in campus authorities had increased intentions to report violence on campus. Gracia and Herrero (2006b) also found that participants who were hesitant to trust authorities also reported their hesitancy to report VAW cases. Research demonstrated that higher trust in the system or the referral mechanisms in charge of MVAW was related with bystander intervention (Allnock & Atkinson, 2019; Holland et al., 2016). When there are possible legal consequences and zero-tolerance policies for MVAW adopted by the organizations, bystanders are more likely to intervene or report (Jacobson & Eaton, 2018).

Perceived effectiveness of referrals in MVAW prevention can be influenced by various factors. Personal experiences of MVAW and reporting are some of these factors. Although significant research showed that women who had an experience of violence support victims more (Beeble et al., 2008), the personal experience of IPVAV was negatively correlated with reporting attitudes (Gracia & Herrero, 2006b). These results are essential since they might reflect the experiences of survivors and might provide information about what worked best for them. Negative attitudes toward indirect intervention, such as calling police officers, might be the result of negative personal experiences with police officers or their ineffectiveness in the situation.

The contextual elements in the context of bystander intervention need to be better researched and developed, because these factors were less studied when compared with the research on social norms (McMahon, 2015). Therefore, this area needs to be studied more, and various relevant contextual elements should be considered in bystander research. This study included the perceived effectiveness of referrals as a possible predictor of bystander intervention.

1.5 Bystander Characteristics and Bystander Intervention

The third category of variables I will present in relation to bystander intervention is bystander characteristics. This category refers to individual-level characteristics and experiences studied in relation to bystander intervention, such as gender, emotions, attitudes, personality traits, prior victimization, etc. (Banyard, 2011; Mainwaring et al., 2022). In the following, I will elaborate on the variables of past experience of being a bystander, past experience of intervention, and gender, which are expected to be significant predictors of bystander intervention in the current study.

1.5.1 Past Experiences of Being a Bystander and Intervening in MVAW Cases

Past experiences of violence is another important variable of bystander characteristics that require further attention from researchers. Women exposed to intimate partner violence are more likely to help victims than women with no experience of violence (Nabi & Horner, 2001). Similarly, in another study, personal experience of intimate partner violence and childhood abuse predicted different ways of helping IPVAV victims (Beeble et al., 2008).

Personal experiences of violence also may affect intervention decisions of how to intervene and what kind of help is offered on the part of bystanders. Women who had an experience of violence support victims more with instrumental support (e.g., financial support, offering a shelter, etc.) rather than emotional (e.g., listening to victim) or formal help (referring to the police or available social services) (Beeble et al., 2008).

However, when indirect intervention was explored, it was found that the personal experience of IPVAW was negatively correlated with reporting attitudes (Gracia & Herrero, 2006). While bystanders intervened in MVAW cases, they generally mentioned their positive feelings related to it, but some bystanders had experience negative emotions from intervention (Seo et al., 2022). Similarly, receiving positive reactions from victims and other individuals was found to be correlated with higher bystander self-efficacy and intentions (Banyard et al., 2021)

In this study, for ethical reasons, I focused on experiences of being a bystander rather than personal experiences of being a survivor of violence, which were also found to be significant correlates of bystander intervention and bystander self-efficacy (Sánchez-Prada et al., 2022). In MVAW studies, some researchers chose not to ask direct questions about subjected violence because the risks to participants may outweigh the benefits of the information obtained (Peterman, 2021). Asking about personal experiences of violence might be much more triggering for participants who were survivors of violence than asking about bystander experiences.

1.5.2 Bystander Gender

Gender is one of the most studied individual-level variables in helping behaviors in general and concerning MVAW situations. In an extensive meta-analytic review of gender differences in prosocial behaviors, it was found that compared to women, men are more likely to help (Eagly & Crowley, 1986). In the context of MVAW, intimate partner violence, or sexual violence situations, many studies showed that women were more likely to intervene and report more actual helping behaviors than men (Amar et al., 2014; Banyard, 2008; Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Burn, 2009; Franklin et al.,

2020; Hoxmeier, Acock, et al., 2020; Hoxmeier, McMahon, et al., 2020; Nicksa, 2013; Savage et al., 2017).

There are also studies which indicated women and men differ in which type of bystander behavior was adopted (e.g., Palmer et al., 2018). For example, while women were found to be more likely to intervene directly dealing with the victims (Holland et al., 2016; Moschella et al., 2018), men were found to intervene more with the perpetrator by confronting (Franklin et al., 2017; Holland et al., 2016). Women were also found to help the victim after the assault (Franklin et al., 2020; Hoxmeier et al., 2015). Also, women participants were more intended to report IPVAW cases and support the victim than men (Baldry & Pagliaro, 2014; Brown et al., 2014; Brown & Messman-Moore, 2010; West & Wandrei, 2002).

However, there are also studies that indicated there were no significant differences between women and men in their bystander intentions or bystander behavior (Banyard et al., 2020; Galdi et al., 2017; Hoxmeier et al., 2015; Katz et al., 2015). Thus, the research findings regarding gender were not consistent and need to be studied further in different contexts.

1.6 The Overview of the Current Research

Male violence against women (including sexual harassment and assault) in universities has also been the focus of attention for more than 10 years in Türkiye (Ecevit & Beşpınar, 2020). With the increasing efforts of feminist academicians and their solidarity within and across the universities, a considerable number of universities accepted political statements against gender-based violence (e.g., Ankara University, Middle East Technical University, Hacettepe University, Başkent University, Atılım University, Sabancı University, etc.). Some of these universities also established relevant units /committees for supporting survivors and taking action against perpetrators to provide transformative justice in the universities. Inter-University Communication Network Against Sexual Harassment and Assault (Cinsel Taciz ve Saldırıya Karşı Üniversitelerarası İletişim Ağı) is one of the important prevention efforts of feminist academicians. The Council of Higher Education also officially called universities to take action against gender-based violence by proposing a Gender

Equality Position Paper in 2015. Although the statement was removed from the website of the Council of Higher Education in 2019 (Bianet, 2019) with the reason of the concept of “gender” was against our cultural values, and there has been a strong backlash against gender issues in Türkiye recently (Bodur Ün & Arıkan, 2022) an increasing number of universities continue addressing the problem of MVAW in university contexts (Ecevit & Beşpınar, 2020; Göker & Polatdemir, 2022).

In Türkiye, although there are studies on students’ attitudes toward violence against women, sexual assaults, and harassment (Sakallı-Uğurlu et al., 2007; Siyez et al., 2021; Toplu-Demirtaş & Fincham, 2022) however, there is no research to the best of my knowledge on bystander intervention in MVAW contexts. This study aims to take a small step forward by studying social psychological factors and bystander intervention in the context of MVAW in universities in Türkiye.

In light of the literature, the aim of the proposed research was to investigate the role of bystander model variables (bystander self-efficacy, feelings of personal responsibility), perceived social-contextual factors (perceived peer norms regarding intervention, effectiveness of referrals), and bystander characteristics (gender, past experiences of being a bystander and intervening in MVAW cases) in predicting bystander intentions to intervene in MVAW cases through correlational methods. In order to reach this aim, I conducted two studies. In Study 1, I developed the measures for studying bystander intervention in the context of MVAW cases at universities in Türkiye and tested their reliability and validity. In Study 2, I examined the correlations of these variables with bystanders’ intention to intervene.

In the light of the literature review on bystander intervention in the context of MVAW presented in Chapter 1, the hypotheses of the study are as follows:

Hypothesis 1. Participants with greater self-efficacy would intend to intervene more than participants with lower levels of bystander self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 2. Participants who feel greater personal responsibility would intend to intervene more than participants with lower levels of personal responsibility.

Hypothesis 3. Participants with higher perceived effectiveness of referrals would have greater intentions to intervene than participants with lower perceived effectiveness of referrals in violence prevention.

Hypothesis 4. Participants with higher perceived peer norms encouraging intervention would intend to intervene more than participants with lower levels of perceived encouraging peer norms.

Hypothesis 5. Bystander characteristics of gender, past experiences of being a bystander, and past experiences of bystander intervention predict bystander intentions to intervene.

Hypothesis 5a. Women have higher intentions to intervene when compared to men.

Hypothesis 5b. Participants with prior experiences of being a bystander and personal experiences of bystander intervention would intend to intervene more than the participants without these experiences.

I also aimed to explore which of the categories of study variables (bystander characteristics, perceived contextual variables, and bystander model variables) mentioned in the above hypotheses most strongly predict bystanders' intention to intervene when they are assessed together in a hierarchical regression model.

CHAPTER 2

THE FIRST STUDY: DEVELOPING THE STUDY MEASURES TO EXPLORE BYSTANDER INTERVENTION IN THE CONTEXT OF MVAW IN UNIVERSITY SETTINGS

As it was proposed in Chapter 1, the aim of the study was to investigate the role of bystander model variables (bystander self-efficacy, feelings of personal responsibility), perceived social-contextual factors (peer norms regarding intervention, effectiveness of referrals), and gender-based bystander characteristics (gender, past experiences of being a bystander and past experiences of intervening in MVAW) in predicting bystander intentions to intervene in MVAW cases through correlational methods.

For this aim, in the first study, the measure of bystanders' intention to intervene, bystander self-efficacy, feelings of personal responsibility, perceived peer norms, and perceived effectiveness of referrals were developed for the study, which focuses mainly on the context of MVAW cases at universities in Türkiye.

In the literature, there are scales developed by researchers to measure bystander's intention to intervene (Banyard, 2008; McMahon et al., 2015), bystander self-efficacy (Banyard, 2008; Banyard et al., 2005; Banyard & Moynihan, 2011) and perceived peer norms (Banyard et al., 2014). However, these measures do not respond the aims of the proposed study since majority of them was developed for responding sexual assault cases encountered in university campuses, particularly in the US context (Mennicke et al., 2022). These measures include party situations that are very usual part of university life in the US. Besides, they mostly utilize the similar items that they used for measuring behavior, intention, self-efficacy, and norms. Therefore, new measures were developed for the study that might be more encompassing for university contexts

in Türkiye. Thus, I will discuss how each measure was developed according to the existing literature and I will present the final versions of the measures in the following parts of this chapter.

2.1 Method

2.1.1 Participants

Five hundred participants were recruited for the study. One participant left the study without completing. Two participants were not part of the target sample (not a university student or indicating their age as below 18). These three participants were deleted from the study. Out of the 497 participants, 304 were women, 192 were men, 1 was non-binary.

The age of participants ranged from 18 to 44 ($M = 21.83$, $SD = 3.13$). Most of the participants were undergraduate students, 68.2%. The percentage of vocational school students was 24.9%, master's student was 4.6%, Ph.D. student was 0.8% while private/exchange students was 1.4%. One of the participants did not indicate the year spent in the university. The other participants' mean year in their current university was 2.73 ($SD = 1.48$). The participants are from various universities in Türkiye, including private and public universities. Most of the participants spent most of their lives in the metropolitan area (49.9%), 25.2% in the city, 17.9% in the district, and 7% in the village or town.

The 8.9% (44 participants) of the participants indicate that they have no religion. The mean religiosity level of the other participants was 3.09 ($SD = 0.93$) on a 1 to 5 scale; greater scores refer to higher religiosity. The detailed demographic profile of the participants can be seen in Table 1.

2.1.2 Measures

Based on the literature, I prepared preliminary items for each measure. To ensure content validity of the measures, I prepared subject matter expert forms. These forms included the aim of the study, operational definitions of each variable, instructions of the measures that would be presented to the participants, and preliminary items for

each measure. The forms also include information regarding how the participants rate these items and finally how the researcher would evaluate them.

Table 1
Demographic Profile of Participants

Characteristics	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Women	304	61.2
Men	192	38.6
Non-binary	1	0.2
Education Level		
Vocational School	124	24.9
Undergraduate	339	68.2
Master	23	4.6
Ph.D.	4	0.8
Other (private/exchange)	7	1.4
Year in the University		
1-2	111	22.4
2-3	140	28.2
3-4	100	20.2
4-5	104	21.0
5 or more	41	8.2
Living status		
With family	270	54.3
With friend/friends	42	8.5
With partner	15	3.0
Living alone	37	7.4
At the university dormitory	73	14.7
At the dormitory outside the campus	57	11.5
Homeless	3	0.6
Romantic Relationship		
No romantic-relationship	299	60.2
Less than six months	43	8.7
More than six months	127	25.6
Engaged	12	2.4
Married	6	3.2
Place of Lived Longest		
Village/town	35	7.0
District	89	17.9
City	125	25.2
Metropolis	248	49.9
Perceived Socio-economic Status		
Lower	42	8.5
Lower-Middle	137	27.6
Middle	240	48.3
Upper Middle	76	15.3
Upper	2	0.4
Mother Education level		
Literate/illiterate	52	10.5
Primary school	163	32.8
Secondary school	78	15.7

Table 1 (continued)

High school	109	21.9
Vocational school	8	1.6
University	67	13.5
Master/Ph.D.	20	4.0
Father Education level		
Literate/illiterate	16	3.2
Primary school	127	25.6
Secondary school	83	16.7
High school	144	29.0
Vocational school	14	2.8
University	87	17.5
Master/Ph.D.	26	5.2

N = 497

I sent these forms to 8 experts (e.g., two professors, five assistant professors, and one public health specialist) who are familiar with MVAW issues and scale development to ensure content validity. I asked the experts to rate both instructions (for participants) and items in terms of comprehensibility and applicability on a 1 to 3 scale. At the end of each scale, they also wrote down their suggestions of new items or new expressions to increase the comprehensibility and applicability of the items and instructions. According to the experts' feedback, I made various changes to the questionnaire. Additionally, I interviewed 2 of these experts (two assistant professors) to take their suggestions in detail and adopted the measures accordingly. The final version of the questionnaire was again sent to 3 experts from psychology (one professor and two assistant professors) and 3 persons (with no psychology background) for testing.

Bystanders' Intention to Intervene. Due to the reasons mentioned before, a new measure was developed, and in the scope of the proposed research bystanders' intention to intervene was conceptualized as the likelihood of individuals to intervene in MVAW situations to stop the violent act. I planned to measure bystanders' intention to intervene by presenting 2 hypothetical scenarios (including physical and sexual violence) after which possible bystander behaviors were rated by participants on a Likert scale.

For doing this, I wrote four scenarios depicting physical and sexual violence cases for different contexts/situations in the university campuses (library, hitchhiking, parking areas, lawn). Then, one of the scenarios was chosen (by four experts including the

researcher) and same context was used for the sexual violence scenario. Therefore, the context (which is witnessing a violent act towards a woman while sitting on the lawn at the university) was kept same but the forms of violence (one includes sexual violence, the other includes physical violence) differ in the two similar scenarios presented. The scenarios were also evaluated by 8 experts (e.g., two professors, five assistant professors, and one public health specialist) in terms of their understandability, language, and applicability in university contexts.

After each scenario, five possible bystander behaviors were presented to participants. The possible bystander behaviors were developed based on the Bowes- Sperry and O'Leary-Kelly (2006) and McMahon and Banyard's (2012) framework that cover a wide range of behaviors across the domains of the immediacy of intervention and level of involvement. Bowes-Sperry and O'Leary-Kelly (2006) and McMahon and Banyard's (2012) prevention/observer intervention typologies were translated to Turkish by the researcher and were presented to research experts in psychology. In these typologies, violent actions vary from making sexist comments to sexual assault cases. Additionally, bystander behaviors include every possible form of intervention including interventions before, during, and after the event. Within the scope of the study, as I mentioned before, we eliminated very detailed versions of possible interventions and included interventions that only occur during the event. The hypothetical scenarios including clearly visible and risky forms of MVAW were chosen to be presented to the participants.

The final items for possible bystander interventions were generated in collaboration with experts in the field of psychology and bystander behaviors which include direct and indirect forms were reduced to 5 from 10 after expert views. Example items are "telling the male student to stop his violent act", "intervening to prevent the incident", "reporting the situation to the relevant security unit to intervene"). Participants rate each bystander intervention behavior on a Likert-type scale (1 = *very unlikely to perform* to 6 = *very likely to perform* intervention) for the presented MVAW case in each scenario (see Appendix A). Scores are created by mean scores of the responses across the same items of the two scenarios. For example, the score from Item 1 "telling the male student to stop" in a physical violence scenario is summed with the score of the same item in the sexual violence scenario and mean score of Item 1 for Bystanders'

Intention to Intervene was computed. Each item score was computed similarly. The total score of bystander intervention was computed as the mean score of these 5 items. Higher means demonstrated higher bystander intentions to intervene.

Feelings of Personal Responsibility. In the scope of the study, feelings of personal responsibility were defined as whether participants feel themselves individually responsible for intervention and responsible for the violent act they witnessed. Based on the previous research, several items were created for measuring the sense of personal responsibility of a bystander for MVAW intervention. The final version with 7 items was adopted after receiving feedback from the experts. Sample items are “I feel responsible for the negative consequences the woman may encounter” and “I expect others to intervene in these events.” For each item, participants were asked to rate how much they agree with each item on a Likert-type scale (1 = *I do not agree at all* to 6 = *totally agree*). The scores from 7 items were summed and averaged. Higher scores on the measure indicate higher personal responsibility for intervention (see Appendix B)

Bystander Self-Efficacy. Different bystander self-efficacy scales were developed in the literature so far. One of them (Banyard et al., 2005) includes 14 statements that assess the participant’s confidence in performing bystander behaviors. Participants rate their confidence to perform the behaviors on a 100- percentage point scale (0 = *can’t do* and 100 = *very certain to do*). Sample items are “Ask a friend if they need to be walked home from a party.”, “Criticize a friend who says they had sex with someone who passed out.”

Another self-efficacy scale is Self-efficacy to Deal with Violence Scale which was developed by Cameron et al. (2007). In this eight-item scale, five items relate to the perception of one’s ability to act when one witnesses or becomes aware of domestic violence against a peer (e.g. ‘How confident are you that you could do something to help a person who is being hit by their boyfriend/ girlfriend?’) and three items concern the perception of one’s ability to deal with domestic violence as a victim or perpetrator which are not relevant for this study. Items were scored on a four-point scale (1 = *not at all confident*; 4 = *very confident*).

Among the self-efficacy scales developed in the literature, mainly researchers used the similar items they used in the bystanders' intentions to intervene scales in the same study. In these studies, participants are typically asked to rate their confidence or ease or difficulty to perform a specific bystander behavior under a variety of circumstances (Ajzen, 2002). As several studies suggested, what is determinative in bystander intervention, however, is situation specific skills, not general measures of self-efficacy or self-esteem (e.g., Chabot et al., 2009).

Ajzen (2002) proposed clear examples of how to measure self-efficacy with sample items from various studies. According to theoretical discussions and considerable empirical evidence, confidence ratings or ratings for ease or difficulty of performing a behavior are the main ways of measuring self-efficacy. In the scope of this study, bystander self-efficacy refers to perceived ease or difficulty of possible bystander behaviors.

Consequently, in the current study, same bystander behaviors (e.g., telling male student to stop, reporting the incident) which are used in the Bystanders' Intention to Intervene Scale are utilized in the Self-Efficacy Scale (see Appendix C) and participants were asked to rate the ease or difficulty of performing these actions on a Likert-type scale (1 = *very difficult for me* to 6 = *too easy for me*). The score from 5 items of self-efficacy were summed and averaged. Higher scores indicate higher levels of self-efficacy.

Perceived Peer Norms Regarding Bystander Intervention. Twenty items were generated by Banyard et al. (2014) to examine perceptions of peer helping which are descriptive norms of how participants viewed their friends as bystanders. Perceived Peer Norms items are used to examine perceptions of how likely a participant's friends were to engage in the specific helpful bystander behavior. In the literature, how peers perceive their friends' bystander behaviors is also used to measure peer norms regarding bystander intervention. I adopted the second approach. Thus, I prepared a new list of items to understand how a participant's intervention as a bystander has been perceived/received by their peers in the context of MVAW. The final version with 7 items was adopted after receiving feedback from 7 experts. Sample items are "If I intervene in such an event, my friends think that I am unnecessarily exaggerating the

situation”, “If I intervene in such an event, my friends support me”. Participants rated how much they agree with each item on a Likert-type scale (1 = *I do not agree at all* to 6 = *totally agree*). The scores from 7 items were summed and averaged. The higher scores indicate higher encouraging perceived peer norms regarding bystander intervention (see Appendix D).

Perceived Effectiveness of Referrals. Based on the literature, several items were written to examine participants’ perceived effectiveness of referrals (e.g., “reporting VAW cases is a deterrent for perpetrators”). The final version with 7 items was adopted after receiving feedback from 7 experts. Participants rated how much they agree with each item on a Likert-type scale (1 = *I do not agree at all* to 6 = *totally agree*). The scores from 7 items were summed and averaged. Higher scores point to higher levels of perceived effectiveness of referrals in violence prevention (see Appendix E).

Past Experiences of Being a Bystander. Past experiences of witnessing a MVAW incident in the university is measured by 2 questions. The questions are “Have you ever witnessed a man committing physical violence against a woman at the university?” and “Have you ever witnessed a man committing sexual violence against a woman at the university?” (See Appendix F). Answers for the questions summed and witnessing at least one form of violence were coded with “1” and no experience was coded with “0”.

Past Experiences of Bystander Intervention. Past experiences of bystander intervention (in any context) is measured by a single question “Have you ever taken any action to prevent the violence or show your disapproval in a previous MVAW case you have witnessed?” (see Appendix F). Participants who had previous experiences of intervention were coded with “1” and participants who had no experience were coded with “0”.

Demographic Information Form. Participants’ age, gender, perceived socioeconomic status, level of education, relationship status, and type of environment where participants were raised (e.g., rural, urban, or suburban), level of religiosity, income,

and education levels of parents were also asked in the questionnaire as demographic variables (see Appendix G).

2.1.3 Procedure

Prior to data collection, institutional ethics committee approval was taken from METU Human Subjects Ethics Committee for conducting the study (see Appendix H). Upon receiving the approval, the study was announced through different mediums (e.g., mail groups of organizations, associations and student groups, WhatsApp groups, and sent to numerous contacts in several universities and associations, etc.) as an online study about bystander intervention in the context of instances students may encounter in their university lives. The study sample consisted of those recruited online using Qualtrics software (Qualtrics, Provo, UT), an online survey-based research platform.

At the beginning of the survey, participants were informed about the study and assured of confidentiality. They were further informed that their responses would be used only for research purposes. Only those who were currently university students and agreed with the consent form could proceed with the survey (see Appendix I). Some students received incentives (i.e., Bonus points) in return for their participation in the study.

After confirming informed consent, all participants started with reading scenarios followed by bystanders' intention to intervene scales. Then, they consecutively continue with the bystander intervention rank order for scenarios 1 and 2. Afterward, the bystander self-efficacy scale was presented. Each participant received the scenarios, measures of bystander intention to intervene, and bystander self-efficacy in the same order. That's because the order of bystander behaviors follows a particular order, and changing it may create additional cognitive load for the participants while answering the questions. Therefore, neither block nor questions were randomized for these measures.

For the other measures (which are Feelings of Personal Responsibility, Perceived Social Norms, and Perceived Effectiveness of Referrals), both the order of the measures and questions were randomized. After these measures, questions regarding past experiences of being a bystander, past experiences of bystander intervention, and Demographic Information Forms were presented sequentially. At the end of the

survey, participants were thanked for their participation; they were debriefed about the aim of the study (see Appendix J). After debriefing, an information package regarding the support & referral mechanisms of VAW in the universities and Türkiye and their communication information (women organizations, VAW monitoring centers, hotlines, etc.) were presented to the participants (see Appendix K). The study flow can be seen in Appendix L.

2.2 Results

Data Cleaning. Before examining the factor structure of the study measures, data were checked for missing cases, careless responses, the presence of univariate and multivariate outliers, and for assumptions. Six participants who completed the questionnaire in less than 300 seconds were deleted from the study. Three participants whom both gave meaningless answers to the open-ended questions and gave straight-lined answers were also excluded from the study. Since gender is one of the main study variables, only one participant indicated being non-binary was also declined from the study. So, 487 participants were left for further analysis.

The remaining data ($N = 487$) were checked for univariate outliers, multivariate outliers, and for assumptions. To check for the univariate outliers, z-scores were examined for each variable in the study, and z-scores of ± 3.29 were selected as a criterion, as advised by Tabachnick and Fidell (2018). Four cases in Bystanders' Intention to Intervene (BII), 1 case in Perceived Peer Norms (PPN) were found to be univariate outliers and were deleted from the study.

For detecting multivariate outliers, three cases that were identified through the $p < .001$ criterion for Mahalonobis distance (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2018) were also deleted from the study. For the final analysis, 479 participants left for the study.

Data Analysis. Data were statistically analyzed using the IBM SPSS Statistics software package (Version 29). For each measure developed, Principal Axis Factoring with Promax Rotation was performed. The score of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy Test and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity were examined to understand if the data was suitable for factor analysis. Anti-image matrices were also analyzed for determining the sampling adequacy for individual items. Then for each

measure, Kaiser’s criterion of eigenvalues, interpretation of scree plots and Velicer’s minimum average partial (MAP) test (O’Connor, 2000) were used to decide the number of factors and the factor structures.

After the final structure of the scales was decided, reliabilities and item-total correlations were assessed and reported. The mean values of scales were calculated, and bivariate correlations were analyzed between the measures developed for the present study.

2.2.1 Exploratory Factor Analyses for Bystanders’ Intention to Intervene Scale

The score of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy test was found to be .82, above the recommended value of .6, and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity ($\chi^2(10) = 1359.64, p < .001$) indicating that the data was suitable for factor analysis.

The Principal Axis Factoring with Promax rotation among 5 items, it was observed that there was a structure consisting of one factor according to scree plot and eigenvalue criteria. The MAP Test also supported one-factor solution. The model explained a total of 67.14% of the variance in bystanders’ intention to intervene (BII). Factor loadings and univariate summary statistics of the scale can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2

Factor Loadings and Univariate Summary Statistics of Bystanders’ Intention to Intervene Scale

Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Item-total Correlations	Factor loadings
3. I tell the student that if he does not stop his behavior, I will report him to the relevant security unit.	5.12	1.08	.82	.891
1. I tell the male student to stop this behavior.	4.96	1.09	.72	.885
2. I intervene myself to prevent the event.	4.70	1.20	.82	.778
5. If there are other witnesses around, I try to get them to intervene.	4.92	1.02	.55	.688
4. I report the situation to the relevant security unit to intervene in the incident.	5.39	.81	.65	.586
			<i>Eigenvalue</i>	3.357
			<i>Variance</i>	67.14
			<i>Cronbach’s α</i>	.88

According to item-total correlation analysis, item-total correlations of the scale ranged between .55 and .82. These values met the criteria of .30 at least (see Tabachnick & Fidell, 2018), and results were taken as satisfactory.

Cronbach alpha coefficient was computed to test the internal consistency of the Bystander's Intention to Intervene Scale. Results have shown that Cronbach alpha of the scale was .88. It has met the criteria of greater than .70 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2018), so it can be concluded that the scale has a good internal consistency.

2.2.2 Exploratory Factor Analyses for Feelings of Personal Responsibility

The score of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy test was found to be .66 above the recommended value of .6, and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was found to be significant ($\chi^2(21) = 531.02$ $p < .001$) indicating that the data was suitable for factor analysis.

To determine the number of factors, initial eigenvalues were checked. There were two factors whose initial eigenvalues were greater than 1. Secondly, a scree plot was used to graphically examine which factors should be retained to explain most of the variance within the data. One factor was determined on the scree plot. Finally, the MAP test was performed using the SPSS syntax provided by O'Connor (2000), resulting in 1 factor.

According to the analysis, there were items (item 1, item 3, and item 6) with low communalities ($< .40$). These items were deleted, and the analysis was repeated with a one-factor solution. The final version of the scale consists of 4 items explaining 48.88% variance in bystanders' sense of personal responsibility (PR) with Cronbach alpha of .64, which is lower than the criteria of Tabachnick and Fidell (2018) but in a range between .60 - .70 which can be observed for scales with few items (3 or 4 items) (Hogan, 2003). Additionally, item-total correlations of the scale range between .37 to .46. These values met the criteria of .30 at least (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2018), and results were taken as satisfactory.

Table 3

Factor Loadings and Univariate Summary Statistics of Bystanders' Feelings of Personal Responsibility

Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Item-total Correlations	Factor loadings
7. I think that people should resolve these issues among themselves. (R)	4.51	1.32	.44	.653
4. I find it unnecessary to intervene in these events. (R)	5.19	1.10	.46	.653
2. I take responsibility by intervening in these events.	4.53	1.14	.44	.509
5. I feel responsible for what happens to the woman during these events.	4.36	1.41	.37	.438
<i>Eigenvalue</i>				1.955
<i>Variance</i>				48.88%
<i>Cronbach's α</i>				.64

2.2.3 Exploratory Factor Analyses for Bystanders' Self-Efficacy Scale

The score of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy test was found to be .75 above the recommended value of .6, and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was found to be significant ($\chi^2(10) = 933.83, p < .001$) indicating that the data was suitable for factor analysis.

The factor analysis of 5 items, examination of scree plots, eigenvalues, and the MAP test revealed that the scale has a single factor which explained a total of 57.47% of the variance in bystanders' self-efficacy (BSE).

According to the item total correlation analysis, items have correlations ranging between .46 and .74. These values met the criteria of .30 at least (see Tabachnick & Fidell, 2018), and results were taken as satisfactory.

Cronbach alpha coefficient was computed to test the internal consistency of the Bystander's Self-Efficacy Scale. Results have shown that Cronbach alpha of the scale was .81. It has met the criteria of greater than .70 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2018), so it can be concluded that the scale has a good internal consistency.

Table 4

Factor Loadings and Univariate Summary Statistics of Bystanders' Self-Efficacy Scale

Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Item-total Correlations	Factor loadings
3. I tell the male student that if he does not stop his behavior, I will report him to the relevant security unit.	4.86	1.25	.74	.857
1. I tell the male student to stop this behavior.	4.47	1.42	.71	.792
2. I intervene myself to prevent the event.	3.85	1.62	.63	.705
5. If there are other bystanders around, I try to get them to intervene.	4.74	1.18	.49	.534
4. I report the situation to the relevant security unit to intervene in the incident.	5.32	.97	.46	.519
			<i>Eigenvalue</i>	2.874
			<i>Variance</i>	57.47%
			<i>Cronbach's α</i>	.81

2.2.4 Exploratory Factor Analyses for Perceived Peer Norms Scale

The score of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy Test was found to be .78, above the recommended value of .6, and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity ($\chi^2(21) = 1425.98, p < .001$) indicating that the data was suitable for factor analysis.

In the initial factor analysis, among 7-items, it was observed that there was a structure consisting of two factors according to the scree plot and eigenvalue criteria. MAP test, however, resulted in one-factor solution.

Therefore, the analysis was repeated with one-factor solution. Two items (Items 5 and 7) with very low communalities (lower than .30.) were deleted from the study. The final analysis of the scale with 5 items and a single factor explained 58.79% of the variance in Perceived Peer Norms (PPN) regarding Bystander Intervention.

Cronbach alpha coefficient was computed to test the internal consistency of the perceived peer norms regarding the bystander intervention scale. Results have shown that Cronbach alpha of the scale was .82. It has met the criteria of greater than .70 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2018), so it can be concluded that the scale has a good internal consistency.

According to the item total correlation analysis, each item in the scale showed high correlations ranging between .49 and .72. These values met the criteria of .30 at least (see Tabachnick & Fidell, 2018), and results were taken as satisfactory.

Table 5

Factor Loadings and Univariate Summary Statistics of Perceived Peer Norms Scale

Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Item-total Correlations	Factor loadings
If I intervene in the incident of MVAW, most of my friends...				
2. ...think that I am unreasonably exaggerating the situation (R)	4.79	1.27	.72	.813
4. ...think that I overreacted. (R)	4.75	1.28	.69	.783
6. ...think I'm causing trouble unnecessarily. (R)	4.03	1.54	.63	.696
1. ... support me by thinking that what I'm doing is right.	5.08	.93	.57	.630
3. ...will be glad that I am trying to prevent violence.	5.08	.95	.49	.552
			<i>Eigenvalue</i>	2.940
			<i>Variance</i>	58.79%
			<i>Cronbach's α</i>	.82

2.2.5 Exploratory Factor Analyses for Perceived Effectiveness of Referrals Scale

The score of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy test was found to be .92 above the recommended value of .6, and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was found to be significant ($\chi^2 (21) = 2257,64, p < .001$) indicating that the data was suitable for factor analysis. Anti-image correlation matrices were also examined for a variable specific measures of sampling adequacy, which are all above .6.

Factor analysis of 7 items revealed that the scale has a single factor which explained a total of 68.15 of the variance in Perceived Effectiveness of Referrals (PER). The communalities of each item were above .40. The examination of items according to scree plot, eigenvalues, and MAP test supported one factor solution.

Results have indicated that the item-total correlations range between .66 and .81. These values met the criteria of .30 at least (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2018), and results were taken as satisfactory.

Cronbach alpha coefficient was computed to test internal consistency of the Bystander’s Intention to Intervene Scale. Results have shown that Cronbach alpha of the scale was .92. It has met the criteria of greater than .70 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2018), so it can be concluded that the scale has a very good internal consistency.

Table 6

Factor Loadings and Univariate Summary Statistics of Perceived Effectiveness of Referrals in Violence Prevention Scale

Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Item-total Correlations	Factor loadings
Reporting VAW incidents to official authorities...				
4. ...reduces the violence women are exposed to	3.67	1.60	.81	.856
6. ...decreases the cases of VAW	3.59	1.63	.81	.848
7. ...contributes to the solution of the problem.	3.97	1.47	.78	.822
3. ... ensures that the perpetrator is given the necessary punishment.	3.49	1.66	.77	.805
5. ...provides necessary intervention for the perpetrator.	4.07	1.513	.77	.802
1. ...will be a deterrent for violent men.	3.48	1.68	.69	.724
2. ...doesn't provide any help. (R)	3.84	1.57	.66	.685
			<i>Eigenvalue</i>	4.770
			<i>Variance</i>	68.15%
			<i>Cronbach's α</i>	.92

2.2.6 Descriptive Information and Correlations Among Study Variables

Bivariate correlation analyses were conducted between study variables namely, bystanders’ intention to intervene (BII) and bystander model variables, which are bystander self-efficacy (BSE) and feelings of personal responsibility (PR), perceived social contextual variables of perceived peer norms (PPN) and perceived effectiveness of referrals (PER) and finally past experiences of being a bystander (PEoBB) and past experiences of bystander intervention (PEoBI) by using Pearson correlation coefficient.

Results showed that BII was positively correlated with BSE ($r = .70, p < .01$), and with PR ($r = .49, p < .01$), suggesting that when participants’ bystander self-efficacy, sense of personality increases, their intentions to bystander intervention in MVAW cases also increase.

When the correlation between BII and perceived social contextual variables were examined, results showed that both PPN ($r = .26, p < .01$) and PER ($r = .10, p < .05$) were positively correlated with BII. This suggests that when participants perceive more encouraging peer norms regarding intervention, they have higher intentions to intervene. Besides when participant's perceived effectiveness of referrals is high so is their intention to intervene.

When the relationships between BII, gender and PEOBB and PEOBI were analyzed results showed that, there is no significant correlation between BII and witnessing a MVAW situation in the university. It should be indicated, however, only 24 of 480 participants had an experience of witnessing a MVAW case in their universities, so this result cannot be taken into account.

Further, there is a positive correlation between BII and PEOBI that means that participants, who have past experiences of bystander intervention in other contexts, have greater intention to intervene in MVAW cases in their universities. Descriptive statistics, internal consistency coefficients of the scales, and zero-order correlations between variables can be seen in Table 8.

2.3 Conclusion

Study 1 was conducted to develop reliable and valid measures to test the hypothesis of the main study. For this aim, the measure of bystanders' intention to intervene (BII), bystander self-efficacy, feelings of personal responsibility, perceived peer norms, and perceived effectiveness of referrals were developed for the study, which focused particularly on the context of MVAW cases at universities in Türkiye. Except for the measure of personal responsibility, all measures had good internal consistency.

Due to the very low prevalence rates of witnessing MVAW in universities, PEOBB was planned to be excluded as a study variable for further analysis in Study 2.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics, Internal Consistency Coefficients, and Zero-Order Correlations between Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	8	9
1.BII	(.88)						
2.BSE	.70**	(.81)					
3.PR	.49**	.32**	(.64)				
4.PPN	.26**	.25**	.38**	(.82)			
5.PER	.11*	.14**	-.09*	.01	(.92)		
8.PEoBB	.03	.02	.01	-.05	-.02		
9.PEoBI	.21**	.22**	.26**	.11*	-.01	.19**	
<i>Mean</i>	5.01	4.65	4.64	4.75	3.73	5%	26.5%
<i>SD</i>	.86	.98	.87	.92	1.31		

Note: BII = Bystanders' Intention to Intervene; BSE = Bystander Self-efficacy; PR = Personal Responsibility; PPN = Perceived Peer Norms; PER = Perceived Effectiveness of Referrals; ASI BS = Benevolent Sexism; ASI HS = Hostile Sexism; PEoBB = Past Experience of Being a Bystander; PEoBI = Past Experience of Bystander Intervention. PEoBB and PEoBI are dummy coded variables. (No = 0, Yes = 1)

Internal consistency coefficients of the scales are presented in parentheses.

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

CHAPTER 3

THE SECOND STUDY: TESTING THE HYPOTHESIS TO EXPLORE BYSTANDER INTERVENTION IN THE CONTEXT OF MVAW IN UNIVERSITY SETTINGS

In Study 2, the main objective was to test the hypotheses of the study and investigate the role of bystander model variables (bystander self-efficacy, sense of personal responsibility), perceived social-contextual factors (social norms regarding intervention, effectiveness of violence prevention), and bystander characteristics (gender, past experiences of being a bystander and past experiences of bystander intervention in MVAW) in predicting bystander intentions to intervene in MVAW cases. I also aimed to explore which of the categories of study variables (bystander characteristics, perceived contextual variables, and bystander model variables) mentioned in the above hypotheses most strongly predict bystanders' intention to intervene when they are assessed together in a regression model.

3.1 Method

3.1.1 Participants

Five hundred forty-three participants were recruited for the study. Five participants left the study (completed 9%, 18% to 50% of the study); these participants were deleted. Twelve participants who were not part of the target sample (either preparing for the entrance exam or graduates/made up of names of the university or indicating their age as below 18) were also deleted.

Thus, 526 participants (320 women and 206 men) left for the further analysis. The age of participants was ranging from 18 to 44 ($M = 21.77$, $SD = 3.05$). The majority of the

participants were undergraduate students (70.9%). The percentage of associate degree/vocational school students was 20.9%, master's student 5.3%; Ph.D. student 1.3% while private/exchange students was 1.5%. One of the participants did not indicate the year spent in the university. The other participants' mean year in their current university was 2.69 ($SD = 1.44$). The participants are from various universities in Türkiye.

Table 8
Demographic Profile of Participants

Characteristics	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Women	320	60.8
Men	206	39.2
Education Level		
Vocational School	110	20.9
Undergraduate	373	70.9
Master	28	5.3
Ph.D.	7	1.3
Other (private/exchange)	8	1.5
Year in the University		
1-2	123	23.4
2-3	151	28.8
3-4	97	18.5
4-5	107	20.4
5 or more	47	8.9
Living status		
with family	258	49
with friend/friends	49	9.3
with partner	12	2.3
Living alone	33	6.3
at the university dormitory	93	17.7
At the dormitory outside the campus	79	15.0
Homeless	2	0.4
Romantic Relationship		
No romantic-relationship	310	58.9
Less than six months	42	8.0
More than six months	144	27.4
Engaged	11	2.1
Married	19	3.6
Place of Lived longest		
Village/town	37	7.0
District	83	15.8
City	132	25.1
Metropolis	274	52.1
Perceived Socio-Economic Status		
Lower	52	9.9
Lower-Middle	136	25.9
Middle	255	48.5

Table 8 (continued)

Upper Middle	76	14.4
Upper	7	1.3
Mother Education level		
Literate/illiterate	46	8.7
Primary school	185	35.2
Secondary school	84	16.0
High school	101	19.2
Vocational school	18	3.4
University	79	15.0
Master/Ph.D.	13	2.5
Father Education level		
Literate/illiterate	13	2.5
Primary school	120	22.8
Secondary school	93	17.7
High school	145	27.6
Vocational school	21	4.0
University	104	19.8
Master/Ph.D.	30	5.7

N = 526

The majority of the participants spent most of their lives in the metropolitan area (52%), 25% in the city, 15.9% in the district and 7% in the village or town. The 10% (53 participants) of the participants indicated that they have no religion. The mean religiosity level of the other participants was 3.14 ($SD = 0.88$) in a 1-to-5 scale, greater scores refer to higher religiosity. The detailed demographic profile of the participants can be seen in Table 8.

3.1.2 Measures

Bystander's Intention to Intervene. Two hypothetical scenarios including physical and sexual violence situations were presented to participants. After each scenario, 5 items of possible bystander intervention behaviors were presented. Example items are “telling the male student to stop his violent act”, “intervening to prevent the incident”, “reporting the situation to the relevant security unit to intervene”). Participants rate each bystander intervention behavior on a Likert-type scale (1 = *very unlikely to perform* to 6 = *very likely to perform intervention*) for the presented MVAW case in each scenario (see Appendix A). Scores are created by mean scores of the responses across the same items of the two scenarios. For example, the score from item 1 “telling the male student to stop” in a physical violence scenario, is summed with the score of

the same item in the sexual violence scenarios, and the mean score of item 1 for bystanders' intention to intervene was computed. Each item score was computed similarly. The total score of bystander intervention was computed as the mean score of these 5 items. Higher means demonstrated higher bystander intentions to intervene. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the bystander self-efficacy scale in the study was .87.

Feelings of Personal Responsibility. The final version of the feelings of personal responsibility scale consists of 4 items. Sample items are "I feel responsible for the negative consequences the woman may encounter" and "I expect others to intervene in these events." For each item, participants were asked to rate how much they agree with each item on a Likert-type scale (1 = *I do not agree at all* to 6 = *totally agree*). The score from 4 items were summed and averaged (see Appendix B). Higher scores indicate higher feelings of personal responsibility for intervention. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the feelings of personal responsibility scale in the study was .63.

Bystander Self-Efficacy. In this study, same bystander behaviors (telling male student to stop and reporting the incident) that were used in the Bystanders' Intention to Intervene Scale were utilized in the self-efficacy scale and participants were asked to rate the ease or difficulty of performing these actions on a Likert-type scale (1 = *very difficult for me* to 6 = *too easy for me*). The scale consisted of 5 items (see Appendix C). The score from 5 items were summed and averaged. Higher scores indicate higher levels of self-efficacy. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the bystander self-efficacy scale in the study was .79.

Perceived Peer Norms Regarding Bystander Intervention. Final version of the Perceived Peer Norms scale consisted of 5 items to understand how a participant's intervention as a bystander has been perceived/received by their peers in the context of MVAW. Sample items are "if I intervene in such an event, my friends think that I am exaggerating the situation unnecessarily", "if I intervene in such an event, my friends support me". Participants rated how much they agree with each item on a Likert-type scale (1 = *I do not agree at all* to 6 = *totally agree*). The scores from 5 items were summed and averaged. The higher scores indicate higher encouraging

perceived peer norms regarding bystander intervention (see Appendix D). The Cronbach alpha of the scale was .80.

Perceived Effectiveness of Referrals. Final version of the Perceived Effectiveness of Referrals consists of 7 items to examine how participants perceived the effectiveness of referrals in MVAW prevention (e.g., “intervening in VAW cases is disincentive for perpetrators”). Participants ranked how much they agree with each item on a Likert-type scale (1 = *I do not agree at all* to 6 = *totally agree*). The scores from 7 items were summed and averaged. Higher scores point to higher levels of perceived effectiveness of referrals in violence prevention. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of the scale was .91 (see Appendix E).

Past Experiences of Being a Bystander of MVAW. Past experiences of witnessing a MVAW incident is measured by 2 questions. Sample items are “Have you ever witnessed a man commit physical violence against a woman at the university?” “Have you ever witnessed a man commit sexual violence against women at the university?”. Answers for the questions summed and witnessing at least one forms of violence were coded with “1” and no experience was coded with “0” (see Appendix F).

Past Experiences of Bystander Intervention. “Have you ever taken any action to end the violence or show your disapproval in a previous MVAW case you have witnessed?”. Participants who responded to this question “yes” is coded 1, and “no” is coded with “0” (Appendix F).

Demographic Information Form. Participants’ age, gender, perceived socio-economic status, level of education, relationship status, and type of environment where participants were raised (e.g., rural, urban, or suburban), level of religiosity, income, and education levels of parents were also asked in the questionnaire as demographic variables (See Appendix G).

3.1.3 Procedure

Before data collection, an institutional ethics committee approval was taken from METU Human Subjects Ethics Committee for conducting the study (see Appendix H). Upon receiving the approval, scales were arranged in Qualtrics. Data were collected

from students from various universities in Türkiye. The study was announced through different mediums (e.g., mail groups of organizations, associations and student groups, WhatsApp groups, and sent to numerous contacts in several universities and associations, etc.) as an online study about bystander intervention in the context of instances students may encounter in their university lives. The study sample consisted of those recruited online using Qualtrics software (Qualtrics, Provo, UT), an online survey-based research platform.

At the beginning of the survey, participants were informed about the study and assured confidentiality. They were further informed that their responses would be used for only research purposes. Only those who were currently university students and agreed with the consent form could proceed with the survey (see Appendix I). Some students received incentives (i.e., Bonus points) in return for their participation in the study.

After confirming informed consent, all participants started with reading scenarios followed by bystander's intention to intervene scales. Then, the bystander self-efficacy scale was presented. Each participant received the scenarios, measures of bystander intention to intervene, and bystander self-efficacy in the same order. That's because the order of bystander behaviors follows a particular order and changing it may create additional cognitive load for the participants while answering the questions. Therefore, neither block nor questions were randomized for these measures. For the other measures (which are Feelings of Personal Responsibility, Perceived Effectiveness of Referrals, and Perceived Social Norms), both the order of the measures and questions were randomized. After these measures, Past Experiences of MVAW (being a bystander and bystander intervention) and Demographic Information Form were presented sequentially.

At the end of the survey, participants were thanked for their participation; they were debriefed about the aim of the study (see Appendix J). After debriefing, an information package regarding the support & referral mechanisms of VAW in the universities and Türkiye and their communication information (women organizations, VAW monitoring centers, hotlines, etc.) were presented to the participants (see Appendix K). The study flow can be seen in Appendix L.

3.2 Results

Data Screening. Prior to test the hypothesis of the study, data was checked for careless responders, and presence of univariate and multivariate outliers and for assumptions.

Since the study is an online study, how long it takes for a participant to complete the survey was also an important criterion for the data quality, so it was checked and the 8 participants who completed the questionnaire less than 300 seconds were deleted from the study. Among these participants there were participants who gave meaningless answers to open-ended questions and also participants who were straight-liners.

The remaining data ($N = 518$) were checked for univariate outliers, multivariate outliers and for multiple regression assumptions. To check for the univariate outliers, z-scores were examined for each variable in the study and z-scores of ± 3.29 were selected as a criterion as advised by Tabachnick and Fidell (2018). Two cases in Bystander's Intention to Intervene (BII), 1 case in bystander self-efficacy (BSE) and 5 cases in personal responsibility (PR) were found to be univariate outliers and deleted from the study. When variables are checked most of the variables were found to be negatively skewed. But their skewness and kurtosis were at moderate levels, except for BII.

Firstly, log transformation was applied for the outcome variable, although there was an improvement in skewness, kurtosis was worsened. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2018, p.70) with large samples, skewness does not make a substantive difference in the analysis. Additionally, although kurtosis carries the risk of underestimation of the variance, this is reduced with large samples (i.e., samples of 200 or more) (Tabachnick & Fidell 2018, p. 70). Just in case, the analysis was repeated with the transformed variable, but the findings did not change. Thus, no transformation was applied.

For detecting multivariate outliers, the Mahalanobis distance was computed. One participant identified through $p < .001$ criterion for Mahalanobis distance (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2018) was deleted from the study. Three participants were eliminated due to high Cook's and Leverage values. For further analysis, 506 cases remained.

Assumptions of multivariate normality, multivariate linearity and homoscedasticity were met.

Multicollinearity among the predictors was also examined by examining correlations between predictor variables and calculating Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). The highest correlation examined between predictors was .45. The results showed that VIF values were between 1.02 and 1.5, which was less than 5, so there were no multicollinearity problems (Alauddin & Son Ngheim, 2010).

Data Analysis. Data were statistically analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics software package (Version 29). Factor structures of the scales were analyzed by Principal Axis Factoring with Promax rotation. They were found to be parallel with Study 1. The reliabilities of the scales were examined and reported. Scale scores were calculated, and bivariate correlations were analyzed between study variables.

Afterward, to test the hypothesis, a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted on bystanders' intention to intervene with bystander characteristics entered as predictors in Step 1, perceived contextual variables in Step 2, and bystander model variables in Step 3.

This order of analysis let me first account for the contribution of bystander characteristics (gender and past experiences of bystander intervention) and control for them. Then, examine the independent contribution of perceived contextual variables (perceived social norms and perceived effectiveness of referrals) and, afterwards the unique contribution of bystander model variables (bystander self-efficacy and feelings of personal responsibility).

The analysis also allowed me to examine which of the study variables were most strongly associated with bystanders' intentions to intervene when assessed together in the analysis.

3.2.1 Descriptive Information and Correlation Analysis

Correlation analysis was performed to examine the relationships between study variables. As seen in Table 9, majority of the university students reported higher bystander intentions to intervene in MVAW situations in university contexts ($M =$

4.93, $SD = .87$). Further, women reported higher bystander intentions than men. Additionally, students who had prior experiences of bystander intervention (not limited to university contexts) had higher intentions to intervene ($r = .17, p < .01$).

While participants mainly mentioned high bystander self-efficacy ($M = 4.64, SD = .94$), higher self-efficacy scores were positively correlated with higher intentions to intervene ($r = .69, p < .01$). There is, however, no gender difference in bystander self-efficacy scores of men and women.

Overall, participants reported high personal responsibility ($M = 4.69, SD = .81$) regarding bystander intervention, and higher personal responsibility is positively correlated with higher intentions to intervene ($r = .50, p < .01$). Women reported higher feelings of responsibility scores than men.

Most participants perceived highly encouraging peer norms regarding intervention ($M = 4.75, SD = .89$), and encouraging perceived peer norms are positively associated with bystander intentions to intervene ($r = .31, p < .01$) and personal responsibility ($r = .45, p < .01$). Additionally, men perceive significantly lesser encouraging norms than women ($r = -.15, p < .01$). Participants who had prior experience of intervention also indicated higher intentions to intervene ($r = .17, p < .01$).

Overall, participants scored higher in perceived effectiveness of referrals, and it was positively correlated with bystander intervention ($r = .10, p < .05$) and bystander self-efficacy ($r = .13, p < .01$). There was no significant relationship with personal effectiveness of referrals and perceived peer norms. When gender difference was examined, no gender difference was found in participants' perceived effectiveness of referrals.

Parallel to the findings of Study 1, in Study 2, only a few participants (14 participants) reported they had witnessed MVAW in their universities. Therefore, the variable of Past Experiences of Being a Bystander was excluded from the study. When past experiences of bystander intervention in any context were analyzed, 28% of participants (142 participants) reported that they had prior experiences of bystander intervention.

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics, Internal Consistency Coefficients, and Zero-Order Correlations between Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.BII	(.87)						
2.BSE	.69**	(.79)					
3.PR	.50**	.42**	(.63)				
4.PPN	.31**	.31**	.45**	(.80)			
5.PER	.10*	.13**	.08	.03	(.91)		
6.Gender (M)	-.11*	.08	-.24**	-.15**	.04		
7.PEoBI	.17**	.23**	.17**	.11*	.00	-.08	
<i>Mean</i>	4.93	4.64	4.69	4.75	3.82	37.9%	28.1%
<i>SD</i>	0.87	.94	.81	.89	1.26		

Note: BII= Bystanders' Intention to Intervene; BSE = Bystander Self-Efficacy; PR = Personal Responsibility; PPN = Perceived Peer Norms; PER = Perceived Effectiveness of Referrals; PEoBI = Past Experience of Bystander Intervention.

Gender is dummy coded (Women = 0, Men = 1). PEoBI is dummy coded (No = 0, Yes = 1).

Internal consistency coefficients of the scales are presented in parentheses.

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

3.2.2 Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Predicting Bystanders' Intention to Intervene

A hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to predict bystanders' intention to intervene with bystander characteristics entered as predictors in Step 1, perceived contextual variables in Step 2, and bystander model variables in Step 3. The results of the hierarchical regression analysis are presented in Table 10.

The bystander characteristics (gender and experience of bystander intervention) were entered in the first step. The results showed that the regression model differed significantly from zero, $F(2,503) = 9.668, p < .001, R^2_{adj} = .03$, and explained only a 3.3% variance in bystanders' intention to intervene.

Gender was significant with $t(503) = -2.247 (\beta = -.10, p = .03)$ at 95% CI [-.33 to -.02] indicating being women predicts higher bystander intervention. PEoBI was significant with $t(503) = 3.587 (\beta = .16, p < .001)$ at 95% CI [.14 to .47], indicating that participants who have prior experience of bystander intervention would have higher intentions to intervene in MVAW cases.

Table 10*Hierarchical Regression Results for Bystanders' Intentions to Intervene*

Predictor	B	95% CI for B		SE B	β	ΔR^2
		LL	UL			
Step 1 (Bystander Characteristics)						.04***
Constant	4.91	4.80	5.02	.06		
Gender	-.18	-.33	-.02	.08	-.10*	
PEoBI	.31	.14	.47	.09	.16***	
Step 2 (Contextual Variables)						.09***
Constant	3.31	2.85	3.76	.23		
Gender	-.11	-.26	.04	.08	-.06	
PEoBI	.25	.09	.41	.08	.13**	
PPN	.29	.20	.37	.04	.30***	
PER	.06	.01	.12	.03	.09*	
Step 3 (Bystander Model Variables)						.42***
Constant	1.20	0.80	1.60	.20		
Gender	-.20	-.31	-.08	.06	-.11**	
PEoBI	-.04	-.16	.08	.06	-.02	
PPN	.02	-.05	.08	.03	.02	
PER	.00	-.04	.05	.02	.00	
PR	.24	.16	.32	.04	.22***	
BSE	.57	.50	.63	.03	.61***	
Total R ² .55						
Total R ² _{adj} .54						

Note. CI = Confidence interval; LL = Lower limit; UL = Upper limit

BII= Bystanders' Intention to Intervene; BSE = Bystander Self-Efficacy; PR = Personal Responsibility;

PPN = Perceived Peer Norms; PER = Perceived Effectiveness of Referrals; PEoBI = Past Experience of Bystander Intervention.

Gender is dummy coded (Women = 0, Men = 1). PEoBI is dummy coded (No = 0, Yes = 1).

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

The addition of perceived social contextual predictors in Step 2 led to a significant but slight increase in explained variance, $\Delta R^2 = .09$, $\Delta F(2,501) = 26.071$, $p < .001$. and accounted for 9% variance in bystanders' intention to intervene.

In the model, perceived peer norms was significant with $t(501) = 6.806$ ($\beta = .30$, $p < .001$) at 95% CI [.20 to .37] indicating that participants who have higher perceived peer norms would have higher intentions to intervene in MVAW cases.

Perceived effectiveness of referrals was also significant with $t(501) = 2.199$ ($\beta = .09$, $p = .03$). The R^2 values indicated that PPN uniquely predicted 8.2% variance in bystanders' intention to intervene while PER denotes only 0.8% of the variance.

With the addition of bystander model variables in Step 3, there was a considerable and significant increase in explained variance, $\Delta R^2 = .42$, $\Delta F(2, 499) = 229.534$, $p < .001$, and accounted for 42% variance in bystanders' intention to intervene.

Among the variables entered at this stage, bystander self-efficacy and personal responsibility emerged as significant unique predictors. Bystander self-efficacy was significant with $t(499) = 17.320$ ($\beta = .61$, $p < .001$) at 95% CI [.50 to .63], indicating that participants who have higher bystander self-efficacy would have higher intentions to intervene in MVAW cases. Feelings of personal responsibility was significant with $t(499) = 5.981$ ($\beta = .22$, $p < .001$) at 95% CI [.16 to .32].

The final model explained about 54% of the participants' variation in the bystanders' intention to intervene, $R^2_{adj} = .54$, $F(6,505) = 99.907$, $p < .001$. In the final model, controlling for all other predictors, gender also appeared to be a significant predictor $t(499) = -3.390$ ($\beta = -.11$, $p = .001$) at 95% CI [-.31 to -.08]. At the same time, the regression coefficients of perceived contextual factors (both perceived social norms and perceived effectiveness of referrals) became nonsignificant.

CHAPTER 4

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The current study aimed to investigate the role of bystander model variables (bystander self-efficacy, feelings of personal responsibility), perceived social-contextual factors (perceived peer norms regarding intervention, perceived effectiveness of referrals), and bystander characteristics (gender, past experiences of being a bystander, and bystander intervention) in predicting bystander intentions to intervene in MVAW cases through correlational methods. To reach this aim, I conducted two studies. In Study 1, I developed several measures for studying bystander intervention in the context of MVAW cases at universities in Türkiye and tested their reliability and validity. In Study 2, I examined the correlations of these variables with bystanders' intention to intervene and conducted hierarchical multiple regression to understand which categories of study variables (bystander characteristics, perceived contextual variables, and bystander model variables) would most strongly predict bystanders' intention to intervene when they were considered together in a regression model. Simple correlation analysis demonstrated that gender, past experiences of bystander intervention, perceived effectiveness of referrals and perceived peer norms, feelings of personal responsibility, and bystander self-efficacy are all significantly correlated with bystander intervention. Hierarchical regression analysis demonstrated that although each category of variables significantly predicted bystander intervention in the steps they were entered, the final model, yet, revealed three significant variables in predicting bystander intervention: gender, bystander self-efficacy, and bystander responsibility. This pointed out the importance of studying bystander model variables in the university contexts in Türkiye.

In the following parts of the chapter, I will discuss the specific results for each variable concerning current literature. This is followed by the limitations of the study and how

they can be improved in future studies. Finally, current study's contributions and future research and intervention directions will be discussed.

4.1 The Role of Bystander Characteristics in Predicting Bystanders' Intention to Intervene

Among the several bystander characteristics that were researched in the literature, in this study, I focused on the role of gender, past experiences of being a bystander (witnessing an MVAW incident), and past experiences of bystander intervention.

4.1.1 Gender

Throughout the bystander research, gender was one of the most studied individual-level variables in the context of MVAW (Mainwaring et al., 2022). Although there were some inconsistencies in the literature regarding the role of gender, in this study, it was hypothesized that women would be intent to intervene more than men in MVAW contexts. The majority of the studies demonstrated that women reported higher intentions or willingness to intervene in the MVAW contexts than men (Banyard, 2008; Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Burn, 2009; Franklin et al., 2017; Hoxmeier et al., 2018; Hoxmeier, Acock, et al., 2020; Hoxmeier, McMahon, et al., 2020; Johnson, 2016; Levine & Crowther, 2008; Nicksa, 2013; Savage et al., 2017).

In the current study, correlation analysis showed that women had higher intentions to intervene when compared to men. Besides, hierarchical regression analysis supported the gender difference hypothesis, which pointed out that being women predicted higher intentions to intervene. The findings of the current study supported the studies mentioned above but differed from the studies that found no gender difference (Banyard et al., 2021; Fischer et al., 2006; Galdi et al., 2017; Katz et al., 2015) and the studies which found men were more willing to intervene than women (Alfredsson et al., 2013).

In the literature, the gender difference found in the context of sexual assaults or MVAW cases was explained similarly. As it was in the current study, "the victim" was a woman in the presented scenarios. Thus, women can identify themselves with the victim and feel empathy for the victim, or they might also have experienced some form

of violence in their lifetime. Thus, whether it is due to identification as a woman or as a survivor of violence, this may increase women's intentions to intervene in such situations. On the other hand, men might identify themselves with the perpetrator and/or might not problematize the violent case (Martini & De Piccoli, 2020). In the studies which used hypothetical vignettes of IPVAV, it was also found that women evaluated the same vignettes as more dangerous and felt a more personal responsibility to intervene than men (e.g., Gracia et al., 2009). The studies indicated that women feel more responsibility regarding intervention was also supported in the current research through correlational analysis.

4.1.2 Past Experiences of Being a Bystander

In the literature, past experiences of witnessing MVAW, which was also conceptualized as bystander opportunities (e.g., Hoxmeier, Acock et al., 2020), have yet to be explored extensively. Participants' prior experiences of witnessing MVAW cases are essential to understand how prevalent MVAW is in the university context and to understand if students find themselves in a situation where bystander opportunities arise.

In the study, one of the aims was to explore the relationship between the experience of being a bystander and bystanders' intentions to intervene. Both in Study 1 and Study 2, very few participants reported that they had witnessed such cases in their universities. Thus, this hypothesis couldn't be explored in the scope of this study.

Low bystander opportunities in university contexts found in the current study might result from the recall effect. This might also be because of the low prevalence rates of MVAW in the university contexts, but the research findings and experiences from the field so far pointed out that this was not the case (Siyez et al., 2021; Toplu-Demirtaş & Fincham, 2022). In a study on college students from four state universities in a Midwestern city in Türkiye, 35% of men indicated they perpetuated at least one physically violent behavior and 41.8% reported perpetrating at least one sexually violent behavior in the last 12 months (Toplu-Demirtaş & Fincham, 2022). Another study investigating dating violence among students in a university in Türkiye, 88.2% of women students who participated in the study reported physical violence, while

19.1% reported sexual coercion. Besides, 37.5% of these students indicated that they had minor to severe injuries due to dating violence (Calikoglu et al., 2021).

According to these studies, the low number of witnessed cases in the current study should be considered with caution since this does not mean that MVAW was rarely experienced in university contexts. The forms of violence which bystanders can easily notice might take place in private where no one can witness/interfere rather than occurring in public. Additionally, as it was clearly described in the bystander model, participants might have “failed to notice the violent event,” which is the initial step in the bystander model.

It should also be emphasized that the violent scenarios presented in the study only depicted explicit forms of physical and sexual violence. Because of that, more covert forms of physical and/or sexual violence might not have been considered by the participants when they were trying to recall their prior experiences.

4.1.3 Past Experiences of Bystander Intervention

While past experiences of violence/victimization were well-studied variables (Reynolds-Tylus et al., 2019), past experiences of bystander intervention have not been explored in detail in the literature. A limited number of studies examined the role of prior experiences of bystander intervention on bystander behavior or bystander intentions (Banyard et al., 2005; Bell et al., 1995; Laner et al., 2001; Nicksa, 2011).

In the studies that studied prior bystander intervention, bystander behavior was generally used as an outcome variable, not as a predictor of bystander intentions or actual behaviors (Moynihan et al., 2010). Commonly, bystander behaviors were researched to discover attitude and behavior relationships or evaluate the effectiveness of bystander training programs (Nicksa, 2011).

Laner et al. (2001) found a significant relationship between the prior experience of bystander intervention and bystander intentions. Similarly, Nicksa (2011) found a significant but weak correlation between prior experience and direct bystander behaviors and asking for external help from other bystanders to intervene, but no

significant relationship with indirect intervention as a response to a hypothetical rape scenario.

In the current study, the findings confirm these previous studies. The results showed that participants with prior experiences intended to intervene more than the other participants. Yet, in the final step of the hierarchical model, including self-efficacy and personal responsibility, the effect of prior experience became nonsignificant.

Past experience of intervention might be important in bystander intervention in two ways. Firstly, it may provide familiarity with such situations. Secondly, previous positive or negative reactions participants perceived/received in response to intervention might also affect the future decisions and intentions to intervene in such cases (Moschella et al., 2018; Moschella & Banyard, 2020; Seo et al., 2022). In the future studies intervention experiences and how they are perceived should be studied in more detail.

4.2 The Role of Perceived Contextual Variables in Predicting Bystanders' Intention to Intervene

In the current study, two variables were studied as perceived contextual variables: Perceived peer norms and perceived effectiveness of referrals. In the following, I will consecutively mention the results related to these variables.

4.2.1 Perceived Peer Norms

Perceive peer norms in the current study was operationalized as the beliefs about whether peers approve or support bystander intervention of a friend in MVAW cases. Perceived norms are the most studied contextual variable in relation to bystander behavior. Previous findings consistently pointed out when peers were supportive of intervention, and if bystanders think that their peers also would intervene, then bystanders were more likely to intervene (Banyard et al., 2014; Reynolds-Tylus et al., 2019; Savage et al., 2017).

In the current study, since peer norms were found to be influential in encouraging or inhibiting bystander behaviors, it was hypothesized that participants with higher perceived peer norms encouraging intervention would intend to intervene more than

participants with lower levels of encouraging peer norms. Similar to the previous studies, correlation analysis supported these findings indicating that if participants think that their intervention was supported and evaluated as required by their peers, they report higher intentions to intervene. Hierarchical regression analysis, in which peer norms and perceived effectiveness of referrals entered into the model, also pointed out that perceived peer norms significantly predicted higher bystander intentions. However, when considered together with self-efficacy and feelings of responsibility (in the final model), perceived peer norm became nonsignificant. A similar result was also observed by Hust et al. (2019), which shows that when perceived norms were considered with self-efficacy, its effect was reduced to non-significance.

In the current study, feelings of responsibility also positively correlated with perceived peer norms. The variance accounted for by the perceived peer norms might be explained by personal responsibility and self-efficacy in the final model. Thus, in the final model, gender and bystander model variables of feelings of responsibility and self-efficacy were the crucial factors underlying the relationship with bystanders' intention to intervene.

4.2.2 Perceived Effectiveness of Referrals

Perceived effectiveness of referrals in the prevention of MVAW is regarded as perceptions of how effective the relevant authorities are in VAW prevention. In the literature, the trust in the system and confidence in the referral mechanisms in charge of MVAW were found to be positively associated with bystander intervention (Allnock & Atkinson, 2019; Holland et al., 2016). Besides, it was found that when there were institutional sanctions, bystanders were more likely to intervene (Jacobson & Eaton, 2018).

In the current study, the results of correlation analysis demonstrated a very weak but significant relationship between the perceived effectiveness of referrals and bystander intervention. When participants think that official institutions may reduce MVAW or prevent the recurrence of violence, they are more likely to intervene in MVAW cases. In the final hierarchical multiple regression model, the perceived effectiveness of

referrals, however, did not significantly predict bystander intentions to intervene. Similarly, Gracia & Herrero (2006) found no relationship between trust in the authorities and attitudes toward indirect intervention (reporting).

In the current study, the perceived effectiveness of referrals as a concept inherently covers only one dimension of intervention: indirect intervention (reporting/informing the authorities). It also refers to the broader picture of authorities that have roles in violence prevention and prosecution rather than focusing on university/campus mechanisms. This conceptualization of the perceived effectiveness of referrals might lead to weak associations with bystander intentions and nonsignificance in the prediction model. Therefore, it might be better to research the effectiveness of relevant campus authorities directly or trust in university authorities in future studies. For example, Sulkowski (2011) showed that students with greater confidence in campus authorities had increased intentions to report violence on campus.

Regarding the role of perceived contextual variables, in summary, the hierarchical multiple regression analysis demonstrated that in the final model, contextual variables lost their significance in predicting bystander intentions. I evaluated these findings positively when considering the particular context of violence prevention in Turkey. To explain briefly, in the last eight years, there was a backlash against prevention efforts in MVAW by the state (Göker & Polatdemir, 2022; Ün & Arıkan, 2022). Even though the contextual elements (perceived peer norms and effectiveness of referrals) might be negatively affected by the backlash experienced in Türkiye; the current study shows that when bystanders feel personally responsible for the MVAW and when they feel competent to intervene, then they were more likely to intervene. Intervening in MVAW contexts can be conceptualized in two forms: formal intervention by the official authorities and informal intervention by the bystanders. A formal intervention is essential because this brings legal consequences for the perpetrator and support for the victim. This influences the wider context and effective response regarding prevention, protection, prosecution, and policy-making in MVAW (Istanbul Convention, 2011). Nonetheless, focusing on bystander model variables and increasing students' sense of responsibility and self-efficacy regarding these issues at least would be effective in intervening in MVAW cases as a prevention method when it was most needed.

4.3 The Role of Bystander Model Variables

4.3.1 Personal Responsibility

Among the bystander model variables, feelings of personal responsibility and bystander self-efficacy were commonly explored in their relation to bystander intervention (Banyard et al., 2021; Bennett et al., 2014; Burn, 2009, Katz et al., 2015).

In the current study, participants reported high personal responsibility regarding intervention. Women significantly felt more responsibility than men, and participants with prior experience of intervention also had significantly higher personal responsibility scores than participants without previous experience.

Previous research resulted in consistent findings demonstrating that when participants failed to take responsibility, they reported lower levels of intervention intentions (Banyard et al., 2021; Bennett et al., 2014; Burn, 2009; Katz et al., 2015). Correspondingly, in the current study, it was hypothesized that participants who feel greater responsibility would be intent to intervene more than those with a lower level of personal responsibility. The findings of the correlational analysis supported the previous studies. According to the hierarchical regression analysis, higher feelings of personal responsibility predict higher bystander intentions, and it is the second important variable (after self-efficacy) in the final model predicting bystander interventions.

Feelings of personal responsibility is a critical step leading to take action (Burn, 2009). Even in a case of violence where bystanders are not directly involved, a sense of responsibility may move people to intervene. It is also essential in the sense that gender-based violence is not conceptualized as something individual but a social, political, and human rights issue (Ertürk, 2015).

4.3.2 Bystander Self-Efficacy

As it was in the case of personal responsibility, bystander self-efficacy is also the most studied variable in relation to bystander intervention. If bystanders feel confident or if they think that the actions are not complex for them to take, they are more willing to intervene (Banyard, 2008; Banyard et al., 2007; Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Frye,

2007; Hoxmeier et al., 2018; Lazarus & Signal, 2013; Savage et al., 2017). However, if they perceive that they do not have proper skills and the actions are difficult, then they do not intervene. There was a significant positive association between bystander self-efficacy and bystander intent to intervene (Pazienza et al., 2022).

In the current study, participants reported higher self-efficacy scores; they generally reported that it is easy to perform presented behaviors in response to hypothetical scenarios. There was no gender difference regarding self-efficacy scores, and participants with prior experience with intervention also had significantly higher self-efficacy scores than participants without previous experience.

The current study hypothesized that participants with higher levels of bystander self-efficacy would intend to intervene more than those with a lower level of self-efficacy. The findings of the correlational analysis indicated high positive correlations between measures of bystander intervention and self-efficacy. It can be discussed that the high correlation might be due to the use of the same bystander behaviors. However, it should be noted that Banyard's study also found a significant correlation between self-efficacy and willingness to intervene at the same level (Banyard, 2008). Moreover, the use of similar items in self-efficacy and bystander intervention measurements is a common practice in the bystander literature.

According to the hierarchical regression analysis, higher bystander self-efficacy predicts higher intervention and explains most of the variance in bystanders' intentions. The bystander model variables explained significant variance beyond the perceived contextual and bystander characteristics in predicting bystander intervention.

4.4 Limitations of the Study

The current study's limitations should be mentioned carefully and in detail to guide further research and intervention attempts. Firstly, the outcome variable of the study was the bystanders' intention to intervene, and a self-report measure was used to assess it by presenting hypothetical scenarios to the participants. Because using direct measures of actual bystander behavior is impractical and carries many ethical considerations (Labhardt et al., 2017), self-report measures with survey methodology

were utilized in this study. Self-report measures have some risk of social desirability biases (Paulhus, 2017), and it is uncertain if these intentions would turn into actual behavior in MVAW cases in universities. Although intentions were conceptualized as precursors of behaviors and found to be significantly correlated with and predictive of actual behaviors (Ajzen, 1991), “the intention-behavior consistency” was still a debatable issue in social psychology (Morwitz & Munz, 2021; Sheeran, 2002; Sutton, 1998; Webb & Sheeran, 2006).

In their influential paper, Morwitz and Munz (2021) presented various examples from the literature showing that a considerable number of meta-analyses found consistent results regarding intention and behavior correlations. Although the strength of the relations has changed across studies, a “moderately strong intentions-behavior” relationship was found. This was also supported by studies showing high predictive power of intentions for behaviors with large effect sizes (Sheeran, 2002)

Another limitation is that one of the independent variables, “past experience of bystander intervention,” was assessed with a single “yes” or “no” question. Even though single-item measures are psychometrically suspect because they may lead to validity and reliability problems, some researchers validate the use of single items since they demonstrated higher correlations with multiple items, and even in some areas, they have greater predictive values (Hoepfner et al., 2011)

When the construct is distinctly defined, is easily comprehended, and does not have different dimensions, then the use of a single item is adequate (Fuchs & Diamantopoulos, 2009). There is also a limitation to using long survey instruments with multiple items for each variable explored. These kinds of tools result in low response rates because they take a long time to complete and overload participants, have high missing values, and even they may lead to sampling bias (Kost & Correa da Rosa, 2018; Marcus et al., 2007).

Another limitation is because of the need for appropriate scales have been tested for validity and reliability in the literature; the measures used in the study were developed for the first time to be used in the current study. Therefore, not using well-established and standardized measures may raise concerns regarding the reliability of the findings.

I tried to overcome this limitation by designing two studies consecutively with the same measures. Although the internal consistency coefficients of the scales were generally high and their content validity was evaluated by experts, the discriminant and convergent validity of the scales were not tested. In addition, the internal consistency of the feelings of personal responsibility scale was low compared to the other scales. This may have been due to the small number of items in the scale. Additionally, it might be due to the fact that the concept was differentiated into responsibilities for the consequences of violence and responsibilities for intervention, or it was not well received by the participants. For future studies, it would be appropriate to improve the feelings of personality scale by developing new items and to conceptualize it in a more descriptive and multidimensional way. In future studies, the development of well-structured scales whose reliability and validity have been retested will ensure that the results are more reliable.

Lastly, in the study, bystander intervention was not differentiated and analyzed with its all dimensions. Distinguishing bystander intervention by using direct vs. indirect intervention and separating between victim-oriented and perpetrator-oriented bystander behaviors are important to understand bystander behaviors in a wider scope.

4.5 Contributions of the Study and Future Directions for Research

Bystander research in the context of MVAW, particularly in the context of sexual assaults, has been proliferated in the US for ten to fifteen years. The accumulated research in the field expands our knowledge and understanding regarding bystander intervention and MVAW (Hoxmeier et al., 2018; Labhardt et al., 2017; Mainwaring et al., 2022). To the best of my knowledge, there is no research regarding bystander intervention in the context of MVAW in Türkiye. This study is the first attempt to explore the role of social psychological factors related to bystander intervention in the context of MVAW in Türkiye, particularly in university contexts.

This research contributed to understanding possible social psychological factors in predicting bystander intervention in different contexts and demonstrated that bystander model variables were also relevant in this particular context. The essential variables of feelings of responsibility and self-efficacy (also critical steps in the bystander

intervention model) were found to be the most important correlates of bystander intervention. Thus, in future research, it is crucial to understand which factors play a role in increasing self-efficacy and responsibility. By studying self-efficacy and responsibility as outcome variables, possible variables such as knowledge regarding MVAW, particularly bystander intervention, attitudes, myths, and broader social context can be studied.

Although the indirect effects between variables were not hypothesized in the scope of the study, hierarchical regression analysis showing the impact of perceived norms and perceived effectiveness of referrals became nonsignificant in the presence of self-efficacy and personal responsibility, inform us to think about the indirect effects between these variables. Thus, self-efficacy and responsibility might mediate the relationship between perceived contextual variables and bystanders' intention to intervene. Besides, the cause-and-effect relationships between variables can also be tested in experimental settings or with a more complex model of analysis structural equation modeling.

While this study, in some respects, makes us understand the factors in the context of universities, studies with samples from the general population provide an understanding of wider community response regarding bystander intervention. In addition to the contributions to the research, the findings of the study can be used to develop intervention programs as it was in the case of the US context (Jouriles et al., 2018; Park & Kim, 2022) to create a university culture free from sexual violence. As discussed in Chapter 1, in Türkiye, an increasing number of universities worked on the problem of MVAW in university contexts. Some universities accepted policy statements regarding prevention, and some established special units for preventing gender-based violence (Ecevit & Beşpınar, 2020). These universities also organize training programs to increase awareness among university students. These training programs include components of information about types of gender-based violence, reporting or referral mechanisms, how to get support, etc. However, to my knowledge, there is no unique component mentioning bystander intervention. Although reporting was mentioned in the scope of the programs, this component was not well established. I hope the current study will be a step in drawing attention to the bystander dimension

of prevention efforts and open the way to discuss a range of safe bystander opportunities (McMahon & Banyard, 2012)

REFERENCES

- Amar, A. F., Sutherland, M., & Laughon, K. (2014). Gender differences in attitudes and beliefs associated with bystander behavior and sexual assault. *Journal of Forensic Nursing*, 10(2), 84–E2. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JFN.0000000000000024>
- Ahmed, S. (2016, June 2). Speaking out. Feministkilljoys. <https://feministkilljoys.com/page/6/>
- Ahrens, C. E., Rich, M. D., & Ullman, J. B. (2011). Rehearsing for real life: The impact of the InterACT Sexual Assault Prevention Program on self-reported likelihood of engaging in bystander interventions. *Violence against Women*, 17(6), 760–776. doi:10.1177/1077801211410212
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Ajzen, I. (2002). Perceived behavioral control, self-efficacy, locus of control, and the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32(4), 665–683. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2002.tb00236.x>
- Alfredsson, H., Ask, K., & von Borgstede, C. (2013). Motivational and cognitive predictors of the propensity to intervene against intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(10), 1877–1893. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260513511696>
- Allnock, D., & Atkinson, R. (2019). 'Snitches get stitches': School-specific barriers to victim disclosure and peer reporting of sexual harm committed by young people in school contexts. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 89(December 2018), 7–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2018.12.025>
- Andersson, N., Cockcroft, A., Ansari, U., Omer, K., Ansari, N. M., Khan, A., & Chaudhry, U. U. (2010). Barriers to disclosing and reporting violence among women in Pakistan: Findings from a national household survey and focus group discussions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25, 1965–1985. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260509354512>

- Anıt Savaş: Şiddetten Ölen Kadınlar İçin Dijital Anıt. (2022). Retrieved January 15, 2023, from <http://anitsayac.com/?year=2022>
- Antai, D. (2011). Traumatic physical health consequences of intimate partner violence against women: What is the role of community-level factors? *BMC Women's Health*, 11(1), 56. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6874-11-56>
- Baldry, A. C., & Pagliaro, S. (2014). Helping victims of intimate partner violence: The influence of group norms among lay people and the police. *Psychology of Violence*, 4(3), 334–347. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034844>
- Banyard, V. L. (2008). Measurement and correlates of prosocial bystander behavior: The case of interpersonal violence. *Violence and Victims*, 23(1), 83–97. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.23.1.83>
- Banyard, V. L. (2011). Who will help prevent sexual violence: Creating an ecological model of bystander intervention. *Psychology of Violence*, 1(3), 216–229. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023739>
- Banyard, V. L., & Moynihan, M. M. (2011). Variation in bystander behavior related to sexual and intimate partner violence prevention: Correlates in a sample of college students. *Psychology of Violence*, 1(4), 287–301. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023544>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033470>
- Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., & Plante, E. G. (2007). Sexual violence prevention through bystander education: An experimental evaluation. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 35(4), 463–481. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20159>
- Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2004). Bystander education: Bringing a broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 32(1), 61–79. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.10078>
- Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2005). Bystander Efficacy Scale [Database record]. *APA PsycTests*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t42713-000>

- Banyard, V. L., Rizzo, A., & Edwards, K. M. (2020). Community actionists: Understanding adult bystanders to sexual and domestic violence prevention in communities. *Psychology of Violence, 10*(5), 531–541. <https://doi.org/10.1037/vio0000281>
- Banyard, V. L., Rizzo, A. J., Bencosme, Y., Cares, A. C., & Moynihan, M. M. (2021). How community and peer perceptions promote college students' pro-social bystander actions to prevent sexual violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 36*(7–8), 3855–3879. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518777557>
- Beeble, M. L., Post, L. A., Bybee, D., & Sullivan, C. M. (2008). Factors related to willingness to help survivors of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 23*, 1713–1729. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260508314333>
- Bennett, S., Banyard, V. L., & Garnhart, L. (2014). To act or not to act, that is the question? Barriers and facilitators of bystander intervention. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 29*(3), 476–496. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260513505210>
- Bianet. (2019). YÖK'ün kaldırdığı toplumsal cinsiyet eşitliği tutum belgesi. <https://m.bianet.org/bianet/toplumsal-cinsiyet/205680-yok-un-kaldirigi-toplumsal-cinsiyet-esitligi-tutum-belgesi>
- Bodur Ün, M. & Arıkan, H. (2022). Europeanization and de-Europeanization of Turkey's gender equality policy: The case of the Istanbul Convention. *Journal of common Market Studies, 60*(4), 945–962. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.13292>
- Bonomi, A. E., Thompson, R. S., Anderson, M., Reid, R. J., Carrell, D., Dimer, J. a., & Rivara, F. P. (2006). Intimate partner violence and women's physical, mental, and social functioning. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 30*(6), 458–466. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2006.01.015>
- Borofsky, G. L., Stollak, G. E., & Messe, L. A. (1971). Sex differences in bystander reactions to physical assault. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 7*, 313–318.
- Bowes-Sperry, L., & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (2005). To act or not to act: The dilemma faced by sexual harassment observers. *Academy of Management Review, 30*(2), 288–306.

- Brown, A. L., Banyard, V. L., & Moynihan, M. M. (2014). College students as helpful bystanders against sexual violence: Gender, race, and year in college moderate the impact of perceived peer norms. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 38(3), 350–362. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684314526855>
- Brown, A. L., & Messman-Moore, T. L. (2010). Personal and perceived peer attitudes supporting sexual aggression as predictors of male college students' willingness to intervene against sexual aggression. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25(3), 503–517. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260509334400>
- Burn, S. M. (2009). A situational model of sexual assault prevention through bystander intervention. *Sex Roles*, 60(11–12), 779–792. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9581-5>
- Calikoglu, E. O., Yerli, E. B., & Tanriverdi, E. (2021). Dating violence among university students: A cross-sectional study from Eastern Turkey. *Eurasian Journal of Medicine and Oncology*, 5(1), 113–121.
- Cameron, C. A., Byers, E. S., Miller, S. A., McKay, S. L., StPierre, M., Glenn, S., et al. (2007). Dating violence prevention in New Brunswick. http://www.unb.ca/fredericton/arts/centres/mmfc/_resources/pdfs/team2007c.pdf
- Carlson, M. (2008). I'd rather go along and be considered a man: Masculinity and bystander intervention. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 16(1), 3–17. <https://doi.org/10.3149/jms.1601.3>
- Casey, E. A., & Ohler, K. (2012). Being a positive bystander: Male antiviolence allies' experiences of "Stepping Up." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27, 62–83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260511416479>
- Ceylan-Batur, S., Sakalli, N., & Gunaratne, S. (2021). Predictors of tolerating violence against women: honor concerns and fundamentalist religious orientation. *Current Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-02276-4>
- Chabot, H. F., Tracy, T. L., Manning, C. A., & Poisson, C. A. (2009). Sex, attribution, and severity influence intervention decisions of informal helpers in domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(10), 1696–1713.
- Cherry, F. (1995). Kitty Genovese and culturally embedded theorizing. In *The Stubborn Particulars of Social Psychology: Essays on the Research Process* (pp. 16–29).

- Coker, A. L., Cook-Craig, P. G., Williams, C. M., Fisher, B. S., Clear, E. R., Garcia, L. S., & Hegge, L. M. (2011). Evaluation of green dot: An active bystander intervention to reduce sexual violence on college campuses. *Violence Against Women*, 17(6), 777–796. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801211410264>
- Coker, A. L., Fisher, B. S., Bush, H. M., Swan, S. C., Williams, C. M., Clear, E. R., & DeGue, S. (2015). Evaluation of the Green Dot Bystander Intervention to reduce interpersonal violence among college students across three campuses. *Violence Against Women*, 21(12), 1507–1527. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801214545284>
- Darley, J. M., & Latané, B. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergencies: Diffusion of responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 8(4), 377–383. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0026570>
- Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., Schroeder, D. A., & Penner, L. (2006). *The social psychology of prosocial behavior*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Debnam, K. J., & Mauer, V. (2021). Who, when, how, and why bystanders intervene in physical and psychological teen dating violence. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 22(1), 54–67. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838018806505>
- Ecevit, Y., & Beşpınar, F.U. (2020). Sexual harassment in Turkish academia through the lens of *gendered academic citizenship*. In S. Sümer, (Eds.), *Gendered academic citizenship: Citizenship, gender and diversity* (pp. 199-228). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-52600-9_7
- Ertürk, Y. (2015). *Sınır tanımayan şiddet*. Metis Yayınları
- European Commission. (2010). Domestic violence against women report. *Special Eurobarometer 344/ Wave 73.2 - TNS Opinion & Social*, 222.
- European Institute for Gender Equality [EIGE]. 2020. Intimate partner violence and witness intervention: What are the deciding factors?. <https://eige.europa.eu/publications/intimate-partner-violence-and-witness-intervention-what-are-deciding-factors>
- Fabiano, P., Perkins, H., Berkowitz, A., Linkenbach, J., & Stark, C. (2003). Engaging men as social justice allies in ending violence against women: Evidence for a social norms approach. *Journal of American College Health*, 52(3), 105–112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448480309595732>

- Felson, R. B., Messner, S. F., Hoskin, A., & Deane, G. (2002). Reasons for reporting and not reporting domestic violence to the police*. *Criminology*, *40*(3), 617–648. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2002.tb00968.x>
- Felson, R. B., & Paré, P. P. (2005). The reporting of domestic violence and sexual assault by nonstrangers to the police. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *67*(August), 597–610. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2005.00156.x>
- Fischer, P., Greitemeyer, T., Pollozek, F., & Frey, D. (2006). The unresponsive bystander: Are bystanders more responsive in dangerous emergencies? *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *36*(2), 267–278. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.297>
- Foubert, J. D., Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Brasfield, H., & Hill, B. (2010). Effects of a rape awareness program on college women: Increasing bystander efficacy and willingness to intervene. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *38*(7), 813–827. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20397>
- Franklin, C. A., Brady, P. Q., & Ashworth, L. M. (2020). Bystander behaviors following an accusation of rape: The effect of relational distance and participant sex on victim-centered intervention. *Journal of School Violence*, *19*(3), 292–308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2019.1680558>
- Franklin, C. A., Brady, P. Q., & Jurek, A. L. (2017). Responding to gendered violence among college students: The impact of participant characteristics on direct bystander intervention behavior. *Journal of School Violence*, *16*(2), 189–206. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2017.1284450>
- Frye, V. (2007). The informal social control of intimate partner violence against women: Exploring personal attitudes and perceived neighborhood social cohesion. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *35*(8), 1001–1018. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20209>
- Fuchs, C., & Diamantopoulos, A. (2009). Using single-item measures for construct measurement in management research: Conceptual issues and application guidelines. *Computer Science. DBW*, *9*(2), 195-210
- Galdi, S., Maass, A., & Cadinu, M. (2017). Defending the victim of sexual harassment: The influence of civil courage and media exposure. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *41*(3), 338–351. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684317709770>

- Gidycz, C. A., Orchowski, L. M., & Berkowitz, A. D. (2011). Preventing sexual aggression among college men: An evaluation of a social norms and bystander intervention program. *Violence against Women, 17*, 720–742. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801211409727>
- Göker, Z. G., & Polatdemir, A. (2022). The quest for gender equality in universities at the crossroads of neoliberal and anti-gender pressures: The case of Turkey. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 0*(0), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2022.2121690>
- Gracia, E. (2004). Unreported cases of domestic violence against women: Towards an epidemiology of social silence, tolerance, and inhibition. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 58*, 536–537. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.2003.019604>
- Gracia, E., García, F., & Lila, M. (2009). Public responses to intimate partner violence against women: The influence of perceived severity and personal responsibility. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology, 12*(2), 648–656. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801208317288>
- Gracia, E., & Herrero, J. (2006a). Acceptability of domestic violence against women in the European Union: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 60*(2), 123–129. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.2005.036533>
- Gracia, E., & Herrero, J. (2006b). Public attitudes toward reporting partner violence against women and reporting behavior. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 68*(August), 759–768. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00288.x>
- Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies. (2015). *Domestic violence against women in Turkey*. <http://www.hips.hacettepe.edu.tr/siddet2014/rapor/KKSA-TRAnaRaporKitap26Mart.pdf>
- Harari, H., Harari, O., & White, R. V. (1985). The reaction to rape by American male bystanders. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 125*(5), 653–658. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1985.9712039>
- Hoepfner, B. B., Kelly, J. F., Urbanoski, K. A., & Slaymaker, V. (2011). Comparative utility of a single-item vs. multiple-item measure of self-efficacy in predicting relapse among young adults. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 41*(3), 305–312. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2011.04.005>

- Hogan, T. P. (2003). *Psychological testing. A practical introduction*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Holland, K. J., Rabelo, V. C., & Cortina, L. (2016). See something, do something: Predicting sexual assault bystander intentions in the U.S. military. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12077>
- Hoxmeier, J. C., Acock, A. C., & Flay, B. R. (2020). Students as prosocial bystanders to sexual assault: Demographic correlates of intervention norms, intentions, and missed opportunities. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 35(3–4), 731–754. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517689888>
- Hoxmeier, J. C., Flay, B. R., & Acock, A. C. (2015). When will students intervene? Differences in students' intent to intervene in a spectrum of sexual assault situations. *Violence and Gender*, 2(3), 179–184. <https://doi.org/10.1089/vio.2015.0015>
- Hoxmeier, J. C., Flay, B. R., & Acock, A. C. (2018). Control, norms, and attitudes: Differences between students who do and do not intervene as bystanders to sexual assault. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 33(15), 2379–2401. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515625503>
- Hoxmeier, J. C., McMahon, S., & O'Connor, J. (2020). Beyond yes or no: Understanding undergraduate students' responses as bystanders to sexual assault risk situations. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 35(23–24), 5772–5796. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517723143>
- Huerta, M., Cortina, L. M., Pang, J. S., Torges, C. M., & Magley, V. J. (2006). *Sex and power in the academy: Modeling sexual harassment in the lives of college women*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167205284281>
- Hust, S. J. T., Rodgers, K. B., Ebreo, S., & Stefani, W. (2019). Rape myth acceptance, efficacy, and heterosexual scripts in men's magazines: Factors associated with intentions to sexually coerce or intervene. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 34(8), 1703–1733. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516653752>
- Istanbul Convention (Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence, May 11, 2011). <https://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list?module=treaty-detail&treatyid=210>

- Jacobson, R. K., & Eaton, A. A. (2018). How organizational policies influence bystander likelihood of reporting moderate and severe sexual harassment at work. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 30(1), 37–62. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10672-017-9309-1>
- Jina, R., & Thomas, L. S. (2012). Health consequences of sexual violence against women. *Best Practice & Research Clinical Obstetrics & Gynaecology*, 27(1), 15–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpobgyn.2012.08.012>
- Johnson, L. (2016). Are gender differences in bystander intent to help a potential victim of party rape mediated by barriers to help, rape myth acceptance, or both? *Proceedings of GREAT Day, 2015*, 13.
- Jouriles, E. N., Krauss, A., Vu, N. L., Banyard, V. L., & McDonald, R. (2018). Bystander programs addressing sexual violence on college campuses: A systematic review and meta-analysis of program outcomes and delivery methods. *Journal of American College Health*, 66(6), 457–466. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2018.1431906>
- Kadın Cinayetletini Durduracağız Platformu. (2023). 2022 yıllık veri raporu. Retrieved February 16, 2023, from <https://kadincinayetlerinidurduracagiz.net/>
- Katz, J., Colbert, S., & Colangelo, L. (2015). Effects of group status and victim sex on female bystanders' responses to a potential party rape. *Violence and Victims*, 30(2), 265–278. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.vv-d-13-00099>
- Katz, J., Paziienza, R., Olin, R., & Rich, H. (2015). That's what friends are for: Bystander responses to friends or strangers at risk for party rape victimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 30(16), 2775–2792. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260514554290>
- Kelly, L. (1987). The continuum of sexual violence. In J. Hanmer & M. Maynard, (Eds.), *Women, violence and social control. Explorations in Sociology* (pp. 46-60). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-18592-4_4
- Kost, R. G., & Correa da Rosa, J. (2018). Impact of survey length and compensation on validity, reliability, and sample characteristics for ultrashort-, short-, and long-research participant perception surveys. *Journal of Clinical and Translational Science*, 2(1), 31–37. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cts.2018.18>

- Labhardt, D., Holdsworth, E., Brown, S., & Howat, D. (2017). You see but you do not observe: A review of bystander intervention and sexual assault on university campuses. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 35*, 13–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2017.05.005>
- Lamb, S., & Attwell, L. (2019). Bystanders in “sketchy” sexual situations: Their constructions of the “girl,” the “guy,” and themselves. *Feminism and Psychology, 29*(3), 391–408. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959353518821150>
- Laner, M. R., M.H., B., & Ventrone, N. A. (2001). Bystander attitudes toward victims of violence: Who’s worth helping? *Deviant Behavior, 22*(November 1999), 23–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/016396201750065793>
- Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1968). *Group inhibition of bystander intervention in emergencies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 10*(3), 215–221. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0026570>
- Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1969). Bystander “apathy.” *American Scientist, 57*(2), 244–268.
- Latané, B., & Nida, S. (1981). Ten years of research on group size and helping. *Psychological Bulletin, 89*(2), 308–324. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.89.2.308>
- Lazarus, K., & Signal, T. (2013). Who will help in situations of intimate partner violence: Exploring personal attitudes and bystander behaviours. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology 2013*(2), 199–209.
- Levine, M., & Crowther, S. (2008). The responsive bystander: How social group membership and group size can encourage as well as inhibit bystander intervention. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(6), 1429–1439. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012634>
- Mainwaring, C., Gabbert, F., & Scott, A. J. (2022). A systematic review exploring variables related to bystander intervention in sexual violence contexts. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse, 0*(0), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380221079660>
- Manning, R., Levine, M., & Collins, A. (2007). The Kitty Genovese murder and the social psychology of helping: The parable of the 38 witnesses. *American Psychologist, 62*(6), 555–562. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.62.6.555>

- Marcus, B., Bosnjak, M., Lindner, S., Pilischenko, S., & Schütz, A. (2007). Compensating for low topic interest and long surveys: A field experiment on nonresponse in web surveys. *Social Science Computer Review*, 25(3), 372–383. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439307297606>
- Martini, M., & De Piccoli, N. (2020). Predicting bystander intention to intervene: The role of gender-specific system justification and rape myth acceptance for men and women. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00326>
- McMahon, S. (2015). Call for research on bystander intervention to prevent sexual violence: The role of campus environments. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 55(3–4), 472–489. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-015-9724-0>
- McMahon, S., & Banyard, V. L. (2012). When can I help? A conceptual framework for the prevention of sexual violence through bystander intervention. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, 13(1), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838011426015>
- McMahon, S., & Dick, A. (2011). “Being in a Room with Like-Minded Men”: An exploratory study of men’s participation in a bystander intervention program to prevent intimate partner violence. *The Journal of Men’s Studies*, 19(1), 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.3149/jms.1901.3>
- McMahon, S., Peterson, N. A., Winter, S. C., Palmer, J. E., Postmus, J. L., & Koenick, R. A. (2015). Predicting bystander behavior to prevent sexual assault on college campuses: The role of self-efficacy and intent. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 56(1–2), 46–56. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-015-9740-0>
- Mennicke, A., Montanaro, E., Bowling, J., Tirunagari, A., Williams, M., Jules, B. N., Campbell, S., Carlson, H., Farris, S., McClare, V., Kissler, N., McGonagle, A., Pruneda, P., Haley, G., McMahon, S., Correia, C. J., Meehan, E., Benson, J. K., Willard, J., ... Sotiroff, A. (2022). A systematic review of validated measures of U.S. based bystander intervention-related constructs. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380221137067>
- Morwitz, V. G., & Munz, K. P. (2021). Intentions. *Consumer Psychology Review*, 4(1), 26–41. <https://doi.org/10.1002/arcp.1061>
- Moschella, E. A., & Banyard, V. L. (2020). Reactions to actions: Exploring how types of bystander action are linked to positive and negative consequences. *Journal*

of *Primary Prevention*, 41(6), 585–602. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10935-020-00618-9>

- Moschella, E. A., Bennett, S., & Banyard, V. L. (2018). Beyond the situational model: Bystander action consequences to intervening in situations involving sexual violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 33(20), 3211–3231. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516635319>
- Moylan, C. A., & Javorka, M. (2020). Widening the lens: An ecological review of campus sexual assault. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 21(1), 179–192. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838018756121>
- Moynihan, M. M., Banyard, V. L., Cares, A. C., Potter, S. J., Williams, L. M., & Stapleton, J. G. (2015). Encouraging responses in sexual and relationship violence prevention: What program effects remain 1 year later? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 30(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260514532719>
- Nabi, R. L., & Horner, J. R. (2001). Victims with voices: How abused women conceptualize the problem of spousal abuse and implications for intervention and prevention. *Journal of Family Violence*, 16(3), 237–253. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1011134231804>
- Nicksa, S. C. (2011). College students' self-predicted reactions to witnessing sexual assault: The impact of gender, community, bystander experience, and relationship to the victim. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, May, 144.
- Nicksa, S. C. (2013). Bystander's willingness to report theft, physical assault, and sexual assault: The Impact of gender, anonymity, and relationship with the offender. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(2), 217–236. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260513505146>
- O'Connor, B. P. (2000). SPSS and SAS programs for determining the number of components using parallel analysis and Velicer's MAP test. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 32(3), 396–402. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03200807>
- Orchowski, L. M., Berkowitz, A., Oesterle, D., Berry-Cabán, C., Borsari, B., Kahler, C. W., & Kazemi, D. M. (2022). Correlates of bystander intervention attitudes and intentions among young adult active duty male soldiers. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(23–24), NP23262–NP23280. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605221080151>

- Palmer, J. E., Nicksa, S. C., & McMahon, S. (2018). Does who you know affect how you act? The impact of relationships on bystander intervention in interpersonal violence situations. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 33(17), 2623–2642. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516628292>
- Park, S., & Kim, S.-H. (2022). A systematic review and meta-analysis of bystander intervention programs for intimate partner violence and sexual assault. *Psychology of Violence*, 13(2), 93-106 <https://doi.org/10.1037/vio0000456>
- Paulhus, D. L. (2017). Socially desirable responding on self-reports. In V. Zeigler-Hill & T.K. Shackelford (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of personality and individual differences*. Springer International Publishing.
- Pazienza, R., Martin, J. L., Wegner, R., McAndrew, L. M., Carey, C., Blumenthal, H., & Ham, L. S. (2022). Bystander intervention among college student drinking gamers: Sexual assault attitudes, self-efficacy, and intent to intervene. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(23–24), NP23443–NP23467. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605221078816>
- Peterman, A. (2021). The art of indirect measures: Asking about violence against women and children in remote Surveys. <https://www.cgdev.org/blog/art-indirect-measures-asking-about-violence-against-women-and-children-remote-surveys>
- Planty, M. (2002). Third-party involvement in violent crime, 1993-99. *Race*, July.
- Potter, S. J., Moynihan, M. M., Stapleton, J. G., & Banyard, V. L. (2009). Empowering bystanders to prevent campus violence against women: A preliminary evaluation of a poster campaign. *Violence against Women*, 15(1), 106–121. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801208327482>
- Reid, A., & Dundes, L. (2017). Bystander programs: Accommodating or derailing sexism? *Behavioral Sciences*, 7(4). <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs7040065>
- Reynolds-Tylus, T., Lukacena, K. M., & Quick, B. L. (2019). An application of the theory of normative social behavior to bystander intervention for sexual assault. *Journal of American College Health*, 67(6), 551–559. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2018.1499648>
- Robinson, S. R., Casiano, A., & Elias-Lambert, N. (2022). “Is It My Responsibility?”: A qualitative review of university students’ perspectives on bystander

behavior. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, 23(1), 117–131. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838020933829>

Rosenthal, A. M. (1964/1999). *Thirty-eight witnesses*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., & Akbaş, G. (2013). Honor and honor violence against women in honor cultures: Social psychological explanations. *Turkish Psychological Articles*, 16(32), 76–91.

Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., Yalçın, Z. S., & Glick, P. (2007). Ambivalent sexism, belief in a just world, and empathy as predictors of Turkish students' attitudes toward rape victims. *Sex Roles*, 57(11), 889–895. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9313-2>

Sánchez-Prada, A., Delgado-Alvarez, C., Bosch-Fiol, E., Ferreiro-Basurto, V., & Ferrer-Perez, V. A. (2022). Personal traits of the people who help: The case of bystanders to violence against women. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(20), 13544. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192013544>

Savage, M. W., Menegatos, L., & Roberto, A. J. (2017). When do friends prevent friends from hooking up intoxicated? An examination of sex differences and hypothetical intoxication in peer interventions. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 46(6), 1819–1829. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-017-0969-6>

Seo, S., Witte, T. H., Casper, D. M., & Owen, S. (2022). Helping friends and strangers in risky situations: Outcomes of bystander interventions for sexual assault and dating violence. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 31(4), 540–561. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2021.1984350>

Sheeran, P. (2002). Intention—behavior relations: A conceptual and empirical review. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 12(1), 1–36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14792772143000003>

Shotland, R. L., & Straw, M. K. (1976). Bystander response to an assault: When a man attacks a woman. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34(5), 990–999. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.34.5.990>

Sillito, C. (2012). Gendered physical and emotional health consequences of situational couple violence for heterosexual married and cohabiting couples. *Feminist Criminology*, 7(4), 255–281. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1557085111431695>

- Siyez, D. M., Ercan, G. S., Esen, E., Soylu, Y., Baran, B., Firuzan, E., Belkis, Ö., Dünder Sezer, T., Efe Güney, M., Ergöner, A. T., Günay, T., Tezcan, S., & Öztürk, B. (2021). Attitudes of the Turkish university students and staff toward sexual harassment and assault: Preliminary psychometric evaluation. *SAGE Open*, *11*(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211050374>
- Sulkowski, M. L. (2011). An investigation of students' willingness to report threats of violence in campus communities. *Psychology of Violence*, *1*(1), 53–65. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021592>
- Sutton, S. (1998). Predicting and explaining intentions and behavior: How well are we doing? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *28*(15), 1317–1338. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1998.tb01679.x>
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2018). *Using multivariate statistics* (7th edition). Pearson Publication.
- Toplu-Demirtaş, E., & Fincham, F. D. (2022). I don't have power, and I want more: psychological, physical, and sexual dating violence perpetration among college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *37*(13–14), NP11490–NP11519. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520951319>
- Webb, T. L., & Sheeran, P. (2006). Does changing behavioral intentions engender behavior change? A meta-analysis of the experimental evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*, *132*(2), 249–268. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.132.2.249>
- West, A., & Wandrei, M. (2002). Intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *17*(9), 972–986. <https://doi.org/10.1542/pir.31-4-145>
- Women Against Violence Europe. (2008). Training manual for improving quality services for victims of domestic violence. <https://wave-network.org/improve-training-manual-for-improving-quality-services-for-victims-of-domestic-violence-2008/>
- Yule, K., & Grych, J. (2020). College students' perceptions of barriers to bystander intervention. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *35*(15–16), 2971–2992. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517706764>
- Yule, K., Hoxmeier, J. C., Petranu, K., & Grych, J. (2022). The chivalrous bystander: The role of gender-based beliefs and empathy on bystander behavior and

perceived barriers to intervention. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(1–2), 863–888. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520916277>

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: BYSTANDERS' INTENTION TO INTERVENE

Yönerge: Bu bölümde, üniversitede günlük yaşantınızda karşılaşılabileceğiniz bazı olaylara ilişkin 2 senaryo yer almaktadır. Bu senaryolara anket boyunca değinilecektir. Her bir senaryoyu **dikkatlice okumanız** ve sizden senaryoda tasvir edilen olaya **tanık olduğunuzu hayal etmeniz** beklenmektedir. Daha sonra, okuduğunuz senaryodaki gibi bir durumla karşılaşmanız durumunda size sunulan farklı davranışları gerçekleştirme olasılığınızı belirtmeniz istenmektedir.

Senaryo 1: Günün yorgunluğunu atmak üzere üniversitenizdeki çimenlik alanda oturuyorsunuz. Bu sırada, bir erkek öğrencinin bir kadın öğrenciyi tokat attığını ve daha sonra da onu ittiğini görüyorsunuz.

Senaryo 2: Günün yorgunluğunu atmak üzere üniversitenizdeki çimenlik alanda oturuyorsunuz. Etrafınıza baktığınızda biraz uzağınızda oturan bir erkek öğrencinin bir kadın öğrenciyi karşı koymasına rağmen kendine doğru çektiğini ve zorla öptüğünü görüyorsunuz. Devamında kadın öğrencinin ortamdaki uzaklaşmaya çalıştığını ancak erkek öğrencinin kadın öğrenciyi takip ettiğini görüyorsunuz.

Yukarıdaki senaryodaki gibi bir durumla siz karşılaşmış olsaydınız, aşağıda belirtilen eylemleri yapma olasılığınız sizce ne olurdu?

Belirtilen her eylem için, o eylemi gerçekleştirme olasılığınızı işaretleyiniz.

1) Erkek öğrenciyi bu davranışını sonlandırmasını söyledim.

(1) Asla gerçekleştir- mezdim	(2) Gerçekleştir- mezdim	(3) Muhtemelen gerçekleştir- mezdim	(4) Muhtemelen gerçekleştirir- dim	(5) Gerçekleşti- rirdim	(6) Kesinlikle gerçekleştirir- dim
--	--------------------------------	--	---	-------------------------------	---

2) Olayı engellemek için araya girerdim.

3) Erkek öğrenciyi davranışını sonlandırmazsa kendisini ilgili güvenlik birimine (kampüs güvenliği, polis, nöbetçi amirlik, cinsel taciz ve saldırıya karşı birim vb.) ihbar edeceğimi söyledim.

4) Olaya müdahale etmesi için durumu ilgili güvenlik birimine (kampüs güvenliği, polis, nöbetçi amirlik vb.) ihbar ederdim.

5) Etrafta olaya tanık olan başka kişiler varsa onların olaya müdahale etmesini sağlardım.

APPENDIX B: PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Yönerge: Bu bölümde, yukarıda okuduğunuz senaryolardaki gibi çeşitli durumlarla karşılaştığınızda olaya müdahale edip etmemek konusunda **genel olarak ne derecede sorumluluk** hissettiğiniz ile ilgili ifadeler yer almaktadır.

Lütfen her bir ifadeyi **dikkatlice okuyunuz** ve ifadelere **ne ölçüde katıldığınızı** samimi bir şekilde belirtiniz.

- 1) Bu olaylara müdahale etmenin başkalarının sorumluluğu olduğunu düşünürüm. (R)

(1) Hiç katılmıyorum	(2) Katılmıyorum	(3) Biraz katılmıyorum	(4) Biraz katılıyorum	(5) Katılıyorum	(6) Tamamen katılıyorum
----------------------------	---------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------	-------------------------------

- 2) Bu olaylara müdahale ederek sorumluluk alırım.**

- 3) Bu olayları sonlandırmak için üzerime düşen bir şey olup olmadığını anlamaya çalışırım.

- 4) Bu olaylara müdahale etmeyi gereksiz görürüm. (R)**

- 5) Bu olaylar sırasında kadının başına geleceklerden kendimi sorumlu hissederim.**

- 6) Bu olaylara başkalarının müdahale etmesini beklerim. (R)

- 7) Bu olayları kişilerin kendi aralarında çözmesi gerektiğini düşünürüm. (R)**

*Bold items are included in the final version of the scale.

APPENDIX C: BYSTANDER SELF-EFFICACY

Yönerge: Bu bölümde, okumuş olduğunuz senaryolardaki gibi çeşitli durumlarla karşılaştığınızda gerçekleştirebileceğiniz müdahaleler ile ilgili bazı ifadeler yer almaktadır.

Lütfen aşağıda yer alan müdahale davranışlarını **dikkatlice okuyunuz** ve söz konusu davranışı gerçekleştirmenin **genel olarak sizin için ne ölçüde zor ya da kolay olduğunu** belirtiniz.

- 1) Erkek öğrenciye bu davranışını sonlandırmasını söylemek

(1) Benim için çok zor	(2) Benim için zor	(3) Benim için biraz zor	(4) Benim için biraz kolay	(5) Benim için kolay	(6) Benim için çok kolay
------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------------

- 2) Olayı engellemek için araya girmek
- 3) Erkek öğrenciye davranışını sonlandırmazsa kendisini ilgili güvenlik birimine (kampüs güvenliği, polis, nöbetçi amirlik, cinsel taciz ve saldırıya karşı birim vb.) ihbar edeceğimi söylemek
- 4) Olaya müdahale etmesi için durumu ilgili güvenlik birimine (kampüs güvenliği, polis, nöbetçi amirlik vb.) ihbar etmek
- 5) Etrafta olaya tanık olan başka kişiler varsa onların olaya müdahale etmesini sağlamak

**APPENDIX D: PERCEIVED PEER NORMS REGARDING BYSTANDER
INTERVENTION**

***Yönerge:** Bu bölümde, kadına yönelik şiddet olaylarına müdahale etmeniz durumunda yakın arkadaşlarınızın bu durumu nasıl karşılayacağına ilişkin ifadeler yer almaktadır.*

Lütfen her bir ifadeyi aşağıdaki cümleyi tamamlayacak şekilde dikkatlice okuyunuz ve ifadelere ne ölçüde katıldığınızı samimi bir şekilde belirtiniz.

**Kadına yönelik şiddet olayına müdahale edersem;
Arkadaşlarımın çoğu...**

1) ...yaptığının doğru olduğunu düşünerek beni destekler.

(1) Hiç katılmıyorum	(2) Katılmıyorum	(3) Biraz katılmıyorum	(4) Biraz katılıyorum	(5) Katılıyorum	(6) Tamamen katılıyorum
----------------------------	---------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------	-------------------------------

2) ...gereksiz yere olayı büyüttüğümü düşünür. (R)

3) ...şiddeti engellemeye çalıştığım için memnuniyet duyar.

4) ...aşırı tepki verdiğimi düşünür. (R)

5) ...olay karşısında sessiz kalmadığım için memnun olur.

6) ...gereksiz yere başıma dert aldığımı düşünür. (R)

7) ...kendimi riske attığımı düşünür. (R)

*Bold items were included in the final version of the scale.

APPENDIX E: PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS OF REFERRALS

Yönerge: Bu bölümde, kadına yönelik şiddet olaylarının resmi makamlara (polis, jandarma vb.) bildirilmesi ile ilgili çeşitli ifadeler yer almaktadır. Aşağıda yer alan ifadelerde bu tür olaylara müdahale etme sorumluluğu bulunan kurumları tanımlamak üzere “resmi makamlar” ifadesi kullanılmıştır.

Lütfen her bir ifadeyi **aşağıdaki cümleyi tamamlayacak şekilde** dikkatlice okuyunuz ve kadına yönelik şiddet olaylarının önlenmesi sürecindeki bildirimler/ihbarlar ile ilgili ifadelere **ne ölçüde katıldığınızı** belirtiniz.

Kadına yönelik şiddet olaylarını, resmi makamlara bildirmek/ihbar etmek...

1) ...şiddet uygulayan erkekler için caydırıcı olacaktır.

(1) Hiç katılmıyorum	(2) Katılmıyorum	(3) Biraz katılmıyorum	(4) Biraz katılıyorum	(5) Katılıyorum	(6) Tamamen katılıyorum
----------------------------	---------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------	-------------------------------

2) ...hiçbir yarar sağlamaz. (R)

3) ...şiddet uygulayan kişiye gerekli cezanın verilmesini sağlar.

4) ...kadınların maruz kaldığı şiddeti azaltır.

5) ...şiddet uygulayan kişiye gerekli müdahalenin yapılmasını sağlar.

6) ...kadına yönelik şiddet olaylarını azaltır.

7) ...sorunun çözülmesine katkı sağlar.

*Bold items were included in the final version of the scale.

APPENDIX F: PAST BYSTANDER EXPERIENCES OF VIOLENCE

Yönerge:** Bu bölümde, üniversite yaşamınızda şiddete tanıklık etme deneyimlerinize ilişkin sorular yer almaktadır. Lütfen her soruyu **samimi bir şekilde cevaplayınız.

- 1) a. Üniversite içerisinde bir erkeğin bir kadına fiziksel şiddet (vurmak, bir şey fırlatmak vb.) uyguladığına tanık olduğunuz mu?

Evet (1) Hayır (2)

b. Cevabınız evet ise, olayı lütfen kısaca anlatınız.

- 2) a. Üniversite içerisinde bir erkeğin bir kadına cinsel şiddet (zorla öpmeye çalışmak, zorla birlikte olmaya çalışmak vb.) uyguladığına tanık olduğunuz mu?

Evet (1) Hayır (2)

b. Cevabınız evet ise, olayı lütfen kısaca anlatınız.

- 3) a. Daha önce tanık olduğunuz herhangi bir kadına yönelik erkek şiddeti olayında, şiddeti sonlandırmak veya onaylamadığınızı göstermek üzere herhangi bir müdahalede buldunuz mu?

Evet, buldum. (1) Hayır, bulunmadım. (2)

b. Cevabınız evet ise, lütfen deneyiminizi kısaca paylaşınız.

APPENDIX G: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM

DEMOGRAFİK BİLGİ FORMU

- 1) Yaşınız (Lütfen yazınız) _____
- 2) Cinsiyetiniz (Lütfen yazınız) _____
- 3) Eğitiminiz
 Ön-lisans/meslek yüksekokulu öğrencisi Lisans öğrencisi
 Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi Doktora öğrencisi
 Diğer (Değişim öğrencisi, özel öğrenci vb.)
- 4) Üniversiteniz (Lütfen yazınız) _____
- 5) Bulduğunuz üniversitenin kaç yıldır öğrencisisiniz? _____
- 6) Nerede kalıyorsunuz?
 Evde ailemle Evde yalnız Evde arkadaşım/arkadaşlarımla
 Evde partnerimle Üniversite yurdunda/ Kampüs yurdunda
 Kampüs dışında bir yurttan Evsizim
- 7) Yaşamınızın büyük bölümünü nerede geçirdiniz?
 Köy- kasaba İlçe İl Büyükşehir
- 8) Romantik ilişki durumunuz
 Romantik ilişki içinde değilim 6 aydan kısa süredir romantik ilişki içerisindeyim
 6 aydan uzun süredir romantik ilişki içerisindeyim Nişanlıyım
 Evliyim
- 9) Sizce aşağıdakilerden hangisi ekonomik durumunuzu en iyi şekilde yansıtmaktadır?
 Alt Alt-orta Orta-Orta Orta-yüksek Yüksek
- 10) Ortalama olarak hanenize giren gelir ne kadar? (TL olarak) _____
- 11) Kendinizi ne kadar dindar biri olarak tanımlarsınız?
 Dini inancım yok Hiç dindar değilim Dindar değilim
 Biraz dindarım Oldukça dindarım Çok dindarım
- 12) Annenizin eğitim durumu
 Okur-yazar değil Okur-yazar İlkokul Ortaokul Lise
 Yüksekokul Üniversite Yüksek lisans Doktora
- 13) Babanızın eğitim durumu

Okur-yazar deęil Okur-yazar İlkokul Ortaokul Lise
 Yksekokul niversite Yksek lisans Doktora

**APPENDIX H: APPROVAL OF METU HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS
COMMITTEE**

UYGULAMALI ETİK ARASTIRMA MERKEZİ APPLIED ETHICS RESEARCH CENTER	 ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
DUMLUPINAR BULVARI 06800 ÇANKAYA ANKARA/TURKEY T: +90 312 210 22 91 F: +90 312 210 79 99 ueam@metu.edu.tr www.ueam.metu.edu.tr	
Sayı: 28620816 /	14 NİSAN 2022
Konu : Değerlendirme Sonucu	
Gönderen: ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (İAEK)	
İlgi : İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başvurusu	
Sayın Prof.Dr. Nuray SAKALLI	
Danışmanlığımı yürüttüğünüz Ezgi Türkçelik Türkel'in "Kadınlara Yönelik Erkek Şiddeti Bağlamında Tanıkların Olaya Müdahalesinin Sosyal Psikolojik Yordayıcıları" başlıklı araştırması İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu tarafından uygun görülmüş ve 203-ODTÜİAEK-2022 protokol numarası ile onaylanmıştır.	
Saygılarımızla bilgilerinize sunarız.	
	 Prof.Dr. Mine MISIRLISOY İAEK Başkan

APPENDIX I: INFORMED CONSENT FORM

(Study 1 & Study 2)

BİLGİLENDİRME VE GÖNÜLLÜ KATILIM ONAY FORMU

Bu araştırma, ODTÜ Psikoloji Bölümü öğretim üyelerinden Prof. Dr. Nuray Sakallı danışmanlığında Sosyal Psikoloji doktora öğrencisi Ezgi Türkçelik Türkel tarafından yürütülen bir çalışmadır. Bu form sizi araştırma koşulları hakkında bilgilendirmek için hazırlanmıştır.

Çalışmanın Amacı Nedir? Araştırmanın amacı, üniversite öğrencilerinin günlük yaşantılarında karşılaşılabilecekleri bazı olaylarda bireysel farklılıklar dahilinde nasıl farklı müdahalelerde bulunabileceklerini ortaya koymak ve bu müdahale davranışlarının bireysel farklılıklar ve sosyal psikolojik etmenlerle ilişkisi hakkında bilgi toplamaktır.

Bize Nasıl Yardımcı Olmanızı İsteyeceğiz? Araştırmaya Türkiye’de yaşayan üniversite öğrencileri katılabilmektedir. Araştırmaya katılımınız tamamen gönüllülük temelinde olmalıdır. Araştırmaya katılmayı kabul ederseniz, sizden beklenen ortalama 15 dakika süren online bir ankette yer alan bir dizi soruyu büyük çoğunluğu derecelendirme ölçeği üzerinde olmak üzere cevaplamanızdır. Anketi **tek oturumda** (başından sonuna kadar ara vermeden) tamamlamanız, araştırmanın güvenilir ve geçerli olması bakımından önem taşımaktadır.

Sizden Topladığımız Bilgileri Nasıl Kullanacağız? Ankette, sizden kimlik belirleyici hiçbir bilgi istenmemektedir. Cevaplarınız tamamıyla gizli tutulacak, sadece araştırmacılar tarafından değerlendirilecektir. Katılımcılardan elde edilecek bilgiler toplu halde değerlendirilecek ve bilimsel yayımlarda kullanılacaktır.

Katılımınızla ilgili bilmeniz gerekenler: Araştırma günlük hayatta karşılaşılması muhtemel olağan risklerin ötesinde bir risk içermemektedir. Günlük hayatta karşılaştığımız olayların yarattığı rahatsızlık ve stresten daha fazla rahatsızlığa ya da strese yol açacak bir unsur içermemektedir. Buna rağmen, katılım sırasında sorulardan ya da herhangi başka bir nedenden ötürü kendinizi rahatsız hissederseniz cevaplamaı yarıda bırakıp anketi sonlandırabilirsiniz.

Araştırmayla ilgili daha fazla bilgi almak isterseniz: Bu çalışmaya katıldığınız için şimdiden teşekkür ederiz.

Araştırma hakkında daha fazla bilgi almak için Psk. Ezgi Türkçelik Türkel (E-posta: ezgiturkcelik@gmail.com) ile iletişim kurabilirsiniz.

Gönüllü katılım formunu okudum ve anladım.

- Üniversite öğrencisiyim ve çalışmaya katılmayı istiyorum.
- Çalışmaya katılmayı istemiyorum.

APPENDIX J: DEBRIEFING FORM

KATILIM SONRASI BİLGİLENDİRME FORMU

Bu arařtırmaya katıldığınız için teřekkür ederiz. Bu arařtırma daha önce de belirtildiđi gibi, ODTÜ Psikoloji Bölümü öğretim üyelerinden Prof. Dr. Nuray Sakallı danıřmanlığında Sosyal Psikoloji doktora öğrencisi Ezgi Türkçelik Türkel tarafından yürütölen bir çalıřmadır.

Arařtırmada, üniversitede günlük yařantınızda karşılařabileceğiniz kadınlara yönelik řiddet olaylarına iliřkin senaryolar sunulmuřtur. Çalıřmanın amacı; kadınlara yönelik erkek řiddeti bağlamında tanıkların olaya müdahalesini belirleyen sosyal psikolojik etmenleri ortaya koymaktır.

Bu çalıřmadan elde edilen bilgiler sadece bilimsel arařtırma ve yazılarda kullanılacaktır. Cevaplarınız tamamıyla gizli tutulacak, sadece arařtırmacılar tarafından deđerlendirilecektir. Katılımcılardan elde edilecek bilgiler toplu halde deđerlendirilecek ve bilimsel yayımlarda kullanılacaktır.

Arařtırmanın sonuçlarını öğrenmek ya da arařtırmayla ilgili daha fazla bilgi almak isterseniz Psk. Ezgi Türkçelik Türkel (E-posta: ezgiturkcelik@gmail.com) iletiřim kurabilirsiniz.

APPENDIX K: VAW SUPPORT SERVICES INFORMATION

ŞİDDETE MARUZ KALDIĞINIZDA VE/VEYA TANIK OLDUĞUNUZDA DESTEK ALABİLECEĞİNİZ BAZI KURULUŞLARA AİT BİLGİLER

- **Cinsel Taciz ve Saldırıya Karşı Destek Birimi olan üniversitelerin linklerine aşağıdaki bağlantıdan ulaşabilirsiniz.**

<https://ctsuni.wordpress.com/cts-birimi-olan-universiteler/>

- **Acil Destek Telefon Hatları - 7/24 saat ulaşılabilir.**

ALO 155 Polis

ALO 156 Jandarma

ALO 112 Acil Tıbbi Yardım Hattı

ALO 183 Sosyal Destek Hattı

Kadın Dernekleri Federasyonu Acil Yardım Hattı:

0 (212) 656 96 96 ve 0 (549) 656 96 96

- **Aile ve Sosyal Hizmetler Bakanlığı'na bağlı ve her ilde bulunan Şiddet Önleme ve İzleme Merkezleri'ne (ŞÖNİM) başvuruda bulunabilirsiniz.**

Ankara ŞÖNİM: 0 (312) 348 36 86 (24 saat)

İstanbul ŞÖNİM: 0 (212) 465 21 96 - 465 21 97 (24 saat)

<https://www.aile.gov.tr/iletisim/bakanlik-iletisim-bilgileri/sonim/>

- **Pek çok ilde bulunan baro bünyesindeki kadın hakları birimlerine yardım talebinde bulunabilir ve hukuki danışmanlık desteği alabilirsiniz.**

Baro Kadın Hakları Merkezi Hattı: 444 26 18

Ankara Barosu Gelincik Hattı: 444 43 06

- **Belediyelere Bağlı Kadın Danışma Merkezlerinden destek alabilirsiniz.**

Ankara Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kadın Danışma Merkezi: 0 (312) 507 37 60

Çankaya Belediyesi Kadın Danışma Merkezi: 0 (312) 458 89 00/ 11 54

Keçiören Belediyesi Kadın Danışma Merkezi: 0 (312) 359 3322

Yenimahalle Belediyesi Kadın Danışma Merkezi: 0(312) 332 08 71- 0(312) 335 22 96

İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Destek Hattı: 444 80 86

İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Psikolojik Danışmanlık Hattı: 0 (212) 449 49 00

İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kadın Danışma Merkezi: 0 (232) 293 4 293

- **Kadın örgütlerinden psikolojik ve hukuki destek alabilirsiniz:**

Kadın Dayanışma Vakfı: 0 (312) 430 40 05- 0 (312) 432 07 82

<https://www.kadindayanismavakfi.org.tr/>

Mor Çatı Kadın Sığınağı Vakfı: 0 (212) 292 52 31-32 www.morcati.org.tr

Cinsel Şiddetle Mücadele Derneği 0 542 585 39 90

<https://cinselsiddetlemucadele.org/>

APPENDIX L: SURVEY FLOW IN QUALTRICS

Informed Consent

Physical Violence Scenario

Bystanders' Intention to Intervene

Sexual Violence Scenario

Bystanders' Intention to Intervene

Bystander Self-Efficacy

Randomized Measures Which Are Evenly Presented

Feelings of Personal Responsibility

Perceived Effectiveness of Referrals

Perceived Peer Norms

Past Experiences of Being a Bystander

Past Experiences of Bystander Intervention

Demographic Info

Debriefing Form

Communication Information of VAW Support Services

End of Survey

APPENDIX M: TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET

1. Giriş

Kadına yönelik şiddet erkek şiddeti (KYEŞ) olaylarına tanık olanların müdahalesine (seyirci müdahalesi) yönelik artan ilgi, ABD üniversite kampüslerinde KYEŞ'yi özellikle de cinsel saldırıları sona erdirmek için daha etkili önleme programları geliştirme çabalarının bir parçasıdır (Ahrens ve ark., 2011; Banyard ve ark., 2004; Coker ve ark., 2011; Gidycz ve ark., 2011; Moynihan ve ark., 2015). Kadınlar her yerde şiddete maruz kalmaktadır ve üniversiteler bunun istisnası değildir. ABD'de her yıl her dört kadın öğrenciden birinin cinsel saldırıya uğradığı tahmin edilmektedir (Franklin ve ark., 2017). KYEŞ'nin yol açtığı ciddi sağlık sonuçlarının yanında, şiddete maruz bırakılan kadınların akademik hayatı da olumsuz etkilenmektedir (Huerta ve ark., 2006). ABD'de, üniversitelerdeki yüksek cinsel şiddet oranları nedeniyle, çeşitli yasal düzenlemeler yapılmış ve üniversitelere şiddeti önlemek amacıyla eğitim programları uygulama zorunluluğu getirilmiştir. Bu amaçla, birçok üniversite KYEŞ'ye tanık/seyirci olanların da şiddet olaylarına müdahalesini sağlamaya yönelik eğitim programları uygulamaya koymuştur (Franklin ve ark., 2017; Hoxmeier, Acock ve ark., 2020).

Bu programlarda, daha geniş bir perspektiften üçüncü kişilerin rolüne vurgu yapılmakta, tüm öğrenciler, KYEŞ'ye müdahale etme kapasitesine ve fırsatına sahip tanıklar olarak hedeflenmektedir. Bu programlar, 1960'ların sonlarından bu yana sosyal psikolojinin en çok ilgi çeken konularından biri olan seyirci müdahalesi davranışı çalışmalarına dayanmaktadır (Darley ve Latané, 1968; Latané ve Darley, 1968, 1969; Latané ve Nida, 1981). Bununla birlikte, 2000'li yıllara kadar ne seyirci müdahale modeli alanyazını ne de KYEŞ araştırmaları, KYEŞ bağlamında seyircilerin müdahalesine odaklanmıştır. Ancak 2000'li yıllardan sonra, KYEŞ bağlamında seyirci müdahalesi araştırmaları giderek artmıştır. Bu çalışmaların çoğu, üniversite kampüslerinde öğrencilerin maruz bırakıldığı cinsel saldırılara ve flört şiddetine odaklanmıştır (Banyard ve Moynihan, 2011; Bennett ve ark., 2014; Brown ve ark.,

2014; Franklin ve ark., 2017; Hoxmeier, Acock ve ark., 2020; Potter ve ark., 2009; Yule ve ark., 2022).

Türkiye'de KYEŞ konusunda çok sayıda araştırma olmasına rağmen (örn., Sakallı-Uğurlu et al., 2007; Siyez et al., 2021; Toplu-Demirtaş ve Fincham, 2022), tanık olanların müdahaleleri üzerine herhangi bir araştırma bulunmamaktadır. Yakın tarihli bir sistematik derleme, araştırmaların çoğunun ABD'de yapılmış olması nedeniyle sonuçların genellenebilirliğinin sınırlılığına işaret etmiş ve ABD bağlamı dışında da araştırma yapılması çağrısında bulunmuştur (Mainwaring ve ark., 2022). Bu çalışmada, alanyazındaki söz konusu boşluğu doldurmak ve sosyal psikolojik araştırmalara katkıda bulunmak için Türkiye'de üniversite ortamında yaşanan KYEŞ olaylarına tanık olanların müdahale etme (şiddeti önlemek için araya girme, polisi arama, vb.) niyetlerine odaklanılmıştır. Araştırmanın, Türkiye'de üniversite ortamında KYEŞ'ye tanık olanların rolüne dikkat çekmesi ve tanıkların müdahalesini de kapsayan KYŞE'yi önleme programları geliştirilmesine katkıda bulunması amaçlanmaktadır.

1.1 Seyirci Müdahalesi ve Seyirci Müdahale Modeli¹

Seyirciler/Tanıklar, "mağdur ya da fail olarak duruma doğrudan müdahil olmayan, ancak varlıklarıyla hiçbir şey yapmama, yüksek riskli bir duruma müdahale etme, yardım etme ve durumu daha iyi hale getirme ya da failin davranışına göz yumarak durumu daha da kötüleştirme potansiyeline sahip bireyler" olarak tanımlanmaktadır (Banyard, 2011, s.216). Acil ve yardım gerektiren durumlarda seyirci davranışları sosyal psikolojide uzun bir araştırma geçmişine sahiptir (Latané ve Nida, 1981).

Seyirci etkisi araştırmaları, 1964'te New York Caddesi'nde 38 tanığın varlığında tecavüze maruz kalarak öldürülen Kitty Genovese'in iyi bilinen hikâyesinden sonra başlamıştır (Rosenthal, 1964/1999). Bu olay birçok araştırmacıyı etkilemiş ve seyirci

¹ Metinde tanık ve seyirci kavramları aynı anlamda ve birbirinin yerine kullanılmıştır. Türkçe alanyazında "bystander intervention" ve onunla ilişkili kavramlar kullanılırken sıklıkla seyirci kavramı kullanılmaktadır. Bu nedenle özellikle müdahale modeli ve ona ilişkin değişkenler ele alınırken seyirci kavramı tercih edilmiştir.

müdahale modelinin geliştirilmesini sağlamıştır (Darley ve Latané, 1968; Latané ve Darley, 1968, 1969; Latané ve Nida, 1981).

Seyirci müdahale modeli (Latané ve Darley, 1969) beş adımdan oluşmaktadır. Modele göre, seyirciler (1) durumu fark etmeli, (2) müdahale gerektiren bir acil durum olarak algılamalı, (3) olaydan kişisel olarak sorumlu hissetmeli, (4) nasıl yardım edeceklerine karar vermeli ve son olarak (5) müdahale etmek için harekete geçmelidir. Latané ve Darley (1969), acil durumlarda seyircilerin yardım davranışlarını test eden bir dizi deneysel araştırmanın ardından bu modeli geliştirmiştir. Bu çalışmalar, seyirci eylemsizliğinin belirleyicileri olan bazı önemli faktörlerin anlaşılmasını sağlamıştır (Latané ve Nida, 1981).

Bu çalışmalarda dikkat çeken, seyirci yaklaşımının önünü açan olayın KYEŞ'nin bir örneği olmasına rağmen deneysel koşulların hiçbirinin (Latane ve Darley, 1968; Latane ve Darley, 1969; Latané ve Nida, 1981) KYEŞ bağlamında seyirci davranışını incelememiş olmasıdır (bkz. Cherry, 1995).

1.1.1 KYEŞ Bağlamında Erken Dönem Seyirci Müdahalesi Çalışmaları

2000'li yıllara kadar, sadece üç çalışma (Borofsky ve ark., 1971; Harari ve ark., 1985; Shotland ve Straw, 1976) KYEŞ bağlamında geçerli olabilecek faktörleri araştırmıştır. Seyirci araştırmalarının başlamasından 30 yıl sonra Cherry (1995), Genovese olayını KYEŞ bağlamından kopararak ele aldığı için seyirci yaklaşımını eleştirmiş ve 1960'ların sonlarında KYEŞ'nin henüz önemli bir toplumsal sorun olarak görülmediğini ancak feminist hareketin yükselişiyle gündeme taşındığını belirtmiştir (1995, s.16). Cherry'nin yorumu, Genovese olayının deneysel eşdeğerini yaratmaya yönelik daha önceki girişimlerin neden KYEŞ bağlamında çalışılmadığını anlamak için önemlidir.

1.1.2 KYEŞ Bağlamında Güncel Seyirci Müdahalesi Çalışmaları

Son on beş yılda, seyirci müdahalesi yaklaşımı, özellikle cinsel saldırılar ve KYEŞ bağlamında giderek daha fazla çalışılmıştır (örn., Banyard, 2011; Banyard ve ark., 2007; Bennett ve ark., 2014; Burn, 2009; Labhardt ve ark., 2017; Mainwaring ve ark., 2022). Artan sayıda çalışmayla birlikte, KYEŞ bağlamında seyirci davranışları üzerine

iki araştırma çizgisi tanımlanabilir. İlkinde, tanık olanların müdahale kararlarını etkileyebilecek bireysel düzeydeki değişkenlere (örn., cinsiyet ve tutumlar) odaklanılmıştır (örn., Banyard 2008; West ve Wandrei, 2002). Bu araştırma çizgisinde, seyirci müdahale modelini KYEŞ bağlamına uyarlayan çalışmalar da bulunmaktadır (örn., Burn, 2009). İkinci araştırma çizgisi, bireysel faktörlerin yanında toplumsal faktörlere (sosyal normlar ve mahalle özellikleri gibi) odaklanmış ve argümanlarını ekolojik modellere dayandırmıştır (Banyard, 2011; Gracia ve Herrero, 2006b; Moylan ve Javorka, 2020).

1.2 Seyirci Müdahale Davranışlarının Türleri

Seyirciler KYEŞ olaylarına müdahale etmeye karar verdiklerinde, nasıl müdahale edeceklerine ilişkin çeşitli seçenekler vardır (Dovidio ve ark., 2006). Bazı araştırmacılar seyirci müdahalelerini doğrudan ve dolaylı olarak sınıflandırmıştır (örn., Chabot ve ark., 2009). Doğrudan müdahale şiddeti durdurmak üzere seyircinin araya girmesi veya şiddete maruz kalan kadını şiddet ortamından uzaklaştırmak gibi davranışlar; dolaylı müdahale, kolluk kuvvetlerini veya diğer ilgili kurumları aramak ya da etraftakilerden yardım istemek gibi davranışlardır (Burn, 2009).

1.3 Seyirci Müdahalesi ve Seyirci Müdahale Modeli Değişkenleri

Çalışmada ele alınan ilk değişken kategorisi seyirci modeli değişkenleridir. Bu çalışmada seyirci müdahalesinin yordayıcı değişkenleri olması beklenen kişisel sorumluluk ve seyirci öz-yeterliliği üzerinde durulmaktadır (Banyard, 2008; Burn 2009).

Burn (2009) ve Banyard ve Moynihan (2011), sorumluluğun seyirci müdahalesinde en önemli değişkenlerden biri olduğunu bulmuştur. Araştırmalar müdahale konusunda daha fazla sorumluluk hissedenlerin müdahale etme olasılığının daha yüksek olduğunu göstermiştir (Banyard ve ark., 2021; Bennett ve ark., 2014; Burn, 2009; Debnam ve Mauer, 2021; Gracia ve ark., 2009; Katz ve ark., 2015).

Seyirci öz-yeterliliği, uygun becerilere sahip olmayı, müdahale etmek için kendine güvenmeyi ya da müdahalenin algılanan kolaylığını veya zorluğunu ifade eder. Seyirci

müdahalesi ile pozitif yönde ilişkilidir ve müdahale kararlarında (kişisel sorumluluğu takiben) önemli bir adımdır (Burn, 2009; Darley ve Latané, 1968).

KYEŞ bağlamında seyirci öz-yeterliliği konusundaki çalışmalar çoğunlukla tutarlı sonuçlara sahiptir. Daha yüksek düzeyde seyirci öz-yeterliliği bildiren katılımcılar, KYEŞ olaylarında daha fazla yardım etme isteği ve davranışı bildirmiştir (Banyard, 2008; Banyard ve ark., 2007; Banyard ve Moynihan, 2011; Frye, 2007; Lazarus ve Signal, 2013; Paziienza ve ark., 2022; Savage ve ark., 2017). Ayrıca, müdahale etmede başarısız olan öğrenciler düşük öz-yeterliliklerinden bahsetmiştir (Hoxmeier ve ark., 2018; Hoxmeier ve ark., 2020).

1.4 Algılanan Bağlamsal Değişkenler ve Seyirci Müdahalesi

Bu çalışmadaki ikinci değişken kategorisi, bireyi çevreleyen daha geniş sosyal bağlama ilişkin değişkenlerdir. Bunlar sosyal/akran normları, kültürel değerler, kolluk kuvvetlerine güven, vb. olabilir (Banyard, 2011; Moylan ve Javorka, 2020). Bu çalışmada bu kategoriden, seyirci müdahalesinin önemli yordayıcıları olması beklenen algılanan akran normları ve bildirim yapılan kurumların algılanan etkililiği seçilmiştir.

Alanyazında grup normlarının müdahale kararlarında oldukça etkili olduğu bulunmuştur (Banyard ve ark., 2021; Brown ve ark., 2014; Brown ve Messman-Moore, 2010; Gidycz ve ark., 2011; Reynolds-Tylus ve ark., 2019; Savage ve ark., 2017). Üniversite bağlamındaki seyirci müdahalesi araştırmaları, sosyal normları, katılımcıların akranlarının/arkadaşlarının seyirci müdahalesine ilişkin tutumları veya onayları olarak ele almıştır.

Müdahale kararlarında akran normlarının önemini ortaya koyan çalışmalar erkek katılımcıların cinsel saldırıya müdahale olasılığının, akranlarının böyle bir durumda müdahale edip etmeyeceklerine ilişkin algılarıyla ilişkili olduğunu göstermiştir (Brown ve Messman-Moore, 2010; Fabiano ve ark., 2003). Cinsel saldırı senaryolarına ilişkin niteliksel çalışmalar da erkeklik normlarına uyum sağlamaya ilişkin kaygıların erkeklerin müdahale kararlarında önemli rol oynadığını göstermiştir (Carlson, 2008; Casey ve Ohler, 2012). Seyirci müdahalesi ile sosyal normlar arasında olumlu ilişkiler ortaya koyan birçok araştırma olmasına rağmen, Hust ve arkadaşları (2019) seyirci müdahalesi ile akran normları arasında anlamlı bir ilişki bulmamıştır.

Bir diğerk sosyal bağlamsal deęişken bildirim yapılan kurumların algılanan etkililięi'dir ve KYEŞ'nin önlenmesinde ilgili makamlara olayı bildirmenin/raporlamanın ne kadar etkili olduęuna dair algıları ifade etmektedir. Kurumların algılanan etkililięi, seyircilerin müdahale etme niyetlerini çeşitli şekillerde etkileyebilir. Örneęin; KYEŞ'yi bildirmenin herhangi bir yarar sağlamadığını düşünenlerin müdahale etme niyeti düşük; KYEŞ'yi azaltacağını düşünenlerin müdahale niyetleri yüksek olabilir.

Çalışmalar, KYEŞ'yi önleme çabalarına daha fazla güvenen bireylerin bildirimde bulunmaya yönelik daha olumlu tutumlara sahip olduklarını göstermiştir (Felson ve ark., 2002). Yine, KYEŞ'ye ilişkin mekanizmalara duyulan yüksek güven, seyirci müdahalesi ile ilişkili bulunmuştur (Allnock ve Atkinson, 2019; Holland ve ark., 2016).

1.5 Seyirci Özellikleri ve Seyirci Müdahalesi

Çalışmada ele alınan üçüncü deęişken kategorisi seyirci özellikleridir. Bu kategori, cinsiyet, duygular, kişilik özellikleri, geçmiş şiddet deneyimleri gibi bireysel düzeydeki özellikleri kapsar (Banyard, 2011; Mainwaring ve ark., 2022). Bu çalışmada seyirci müdahalesinin önemli yordayıcı deęişkenleri olması beklenen geçmişte seyirci olma deneyimi, müdahale deneyimi ve cinsiyet deęişkenleri ele alınmıştır.

Geçmiş şiddet deneyimleri, araştırmacıların daha fazla ilgi göstermesi gereken bir deęişkendir. Partner şiddetine maruz kalan kadınların, şiddet deneyimi olmayan kadınlara kıyasla mağdurlara yardım etme olasılığı daha yüksektir (Nabi ve Horner, 2001). Başka bir çalışmada, yakın partner şiddeti ve çocuklukta istismara maruz kalmanın KYEŞ mağdurlarına yardım etmeyi yordadığı bulunmuştur (Beeble ve ark., 2008).

Bu çalışmada, katılımcılar için yaratacağı risklerin, yaratacağı faydadan fazla olabileceęi düşünülerek maruz kalınan şiddete ilişkin doğrudan soru sorulmamış ve seyirci olma deneyimine odaklanılmıştır (Peterman, 2021). Bu deneyimlerin de seyirci müdahalesi ve seyirci öz yeterlilięi ile anlamlı ilişkisi olduęu bulunmuştur (Sánchez-Prada ve ark., 2022).

Cinsiyet, seyirci davranışlarında en çok çalışılan bireysel düzeydeki değişkenlerden biridir. KYEŞ bağlamında, birçok çalışma kadınların müdahale etme olasılığının ve davranışlarının erkeklere göre daha fazla olduğunu göstermiştir (Amar ve ark., 2014; Banyard, 2008; Banyard ve Moynihan, 2011; Burn, 2009; Franklin ve ark., 2020; Hoxmeier, Acock ve ark., 2020; Hoxmeier, McMahon ve ark., 2020; Nicksa, 2013; Savage ve ark., 2017). Kadın ve erkeklerin farklı müdahale biçimlerini benimsediği yönünde çalışmalar da bulunmaktadır (örn., Holland ve ark., 2016, Palmer ve ark., 2018). Bununla birlikte, seyirci niyetlerinde veya davranışlarında kadınlar ve erkekler arasında anlamlı bir fark olmadığını gösteren çalışmalar da vardır (Banyard ve ark., 2020; Galdi ve ark., 2017; Hoxmeier ve ark., 2015; Katz ve ark., 2015).

1.6 Araştırmaya Genel Bakış ve Hipotezler

Türkiye'de de üniversite ortamında yaşanan cinsel taciz ve saldırı olayları 10 yılı aşkın bir süredir ilgi odağıdır (Ecevit ve Beşpınar, 2020). Feminist akademisyenlerin artan çabaları ve üniversiteler arasında kurdukları dayanışmayla, önemli sayıda üniversite toplumsal cinsiyete dayalı şiddete, cinsel taciz ve saldırıya karşı politika belgeleri kabul etmiştir. Bu üniversitelerden bazıları, üniversitelerde dönüştürücü adaleti sağlamak, şiddete maruz kalan kişileri (öğrenci, akademisyen, idari personel vb) desteklemek ve failleere karşı harekete geçmek için ilgili birimler de kurmuştur.

Türkiye'de, öğrencilerin KYEŞ, cinsel saldırı ve tacize yönelik tutumları üzerine çalışmalar olmasına rağmen (Sakallı-Uğurlu ve ark., 2007; Siyez ve ark., 2021; Toplu-Demirtaş ve Fincham, 2022), özellikle üniversite ortamında yaşanan KYEŞ olaylarına tanık olanların müdahalesi üzerine bir araştırma bulunmamaktadır.

Alanyazın ışığında, bu araştırmanın amacı, seyirci modeli değişkenlerinin (seyirci öz-yeterliliği, hissedilen kişisel sorumluluk), algılanan sosyal-bağlamsal faktörlerin (müdahaleye ilişkin algılanan akran normları, bildirim yapılan kurumların şiddetin önlenmesinde algılanan etkililiği) ve seyirci özelliklerinin (cinsiyet, geçmiş tanık olma veya müdahale deneyimleri) KYEŞ olaylarına müdahale etme niyetlerini öngörmedeki rolünü korelasyonel yöntemlerle araştırmaktır. Bu amaçla iki çalışma yürütülmüştür. Çalışma 1'de, Türkiye'deki üniversitelerde KYEŞ vakaları bağlamında seyirci müdahalesini incelemek için ölçekler geliştirilmiş ve bu ölçeklerin güvenilirlik ve

geçerlilikleri test edilmiştir. Çalışma 2'de ise söz konusu değişkenlerin KYEŞ olaylarına müdahale etme niyetlerini ne ölçüde yordadığı test edilmiştir.

Çalışmanın hipotezleri aşağıdaki gibidir:

H1. Daha yüksek seyirci öz-yeterliliğe sahip katılımcılar, daha düşük seyirci öz-yeterliliğine sahip katılımcılara göre KYEŞ olaylarına daha fazla müdahale etme niyetinde olacaktır.

H2. KYEŞ olaylarına müdahale etme konusunda daha fazla kişisel sorumluluk hisseden katılımcılar, daha düşük kişisel sorumluluk hisseden katılımcılara göre KYEŞ olaylarına daha fazla müdahale etme niyetinde olacaktır.

H3. KYEŞ konusunda bildirim yapılan kurumların KYEŞ'yi önleme konusunda etkililiğini daha yüksek algılayan katılımcılar, kurumların etkililiğini daha düşük algılayan katılımcılara göre daha fazla müdahale etme niyetine sahip olacaktır.

H4. KYEŞ olaylarına müdahale konusundaki akran normlarını daha destekleyici olarak algılayan katılımcılar, akran normlarını daha az destekleyici algılayan katılımcılara kıyasla daha fazla müdahale etme niyetinde olacaktır.

H5. Cinsiyet, KYEŞ olaylarına geçmişte tanık olma ve müdahale deneyimleri gibi seyirci özellikleri, seyirci müdahale niyetlerini yordamaktadır.

H5a. Kadınların KYEŞ olaylarına müdahale etme niyetleri erkeklere kıyasla daha yüksek olacaktır.

H5b. Daha önce KYEŞ'ye tanık olma ve müdahale etme deneyimleri olan katılımcılar, bu deneyimleri olmayan katılımcılara kıyasla bu olaylara daha fazla müdahale etme niyetinde olacaktır.

Ayrıca çalışmada, belirtilen çalışma değişkeni kategorilerinden hangilerinin (seyirci özellikleri, algılanan bağlamsal değişkenler ve seyirci müdahale modeli değişkenleri) bir regresyon modelinde birlikte değerlendirildiklerinde seyircilerin müdahale etme niyetlerini en güçlü şekilde yordadığını ortaya koymak amaçlanmıştır.

2. Birinci Çalışma: Üniversite Ortamlarında KYEŞ Bağlamında Seyirci Müdahalesini İncelemek Üzere Ölçeklerin Geliştirilmesi

2.1. Yöntem

Birinci çalışmada, Türkiye'deki üniversitelerde KYEŞ bağlamına odaklanan çalışma için seyircilerin müdahale etme niyeti, seyirci öz-yeterliliği, hissedilen kişisel sorumluluk, algılanan akran normları ve ilgili kurumların algılanan etkililiği ölçekleri geliştirilmiştir.

Alanyazında, seyircilerin müdahale etme niyetini (Banyard, 2008; McMahon ve ark., 2015) (Banyard, 2008; McMahon ve ark., 2015), seyirci öz-yeterliliğini (Banyard, 2008; Banyard ve ark., 2005; Banyard ve Moynihan, 2011) ve algılanan akran normlarını (Banyard ve ark., 2014) ölçmek için geliştirilmiş ölçekler bulunmaktadır. Ancak, bu ölçeklerin çoğu ABD'de üniversite kampüslerinde karşılaşılan cinsel saldırı vakaları için geliştirilmiştir (Mennicke ve ark., 2022) ve bu çalışmanın amaçlarına tam olarak yanıt vermemektedir. Bu nedenle, çalışma için Türkiye'deki üniversite bağlamlarını daha iyi kapsayabilecek yeni ölçekler geliştirilmiştir.

2.1.1 Katılımcılar

Çalışmaya 500 üniversite öğrencisi katılmıştır. Üç katılımcı hedef örneklemin bir parçası olmadığı ve biri de çalışmayı yarıda bıraktığı için çalışmadan çıkarılmıştır. 497 katılımcının 304'ü kendini kadın, 192'si erkek ve 1'i ikili cinsiyet sistemi dışında tanımlamıştır. Katılımcıların yaşları 18 ile 44 arasında değişmektedir ($Ort. = 21.83$, $SS = 3.13$). Katılımcıların çoğu %68,2 oranında lisans öğrencisidir. Katılımcılar, özel ve devlet üniversiteleri olmak üzere 70'e yakın üniversiteden öğrencilerdir. Katılımcıların detaylı demografik özellikleri Tablo 1'de görülebilir.

2.1.2 Veri Toplama Araçları

İlgili alan yazına dayanarak, her bir ölçek için örnek maddeler geliştirilmiş ve ölçeklerin kapsam geçerliliğini sağlamak için uzman görüş formları hazırlanmıştır. Bu formlar çalışmanın amacını, her bir değişkenin tanımını, ölçek yönergelerini ve maddeleri içermektedir. İçerik geçerliliğini sağlamak için formlar KYEŞ ve ölçek

geliştirme konusunda deneyimi olan 8 uzmana gönderilmiş ve uzmanlardan gelen geri bildirimlere göre ölçek maddelerinde gerekli değişiklikler yapılmıştır.

Seyircilerin Müdahale Etme Niyetleri. Araştırma kapsamında seyircilerin müdahale etme niyetleri, bireylerin şiddet eylemini önlemek için KYEŞ durumlarına müdahale etme olasılığı olarak kavramsallaştırılmıştır. Seyircilerin KYEŞ olaylarına müdahale etme niyetini ölçmek için fiziksel ve cinsel şiddet içeren 2 senaryo geliştirilmiştir. Bu senaryolar KYEŞ'nin dışarıdan açıkça fark edilebilen ve riskli biçimlerini içermektedir.

Her senaryodan sonra katılımcılara beş olası seyirci müdahale davranışı sunulmuştur. Olası seyirci davranışları, Bowes- Sperry ve O'Leary-Kelly (2006) ile McMahon ve Banyard'ın (2012) geliştirdiği çerçeveler temel alınarak hazırlanmıştır. Çalışma kapsamında, sadece olay sırasında gerçekleşen seyirci müdahale davranışları çalışmaya dahil edilmiştir. Doğrudan ve dolaylı müdahale biçimlerini içeren seyirci davranışları uzman görüşlerinden sonra 10'dan 5'e düşürülmüştür. Örnek maddeler "olayı engellemek için araya girerdim", " Olaya müdahale etmesi için durumu ilgili güvenlik birimine (kampüs güvenliği, polis, vb.) ihbar ederdim." şeklindedir.

Katılımcılar, KYEŞ senaryoları için her bir seyirci müdahalesi davranışını Likert tipi bir ölçekte (1 = asla gerçekleştirmezdim ila 6 = kesinlikle gerçekleştirirdim) derecelendirir (bkz. Ek A). Puanlar, iki senaryonun aynı numaralı maddelerindeki yanıtların ortalama puanları ile oluşturulur. Seyirci müdahalesinin toplam puanı, bu 5 maddenin ortalama puanı olarak hesaplanmıştır. Daha yüksek ortalamalar, daha yüksek seyirci müdahale niyetini göstermektedir.

Hissedilen Kişisel Sorumluluk. Çalışma kapsamında, hissedilen kişisel sorumluluk, katılımcıların kendilerini KYEŞ olaylarına müdahale etmek için bireysel olarak sorumlu hissedip hissetmemeleri durumu olarak tanımlanmıştır. Önceki araştırmalara dayanarak ölçek maddeleri oluşturulmuş ve uzmanlardan geri bildirim alındıktan sonra ölçeğe son hali verilmiştir. Örnek maddeler "Bu olaylar sırasında kadının başına geleceklerden kendimi sorumlu hissedirim" ve "Bu olayları kişilerin kendi aralarında çözmesi gerektiğini düşünürüm" şeklindedir. Her bir madde için katılımcılardan Likert tipi bir ölçek üzerinde (1 = *hiç katılmıyorum* ile 6 = *tamamen katılıyorum*) belirtilen

ifadeye ne ölçüde katıldıklarını derecelendirmeleri istenmiştir. Yedi maddeden alınan puanlar toplanmış ve ortalaması alınmıştır. Ölçekten alınan yüksek puanlar, müdahale için hissedilen daha yüksek kişisel sorumluluğa işaret etmektedir (bkz. Ek B)

Seyirci Öz-Yeterliliği. Bu çalışma kapsamında seyirci-öz yeterliliği, olası müdahale davranışlarını gerçekleştirmenin katılımcılar tarafından algılanan kolaylığı veya zorluğu anlamına gelmektedir. Seyircilerin Müdahale Niyetleri Ölçeğinde kullanılan müdahale davranışlarının aynısı (örn., olayı engellemek için kendim araya girerim), Seyirci Öz-Yeterliliği Ölçeği'nde de kullanılmış (bkz. Ek C) ve belirtilen eylemi gerçekleştirmenin kendileri için ne ölçüde zor ya da kolay olduğunu Likert tipi bir ölçekte (1 = *benim için çok zor* - 6 = *benim için çok kolay*) derecelendirmeleri istenmiştir. Ölçeğin 5 maddesinden alınan puanlar toplanmış ve ortalaması alınmıştır. Daha yüksek puanlar daha yüksek seyirci öz-yeterliliğine işaret etmektedir.

KYEŞ'ye Tanık Olma Deneyimi. KYEŞ'ye tanıklık etme konusundaki geçmiş deneyim 2 soru ile ölçülmektedir. Maddeler " Üniversitede bir erkeğin bir kadına fiziksel şiddet uyguladığına tanık oldunuz mu?" ve "Üniversitede bir erkeğin bir kadına cinsel şiddet uyguladığına tanık oldunuz mu?" şeklindedir. Sorulara verilen cevaplar toplanmış ve en az bir şiddet türüne tanık olma durumu "1" ile, hiç tanık olmama ise "0" ile kodlanmıştır (bkz. Ek F).

Geçmiş Seyirci Müdahalesi Deneyimi. "Daha önce tanık olduğunuz KYEŞ olayında şiddeti sona erdirmek veya onaylamadığınızı göstermek için herhangi bir eylemde bulundunuz mu?". Bu soruya "evet" yanıtı veren katılımcılar 1, "hayır" yanıtı veren katılımcılar ise "0" ile kodlanmıştır (Ek F).

Demografik Bilgi Formu. Katılımcıların yaşı, cinsiyeti, algılanan sosyo-ekonomik durumu, eğitim düzeyi, ilişki durumu ve yaşamının büyük bölümünü geçirdiği yer, dindarlık düzeyi ve ebeveynlerinin eğitim düzeyleri sorulmuştur (Bkz. Ek G).

2.1.3 İşlem

Veri toplamadan önce, ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu onayı alınmıştır (bkz. Ek H). Onayın ardından çalışma, farklı mecralar aracılığıyla (ör. Kuruluşların, derneklerin ve öğrencilerin mail grupları, WhatsApp grupları, çeşitli üniversitelerdeki

ve derneklerdeki çok sayıda kişiye gönderilerek vb.) duyurulmuştur. Veriler Qualtrics.com (Qualtrics, Provo, UT) aracılığıyla çevrimiçi olarak toplanmıştır.

Anketin başında katılımcılar çalışma hakkında bilgilendirilmiş ve yanıtlarının gizli tutulacağı bilgisi verilmiştir. Sadece üniversite öğrencisi olan ve onam formunu kabul edenler ankete devam edebilmiştir (bkz. Ek I). Bazı öğrenciler çalışmaya katılımları karşılığında teşvik (örn., Bonus puan) almıştır.

Anketin sonunda katılımcılara teşekkür edilmiş; çalışmanın amacı açıklanmıştır (bkz. Ek J). Son olarak, katılımcılara üniversitelerdeki ve Türkiye'deki KYŞ destek mekanizmalarının iletişim bilgileri (kadın örgütleri, Şiddet Önleme ve İzlem Merkezleri, vb.) sunulmuştur (bkz. Ek K). Anketin akışı Ek L'de görülebilir.

2.2 Bulgular

Veri Temizliği. Geliştirilen ölçeklerin faktör yapısını incelemeye önce, veriler eksik vakalar, tek değişkenli ve çok değişkenli aykırı değerlerin varlığı ve analizler için gerekli varsayımlar açısından kontrol edilmiştir. Veri temizliği sonrası analiz için 479 katılımcı kalmıştır.

Veri Analizi. Veriler IBM SPSS Statistics yazılım paketi (Sürüm 29) kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Geliştirilen her bir ölçek için Promax Rotasyonlu Temel Eksen Faktör Analizi (PAF) kullanılmıştır. Verilerin faktör analizine uygun olup olmadığını anlamak için Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Örneklem Yeterliliği Ölçütü ve Bartlett Küresellik Testi skorları incelenmiştir. Faktör sayısına ve yapılarına karar vermek için Kaiser özdeğer kriteri, yamaç birikim grafiği ve MAP Testi (Velicer's Minimum Partial Average, O'Connor, 2000) kullanılmıştır. Ölçeklerin nihai yapısına karar verdikten sonra, iç tutarlılık ve madde-toplam korelasyonları değerlendirilmiştir. Tüm örneklem için ölçeklerin ortalamaları hesaplanmıştır ve birbirleriyle korelasyonları analiz edilmiştir.

2.2.1 KYEŞ'ye Seyircilerin Müdahale Etme Niyetleri Ölçeği İçin Açıklayıcı Faktör Analizleri

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Örneklem Yeterliliği Testi (.82) ve Bartlett Küresellik Testi skorları ($\chi^2(10) = 1359.64, p < .001$) verilerin faktör analizi için uygun olduğunu

göstermiştir. Promax rotasyonu ile Temel Eksen Faktör Analizi yapılmış, yamaç birikinti grafiği ve özdeğer kriterlerine göre tek faktörden oluşan bir yapı olduğu görülmüştür. MAP Testi de tek faktörlü çözümü desteklemiştir. Tek faktörlü yapı seyircilerin müdahale etme niyetlerindeki (BII) varyansın toplam %67,14'ünü açıklamaktadır. Ölçeğin faktör yükleri ve özet istatistikleri Tablo 2'de görülebilir.

Madde-toplam korelasyon analizine göre ölçeğin madde-toplam korelasyonları .55 ile .82 arasında değişmektedir. Bu değerler en az .30 kriterini karşılamaktadır (bkz. Tabachnick ve Fidell, 2018). Seyircilerin Müdahale Niyetleri Ölçeği'nin iç tutarlılığı .88 olarak bulunmuştur, .70'ten büyük olma kriterini karşıladığından (Tabachnick ve Fidell, 2018) ölçeğin iyi bir iç tutarlılığa sahip olduğu sonucuna varılabilir.

2.2.2 Hissedilen Kişisel Sorumluluk Ölçeği için Açımlayıcı Faktör Analizleri

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Örneklem Yeterliliği Testi skoru önerilen .6 değerinin üzerinde ve .66'dır. Bartlett Küresellik Testi'nin de anlamlı çıkması ($\chi^2(21) = 531.02, p < .001$) verilerin faktör analizi için uygun olduğunu göstermiştir. Faktör analizinde özdeğerleri 1'den büyük olan 2 faktör bulunmuştur. Yamaç birikinti grafiği ve MAP testinde 1 faktör elde edilmiştir. Düşük ortak varyansa sahip ($< .40$) maddeler silinmiş ve analiz tek faktörlü çözümle tekrarlanmıştır. Ölçeğin iç tutarlılığı .64 olarak bulunmuştur. Maddeler hissedilen kişisel sorumluluk (PR) varyansının %48,88'ini açıklamakta ve madde-toplam korelasyonları .37 ile .46 arasında değişmektedir.

2.2.3 Seyirci Öz-Yeterliliği Ölçeği için Açımlayıcı Faktör Analizleri

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Örneklem Yeterliliği Testi skoru .75 olarak bulunmuş ve Bartlett Küresellik testinin anlamlı çıkması ($\chi^2(10) = 933.83, p < .001$) verilerin faktör analizi için uygun olduğunu göstermiştir. Faktör analizi, özdeğerler, yamaç birikinti grafiği, ve MAP testi sonuçları, ölçeğin tek faktörlü olduğunu ve bu faktörün tanıkların öz yeterliliğindeki (BSE) varyansın toplam 57.47'sini açıkladığını ortaya koymuştur. Seyirci Öz-Yeterliliği Ölçeğinin iç tutarlılığı ise .81'dir ve madde-toplam korelasyonları .46 ile .74 arasında değişmektedir.

2.2.4 Seyircilerin Müdahalesine İlişkin Algılanan Akran Normları Ölçeği için Açımlayıcı Faktör Analizleri

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Örneklem Yeterliliği Testi skoru (.78) ve Bartlett Küresellik Testi sonuçları ($\chi^2(21) = 1425.98, p < .001$) verilerin faktör analizi için uygun olduğunu göstermiştir.

İlk faktör analizinde ölçeğin, yamaç grafiği ve özdeğer kriterlerine göre iki faktörden oluşan bir yapıda olduğu görülmüştür. Ancak MAP testi tek faktörlü çözümle sonuçlanmıştır ve analiz tek faktörlü çözümle tekrarlanmıştır. Ortak varyans değeri çok düşük olan 2 madde çalışmadan çıkarılmıştır. Ölçeğin 5 maddeli ve tek faktörlü nihai analizi, Seyirci Müdahalesine İlişkin Algılanan Akran Normları (PPN) ölçeğindeki varyansın %58,79'unu açıklamıştır. Ölçeğin iç tutarlılığı .82'dir ve madde-toplam korelasyonları .49 ile .72 arasında değişen yüksek korelasyonlar göstermiştir.

2.2.5 Kurumların Şiddeti Önlemede Algılanan Etkililiği Ölçeği için Açımlayıcı Faktör Analizleri

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Örneklem Yeterliliği skoru (.92) ve Bartlett Küresellik Testi sonuçları ($\chi^2(21) = 2257,64, p < .001$) verilerin faktör analizi için uygun olduğunu göstermiştir. Faktör analizi, ölçeğin tek faktörlü olduğunu ve Kurumların Şiddeti Önlemede Algılanan Etkililiği'ndeki (PER) varyansın toplam 68.15'ini açıkladığını ortaya koymuştur. Yamaç birikinti grafiği, özdeğerler ve MAP testine tek faktörlü çözümü desteklemiştir. Madde-toplam korelasyonları .66 ile .81 arasında değişmektedir ve Kurumların Algılanan Etkililiği Ölçeği'nin iç tutarlılığı .92'dir.

2.2.6 Tanımlayıcı Bilgiler ve Çalışma Değişkenleri Arasındaki İlişkiler

Çalışma değişkenleri olan katılımcıların müdahale etme niyetleri (BII) ile seyirci modeli değişkenleri olan seyirci öz yeterliliği (BSE) ve hissedilen kişisel sorumluluk (PR); algılanan sosyal bağlam değişkenleri olan müdahaleye ilişkin algılanan akran normları (PPN) ve kurumların şiddeti önlemede algılanan etkililiği (PER) ve seyirci özellikleri değişkenlerinden tanık olma deneyimleri (PEoBB) ve geçmiş müdahale deneyimleri (PEoBI) arasında Pearson korelasyon katsayısı kullanılarak korelasyon analizleri yapılmıştır.

Bulgular, BII'nin BSE ($r = .70, p < .01$) ve PR ($r = .49, p < .01$) ile pozitif yönde ilişkili olduğunu göstermiştir; bu da katılımcıların seyirci öz-yeterlilikleri ve hissettikleri kişisel sorumluluk arttığında, tanık oldukları KYEŞ olaylarına müdahale niyetlerinin de arttığını göstermektedir.

KYEŞ'ye müdahale etme niyeti ile algılanan sosyal bağlamsal değişkenler arasındaki korelasyon incelendiğinde, sonuçlar hem PPN ($r = .26, p < .01$) hem de PER ($r = .10, p < .05$) ile BII arasında pozitif yönde ilişki olduğunu göstermiştir. Bu durum, katılımcıların akran normlarını daha destekleyici olarak algıladıklarında, müdahale etme niyetlerinin daha yüksek olduğunu göstermektedir. Ayrıca, katılımcılar bildirim yapılan kurumların şiddeti önlemedeki etkilerini yüksek olarak değerlendirdiklerinde müdahale etme niyetleri de yüksek olmaktadır.

BII ve PEOBB arasındaki ilişki analiz edildiğinde, sonuçlar BII ile üniversitede bir KYEŞ olayına tanık olma arasında anlamlı bir ilişki olmadığını göstermiştir. Ancak 480 katılımcının sadece 24'ü üniversitelerinde KYEŞ olayına tanık olduğunu belirtmiştir. Bu nedenle sonuç dikkate alınmamalıdır.

Ayrıca, BII ile PEOBI arasında pozitif yönde bir ilişki vardır, bu da diğer bağlamlarda müdahale etme deneyimine sahip katılımcıların üniversitelerindeki KYEŞ olaylarına müdahale etme niyetlerinin daha yüksek olduğunu göstermektedir. Tanımlayıcı istatistikler ve değişkenler arasındaki korelasyonlar Tablo 8'de görülebilir.

2.3 Sonuç

Çalışma 1, araştırma amacına uygun, güvenilir ve geçerli ölçekler geliştirmek amacıyla yürütülmüştür. Seyircilerin müdahale etme niyetleri (BII), seyirci öz-yeterliliği, hissedilen kişisel sorumluluk, seyirci müdahalesine ilişkin algılanan akran normları, bildirim yapılan kurumların şiddeti önlemede algılanan etkililiği ölçekleri geliştirilmiştir. Hissedilen Kişisel Sorumluluk Ölçeği hariç tüm ölçeklerin iyi bir iç tutarlılığa sahip olduğu bulunmuştur.

Çalışmada, üniversite ortamında KYEŞ'ye tanık olma yaygınlık oranlarının çok düşük bulunması nedeniyle, PEOBB'nin Çalışma 2'de benzer oranlarda bulunabileceği düşünülerek analizlere dahil edilmemesi planlanmıştır.

3. İkinci Çalışma: Üniversite Ortamında KYEŞ'ye Tanık Olanların Müdahale Etme Niyetlerini Yordayan Değişkenlerin İncelenmesi

Çalışma 2'de temel amaç, tezin hipotezlerini test etmek ve seyirci modeli değişkenlerinin (seyirci öz-yeterliliği, hissedilen kişisel sorumluluk), algılanan sosyal-bağlamsal faktörlerin (müdahaleye ilişkin algılanan akran normları, kurumların şiddetin önlenmesinde algılanan etkililiği) ve seyirci özelliklerinin (cinsiyet, tanık olma deneyimleri ve KYEŞ'ye geçmiş müdahale etme deneyimleri), KYEŞ'ye tanık olanların olaya müdahale etme niyetlerini yordamadaki rolünü araştırmaktır. Ayrıca, değişken kategorilerinden hangilerinin bir regresyon modelinde birlikte ele alındıklarında tanıkların müdahale etme niyetini en güçlü şekilde yordadığını ortaya koymak amaçlanmıştır.

3.1 Yöntem

3.1.1 Katılımcılar

Beş yüz kırk üç katılımcı çalışmaya katılmıştır. Hedef örneklemin bir parçası olmayan ve çalışmayı tamamlamadan ayrılan katılımcılar çıkarıldığında 526 katılımcı (320 kadın ve 206 erkek) kalmıştır. Katılımcıların yaşları 18 ile 44 arasında değişmektedir ($Ort. = 21.77$, $SS = 3.05$). Katılımcıların çoğunluğunu Türkiye'nin çok çeşitli üniversitelerinden lisans öğrencileri oluşturmaktadır (%70,9). Katılımcıların büyük bölümü (%52) yaşamlarının çoğunu büyükşehirde, %25'i ilde, %15,9'u ilçede ve %7'si köy veya kasabada geçirmiştir. Katılımcıların detaylı demografik profili Tablo 8'de görülebilir.

3.1.2 Veri Toplama Araçları

Veri toplama araçları, Çalışma 1'de açılımcı faktör analizleri sonrasında son halleri verilmiş olan Seyircilerin Müdahale Etme Niyetleri, Hissedilen Kişisel Sorumluluk, Seyirci Öz-Yeterliliği, Seyirci Müdahalesine İlişkin Algılanan Akran Normları, Bildirim Yapılan Kurumların Algılanan Etkililiği ölçeklerinden ve KYEŞ'ye geçmiş seyirci olma deneyimi, geçmiş seyirci müdahalesi deneyimlerine ilişkin sorular ve demografik bilgi formundan oluşmaktadır. Ölçeklerin Çalışma 2'de hesaplanan Cronbach Alfa iç

tutarlılık katsayıları Tablo 9'da görülebilir. Ayrıca ters maddeler, çıkarılmış maddeler ve ölçeklerin son halleri Ekler bölümünde görülebilir (Ek A-Ek G).

3.1.3 İşlem

Veri toplamadan önce, ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu'ndan etik kurul onayı alınmıştır (bkz. Ek H). Çalışma, tanıkların müdahalesi hakkında çevrimiçi bir çalışma olarak farklı ortamlarda duyurulmuştur. Bilgilendirilmiş onam onaylandıktan sonra, tüm katılımcılara önce sırasıyla senaryolar, ardından seyirci müdahale niyeti ölçekleri ve sonrasında diğer ölçekler uygulanmıştır. Çalışma akışı Ek L'de görülebilir. Anketin sonunda katılımcılara teşekkür edilmiş ve çalışmanın amacı açıklanmıştır (bkz. Ek J). Son olarak, üniversitelerdeki ve Türkiye'deki KYŞ destek mekanizmalarının iletişim bilgileri (kadın örgütleri, yardım hatları, vb.) sunulmuştur (bkz. Ek K).

3.2 Bulgular

Veri Temizliği. Çalışmanın hipotezlerini test etmeden önce, veriler tek değişkenli ve çok değişkenli aykırı değerlerin varlığı ve varsayımlar açısından kontrol edilmiştir. Anketi kısa sürede tamamlayan, açık uçlu sorulara anlamsız cevaplar veren ve aynı sıradaki cevapları seçen 8 katılımcı çalışmadan çıkarılmıştır.

Kalan veriler ($N = 518$) tek değişkenli aykırı değerler, çok değişkenli aykırı değerler ve çoklu regresyon varsayımları açısından kontrol edilmiştir. Tek değişkenli aykırı değerler için Tabachnick ve Fidell (2018) tarafından önerildiği gibi $\pm 3,29$ z-skorumları kriteri kullanılmış ve BII değişkeninde 2, BSE'de 1 ve PR'de 5 katılımcı çalışmadan çıkarılmıştır. Değişkenlerin çoğunun negatif çarpık olduğu görülmüştür. Ancak çarpıklık ve basıklık değerleri BII hariç orta düzeydedir. İlk olarak, bağımlı değişken için log dönüşümü uygulanmış, çarpıklıkta bir iyileşme olmasına rağmen basıklık kötüleşmiştir. Analiz sonuçlarının dönüştürülmüş değişkenle değişmediği görülmüş, dolayısıyla herhangi bir dönüşüm uygulanmadan analiz yapılmıştır.

Çok değişkenli aykırı değerleri tespit etmek için Mahalonobis mesafesi $p < .001$ kriteri (Tabachnick ve Fidell, 2018) ile belirlenen 1 katılımcı ve yüksek Cook uzaklığı (Cook's distance) ve Leverage değerleri nedeniyle 3 katılımcı çalışmadan çıkarılmıştır. Analiz için 506 katılımcı kalmıştır.

Yordayıcı deęişkenler arasındaki çoklu doğrusallık, korelasyonlar ve varyans artış faktörleri (VIF) hesaplanarak incelenmiştir. Yordayıcı deęişkenler arasında en yüksek korelasyon .45'tir ve VIF deęerleri 1.02 ile 1.5 arasında ve 5'ten küçüktür (Alauddin ve Son Ngheim, 2010). Sonuçlar, yordayıcı deęişkenler arasında çoklu doğrusal bir ilişkinin olmadığını göstermiştir.

Veri Analizi. Veriler IBM SPSS Statistics yazılım paketi (Sürüm 29) kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Ölçeklerin iç tutarlılıkları, tüm örneklem için ölçeklerin ortalama puanları hesaplanmış ve çalışma deęişkenleri arasındaki korelasyonlar analiz edilmiştir.

Daha sonra, çalışmanın hipotezlerini test etmek için, Adım 1'de seyirci özellikleri (cinsiyet ve geçmiş seyirci müdahalesi deneyimleri), Adım 2'de algılanan bağlamsal deęişkenler (müdahaleye ilişkin algılanan akran normları ve kurumların algılanan etkililięi) ve Adım 3'te seyirci modeli deęişkenleri (seyirci öz-yeterlilięi ve hissedilen kişisel sorumluluk) ile seyircilerin müdahale niyetleri üzerinde hiyerarşik regresyon analizi yapılmıştır.

3.2.1 Tanımlayıcı Bilgiler ve Korelasyon Analizleri

Çalışma deęişkenleri arasındaki ilişkileri incelemek için korelasyon analizi yapılmıştır. Tablo 9'da görüldüğü üzere, üniversite öğrencilerinin çoğunluğu üniversite bağlamında KYEŞ durumlarına yüksek müdahale etme niyetine sahiptir (*Ort.* = 4.93, *SS* = .87). Ayrıca, kadınların KYEŞ olaylarına müdahale etme niyetleri erkeklerden yüksektir. Aynı şekilde, daha önce müdahale deneyimi olan (üniversite bağlamıyla sınırlı olmayan) öğrencilerin müdahale etme niyetleri, müdahale deneyimi olmayan öğrencilerden daha yüksektir ($r = .17, p < .01$).

Katılımcılar genel olarak yüksek seyirci öz-yeterlilięine sahiptir (*Ort.* = 4.64, *SS* = .94) ve yüksek öz-yeterlilik puanları yüksek müdahale niyetleri ile pozitif yönde ilişkilidir ($r = .69, p < .01$). Bununla birlikte, erkeklerin ve kadınların seyirci öz-yeterlilik puanlarında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir fark yoktur.

Katılımcılar seyirci müdahalesine ilişkin yüksek kişisel sorumluluk ($Ort. = 4.69, SS = .81$) bildirmiştir ve daha yüksek kişisel sorumluluk yüksek müdahale niyetiyle pozitif yönde ilişkilidir ($r = .50, p < .01$).

Katılımcıların çoğu akran normlarını müdahaleyi destekleyici olarak algılamaktadır ($Ort. = 4.75, SS = .89$) ve müdahaleyi destekleyen akran normları seyirci müdahale niyeti ($r = .31, p < .01$) ve hissedilen kişisel sorumluluk ($r = .45, p < .01$) ile pozitif yönde ilişkilidir. Ayrıca, erkekler akran normlarını, kadınlara kıyasla daha az destekleyici algılamaktadır ($r = -.15, p < .01$). Daha önce müdahale deneyimi olan katılımcıların müdahale etme niyetleri de daha yüksektir ($r = .17, p < .01$).

Genel olarak, katılımcılar kurumların şiddeti önlemede algılanan etkililiği konusunda yüksek puan almışlardır ve bu durum seyirci müdahalesi ($r = .10, p < .05$) ve seyirci öz-yeterliliği ($r = .13, p < .01$) ile pozitif yönde ilişkilidir. Kurumların şiddeti önlemede etkililiği ve seyirci müdahalesine ilişkin algılanan akran normları arasında anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmamıştır. Kurumların algılanan etkililiğinde cinsiyet farkı bulunmamıştır.

Çalışma 1'in bulgularına paralel olarak, Çalışma 2'de sadece 14 katılımcı üniversitelerinde KYEŞ'ye tanık olduklarını bildirmiştir. Bu nedenle, bu değişken çalışma dışı bırakılmıştır. Herhangi bir bağlamda seyirci müdahalesi deneyimleri incelendiğinde, katılımcıların %28'i (142 katılımcı) daha önce KYEŞ'ye müdahale deneyimleri olduğunu bildirmiştir.

3.2.2 Seyircilerin Müdahale Etme Niyetlerini Yordayan Değişkenler: Hiyerarşik Regresyon Analizi

Adım 1'de yordayıcı değişken olarak seyirci özellikleri, Adım 2'de algılanan bağlamsal değişkenler ve Adım 3'te seyirci modeli değişkenleri girilerek tanıkların KYEŞ olaylarına müdahale niyetini yordamak için hiyerarşik regresyon analizi yapılmıştır. Analizin sonuçları Tablo 10'da sunulmuştur.

Seyirci özellikleri (cinsiyet ve geçmiş müdahale deneyimleri) ilk adımda girilmiştir. Sonuçlar, regresyon modelinin istatistiksel olarak anlamlı olduğunu göstermiştir, $F(2,503) = 9.668, p < .001, R^2_{adj} = .03$ ve seyirci özellikleri müdahale etme niyetinde sadece %3.3'lük bir varyansı açıklamaktadır.

Cinsiyet yordayıcı değişkeni müdahale etme niyetlerini anlamlı olarak yordamaktadır $t(503) = -2.247$ ($\beta = -.10, p = .03$) ile %95 GA'da $[-.33, -.02]$ ve kadın olmanın daha yüksek seyirci müdahalesini yordadığını göstermektedir. PEOBI, $t(503) = 3.587$ ($\beta = .16, p < .001$) ve %95 GA $[.14, .47]$ ile anlamlı olup, daha önce seyirci müdahalesi deneyimi olan katılımcıların KYEŞ vakalarına müdahale etme niyetlerinin daha yüksek olduğunu göstermektedir.

Adım 2'de algılanan sosyal bağlamsal yordayıcı değişkenlerinin eklenmesi, açıklanan varyansta anlamlı ancak küçük bir artışa yol açmıştır, $\Delta R^2 = .09, \Delta F(2,501) = 26.071, p < .001$. ve seyircilerin müdahale etme niyetindeki %9'luk varyansı açıklamıştır.

Modelde, algılanan akran normları $t(501) = 6.806$ ($\beta = .30, p < .001$) ile %95 GA'da $[.20, .37]$ anlamlıdır ve daha teşvik edici olarak algılanan akran normlarına sahip katılımcıların KYEŞ'ye müdahale etme niyetlerinin daha yüksek olduğunu göstermektedir.

Bildirim yapılan kurumların algılanan etkililiği $t(501) = 2.199$ ($\beta = .09, p = .03$) ile anlamlı bulunmuştur. R^2 değerleri, PPN'nin seyircilerin müdahale etme niyetindeki %8,2'lik varyansı tek başına yordadığını, PER'nin ise varyansın yalnızca %0,8'ini açıkladığını göstermiştir.

Adım 3'te seyirci modeli değişkenlerinin eklenmesiyle, açıklanan varyansta anlamlı bir artış olmuştur, $\Delta R^2 = .42, \Delta F(2, 499) = 229.534, p < .001$ ve değişkenler müdahale etme niyetindeki %42'lik varyansı açıklamıştır. Seyirci öz-yeterliliği ve kişisel sorumluluk anlamlı yordayıcı değişkenlerdir. Seyirci öz-yeterliliği $t(499) = 17.320$ ($\beta = .61, p < .001$) ve %95 GA $[.50, .63]$ ile anlamlı olup, seyirci öz-yeterliliği yüksek olan katılımcıların KYEŞ vakalarına müdahale etme niyetlerinin daha yüksek olacağını göstermektedir. Kişisel sorumluluk duygusu $t(499) = 5.981$ ($\beta = .22, p < .001$) %95 GA'da $[.16, .32]$ anlamlı bulunmuştur.

Nihai model, seyircilerin müdahale etme niyetindeki varyasyonun yaklaşık %54'ünü açıklamıştır: $R^2_{adj} = .54, F(6,505) = 99.907, p < .001$. Nihai modelde, diğer tüm yordayıcı değişkenler kontrol edildiğinde, cinsiyetin de %95 GA $[-.31, -.08]$ $t(499) = -3.390$ ($\beta = -.11, p = .001$) anlamlı olduğu görülmüştür. Bununla birlikte, nihai modelde algılanan bağlamsal faktörlerin regresyon katsayıları (hem algılanan akran

normları hem de bildirim yapılan kurumların algılanan etkililiği) istatistiksel olarak anlamlı değildir.

4. Tartışma

4.1 Seyirci Özelliklerinin Rolü

Çalışmaların çoğunluğu, kadınların tanık oldukları KYEŞ olaylarına müdahale etme niyetlerinin erkeklerden daha yüksek olduğunu göstermiştir (Banyard, 2008; Banyard ve Moynihan, 2011; Burn, 2009; Franklin ve ark., 2017; Hoxmeier ve ark., 2018; Hoxmeier, Acock ve ark., 2020; Hoxmeier, McMahon ve ark., 2020; Savage ve ark., 2017). Mevcut çalışmada da korelasyon analizi kadınların erkeklere kıyasla daha yüksek müdahale niyetine sahip olduğunu göstermiştir. Ayrıca, hiyerarşik regresyon analizi, kadın olmanın daha yüksek müdahale niyetini yordadığını göstermiştir.

Çalışmada amaçlardan biri, seyirci olma deneyimi ile seyircilerin müdahale etme niyetleri arasındaki ilişkiyi araştırmaktır. Hem Çalışma 1'de hem de Çalışma 2'de, çok az sayıda katılımcı üniversitelerinde bu tür olaylara tanık olduklarını bildirmiştir. Dolayısıyla, çalışmada bu hipotez araştırılamamıştır. Mevcut çalışmada bulunan üniversite bağlamındaki düşük tanıklık oranları, hatırlama etkisinden veya üniversitelerde KYEŞ'nin düşük yaygınlık oranlarından olabilir, ancak diğer araştırmalar KYEŞ oranlarının üniversitelerde yüksek olduğuna işaret etmektedir (Siyez ve ark., 2021; Toplu-Demirtaş ve Fincham, 2022). Bu çalışmadaki düşük yaygınlık nedenleri, dışarıdan kolaylıkla fark edebilecek şiddet biçimlerinin, kamusal alanda değil kimsenin tanık olamayacağı özel alanlarda gerçekleşmiş olması veya katılımcıların şiddet emarelerini fark edemeyişi olabilir.

Geçmiş şiddete maruz kalma öyküsü ve seyirci müdahalesi arasındaki ilişki iyi çalışılmış olsa da (Reynolds-Tylus ve ark., 2019), geçmiş seyirci müdahalesi deneyimleri alanyazında ayrıntılı olarak araştırılmamıştır. Sınırlı sayıda çalışma, önceki seyirci müdahalesi deneyimlerinin seyirci davranışı veya niyetleri üzerindeki rolünü incelemiştir (Banyard ve ark., 2005; Bell ve ark., 1995; Laner ve ark., 2001; Nicksa, 2011). Önceki çalışmalarda, geçmiş müdahale etme deneyimleri genellikle seyirci niyetlerinin veya seyirci davranışlarının bir yordayıcısı olarak değil, seyirci davranışları ve tutum ilişkilerini keşfetmek (Moynihan ve ark., 2010) ya da eğitim

programlarının etkilliğini deęerlendirmek için (Nicksa, 2011) bir sonu deęiřkeni olarak kullanılmıřtır.

Laner ve arkadaşları (2001) seyirci mdahalesi deneyimi ile mdahale etme niyetleri arasında anlamlı bir iliřki bulmuřtur. Benzer řekilde, Nicksa (2011) nceki deneyim ile seyirci davranıřları arasında anlamlı ancak zayıf bir iliřki bulmuřtur. Bu alıřmada da gemiř mdahale deneyimi olan katılımcıların dięer katılımcılara gre daha fazla mdahale etme niyetinde olduęu bulunmuřtur. Bununla birlikte, hiyerarřik modelin son basamaęında, gemiř deneyimin etkisi istatistiksel olarak anlamlı deęildir.

Katılımcıların daha nceki mdahaleleri sonucunda karřılařtıkları tepkiler, gelecekte mdahale etme kararlarını ve niyetlerini etkileyebilir (Moschella ve ark., 2018; Moschella ve Banyard, 2020; Seo ve ark., 2022). Gelecek alıřmalarda mdahale deneyimlerine iliřkin algı ve duygular ayrıntılı olarak incelenmelidir.

4.2 Algılanan Baęlamsal Deęiřkenlerin Rol

nceki bulgular, akranlar mdahaleyi destekledięinde ve seyirciler byle bir durumda akranlarının da mdahale edeceęini dřndęnde, mdahale etme olasılıęının daha yksek olduęunu gstermiřtir (Banyard ve ark., 2014; Reynolds-Tylus ve ark., 2019; Savage ve ark., 2017). Bu alıřmada, KYEŐ olaylarına mdahale konusundaki akran normlarını daha destekleyici olarak algılayan katılımcıların akran normlarını daha az destekleyici olarak algılayan katılımcılara kıyasla daha fazla mdahale etme niyetinde olacacaęı varsayılmıřtır.

Korelasyon analizi nceki bulguları desteklemiřtir. Ayrıca, hiyerarřik regresyon analizi de algılanan akran normlarının daha yksek seyirci niyetlerini anlamlı bir řekilde yordadıęına iřaret etmiřtir. Ancak, z-yeterlilik ve sorumluluk duygusu ile birlikte ele alındıęında (son modelde), algılanan akran normları anlamsız hale gelmiřtir.

Kurumların algılanan etkililięi ile iliřki olarak alanyazında, KYEŐ'den sorumlu mekanizmalara olan gvenin, seyirci mdahalesi ile pozitif ynde iliřkili olduęu bulunmuřtur (Allnock ve Atkinson, 2019; Holland ve ark., 2016). Korelasyon analizi, kurumların algılanan etkinlięi ile seyirci mdahalesi arasında zayıf ancak anlamlı bir

ilişki olduğunu göstermiştir. Katılımcılar, resmi kurumların kadına yönelik şiddeti azaltabileceğini veya önleyebileceğini düşündüklerinde, KYEŞ'ye müdahale etme olasılıkları daha yüksektir. Bununla birlikte, hiyerarşik regresyon analizin nihai modelinde, kurumların algılanan etkilliği, müdahale etme niyetleri üzerinde istatistiksel olarak anlamlı değildir.

Mevcut çalışmada, kurumların algılanan etkinliği, müdahalenin yalnızca bir boyutunu kapsamaktadır: yetkililere bildirme/ raporlama. Ayrıca, üniversite/kampüs mekanizmalarına odaklanmak yerine, daha geniş bir çerçevede şiddetin önlenmesinde rolleri olan yetkililer kapsamıştır. Bu kavramsallaştırma, seyirci niyetleri ile zayıf ilişkilere yol açmış olabilir. Gelecek çalışmalarda doğrudan üniversite yetkililerinin etkililiği veya onlara duyulan güvenin araştırılması uygun olur.

Özetle, hiyerarşik regresyon analizi, nihai modelde bağlamsal değişkenlerin seyirci niyetlerini yordamadaki önemini yitirdiğini göstermiştir. KYEŞ konusunda resmi/kurumsal müdahale esastır çünkü önleme koruma, kovuşturma ve politika oluşturma gibi geniş çerçevede ve etkili müdahaleyi içerir (İstanbul Sözleşmesi, 2011). Bu da fail için yasal sonuçlar ve mağdur için destek çalışmalarını beraberinde getirir. Bununla birlikte, bu unsurlarda geriye gidüş yaşandığı durumlarda; seyirci modeli değişkenlerine odaklanmak ve en azından öğrencilerin bu konulardaki sorumluluk duygusunu ve öz-yeterliliğini artırmak, şiddete maruz kalanların desteksiz kalmamasını sağlayabilir.

4.3 Seyirci Müdahale Modeli Değişkenlerinin Rolü

Seyirci modeli değişkenleri arasında, kişisel sorumluluk ve seyirci öz-yeterliliği yaygın olarak araştırılmıştır (Banyard ve ark., 2021; Bennett ve ark., 2014; Burn, 2009, Katz ve ark., 2015). Mevcut çalışmada, katılımcılar müdahaleye ilişkin yüksek kişisel sorumluluk bildirmiştir.

Önceki araştırmalar, daha az sorumluluk hisseden katılımcıların daha düşük düzeyde müdahale niyeti bildirdiklerini göstermiştir (Banyard ve ark., 2021; Bennett ve ark., 2014; Burn, 2009; Katz ve ark., 2015). Buna paralel olarak, mevcut çalışmada, daha fazla sorumluluk hisseden katılımcıların, daha az sorumluluk hissedenlere göre daha fazla müdahale etme niyetinde olacağı varsayılmıştır. Korelasyonel analiz bulguları

önceki çalışmaları desteklemiştir. Hiyerarşik regresyon analizine göre, daha yüksek kişisel sorumluluk duygusu daha yüksek seyirci niyetlerini öngörmektedir ve nihai modelde (öz-yeterlilikten sonra) ikinci önemli değişkendir.

Öz-yeterliliğe ilişkin bulgular değerlendirildiğinde, bireyler müdahale konusunda kendilerine güveniyor ve müdahalenin zor olmadığını düşünüyorlarsa müdahale etmeye daha istekli olmaktadır (Banyard, 2008; Banyard ve ark., 2007; Banyard ve Moynihan, 2011; Frye, 2007; Hoxmeier ve ark., 2018; Lazarus ve Signal, 2013; Savage ve ark., 2017). Seyirci öz-yeterliliği ile müdahale etme arasında pozitif yönde anlamlı bir ilişki vardır (Pazienza ve ark., 2022).

Bu çalışmada, daha yüksek düzeyde seyirci öz-yeterliliğine sahip katılımcıların, daha düşük düzeyde öz-yeterliliğe sahip olanlara kıyasla daha fazla müdahale etme niyetinde olacağı varsayılmıştır. Hiyerarşik regresyon analizinde yüksek seyirci öz-yeterliliği, yüksek müdahaleyi öngörmekte ve seyircilerin niyetlerindeki varyansı büyük ölçüde açıklamaktadır. Seyirci modeli değişkenleri, seyirci müdahalesini yordamada algılanan bağlamsal ve seyirci özelliklerinin ötesinde anlamlı varyans açıklamıştır.

4.4 Çalışmanın Sınırlılıkları

Mevcut çalışmanın bazı sınırlılıkları vardır. İlk olarak, seyirci davranışının doğrudan ölçülmesi pratik olmadığından ve birçok etik sorunu beraberinde getirdiğinden, bağımlı değişken olarak seyircilerin müdahale etme niyetleri seçilmiştir. Bunu ölçmek için katılımcılara varsayımsal senaryolar sunulmuş ve sonrasında öz-bildirime dayalı ölçekler kullanılmıştır. Öz-bildirim ölçümleri sosyal istenirlik yanlılığı riski taşımaktadır (Paulhus, 2017). Bununla birlikte müdahale etme niyetlerinin gerçek davranışa dönüşüp dönüşmeyeceği de belirsizdir. Her ne kadar niyetler davranışların öncülleri olarak kavramsallaştırılmış olsa da (Ajzen, 1991), "niyet-davranış tutarlılığı" sosyal psikolojide hala tartışmalı bir konudur (Morwitz ve Munz, 2021; Sheeran, 2002; Sutton, 1998; Webb ve Sheeran, 2006).

Bir diğer kısıtlama ise bağımsız değişkenlerden biri olan "geçmiş seyirci müdahalesi deneyiminin" tek bir "evet" ya da "hayır" sorusuyla değerlendirilmiş olmasıdır. Tek maddeli ölçümler geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik sorunlarına yol açsa da bazı araştırmacılar

çoklu maddelerle yüksek korelasyonlar gösterdikleri için tek maddelerin kullanımını onaylamaktadır (Hoepfner ve ark., 2011). Ayrıca, evet ve hayır şeklinde cevaplanması, cevabın niteliği ve niceliği açısından bir kısıtlılık taşımaktadır.

Bir diğer sınırlama ise çalışmada standartlaştırılmış ölçeklerin kullanılmamasıdır. Ölçekler ilk defa mevcut çalışmada kullanılmak üzere geliştirilmiştir. Bu, bulguların güvenilirliği konusunda endişelere yol açabilir. Ayrıca, hissedilen kişisel sorumluluk ölçeğinin iç tutarlılığı düşüktür. Bu durum ölçeğin az sayıda madde içermesinden ve hissedilen sorumluluğun şiddetin sonuçlarına ve müdahale etmeye ilişkin sorumluluklar olarak ayrışmasından kaynaklanmış olabilir. Gelecek çalışmalarda hissedilen sorumluluk ölçeği için yeni maddeler geliştirilmesi ve kavramsal olarak daha açık ve çok boyutlu olarak ele alınması uygun olur.

Son olarak, çalışmada olası seyirci müdahaleleri tüm boyutlarıyla analiz edilmemiştir. Gelecek çalışmalarda doğrudan ve dolaylı müdahale davranışlarını daha geniş kapsamda ve ayrıştırarak ele almak seyirci davranışlarını daha detaylı olarak anlamak için gereklidir.

4.5 Çalışmanın Katkıları ve Gelecek Çalışmalar için Öneriler

Bu çalışma, farklı bağlamlarda test edilmiş ve seyirci müdahalesini öngörmede rolü olduğu görülmüş seyirci modeli değişkenlerinin, Türkiye’de üniversite bağlamında da önemli olduğunu göstermiştir. Hissedilen kişisel sorumluluk ve seyirci öz-yeterliliği seyirci müdahalesinin en önemli yordayıcı değişkenleri olarak bulunmuştur. Gelecek araştırmalarda, öz-yeterlilik ve sorumluluğun artırılmasında KYEŞ’ye ilişkin bilgi, tutumlar, mitler, mağdur suçlayıcılık, namus kültürü ve daha geniş kültürel normlar gibi olası değişkenlerin rolünün incelenmesi hem önleyici programların geliştirilmesi hem de farklı bağlamlara ilişkin bilgi vermesi açısından katkı sağlayabilir.

Çalışma kapsamında değişkenler arasındaki dolaylı etkiler araştırılmamış olsa da, sosyal bağlama ilişkin faktörlerin anlamlı etkisinin seyirci modeli yordayıcı değişkenleri modele eklendiğinde istatistiksel olarak etkisini kaybettiğini gösteren hiyerarşik regresyon analizi, değişkenler arasındaki dolaylı etkilere işaret etmektedir. Seyirci modeli değişkenleri, algılanan bağlamsal değişkenler ile seyircilerin müdahale etme niyetleri arasındaki ilişkiye aracılık edebilir.

Bu çalışma, üniversiteler bağlamındaki faktörleri anlamamızı sağlarken, genel popülasyondan örneklerle yapılacak çalışmalar, daha geniş toplum tutumlarının anlaşılmasını sağlayacaktır. Alanyazına katkılarının yanında, çalışmanın bulguları, şiddetten arınmış bir üniversite kültürü oluşturmak için müdahale programları geliştirmek amacıyla kullanılabilir. Mevcut çalışmanın, önleme çabalarında şiddete tanıklık eden kişilerin rollerine dikkat çekmesi ve olası güvenli seyirci müdahale davranışlarının uygulanabilirliği konusundaki tartışmaların yolunu açması umulmaktadır (McMahon ve Banyard, 2012).

APPENDIX N: CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Name- Surname **EZGI TÜRKÇELİK TÜRKEL**
Address Baskent University
Woman Child Health and Family Planning Research and
Implementation Center (BUWCRIC)
Yukarı Bahçelievler Mah. Şehit Temel Kuğuoğlu Sok.
No:38/9
Çankaya/Ankara
E-mail eturkcelik@baskent.edu.tr, ezgiturkcelik@gmail.com

EDUCATION

2012 - ongoing **Middle East Technical University, Turkey**
Social Psychology Ph.D. Programme
Department of Psychology

2010 **Lund University, Sweden**
International Master's Programme in Gender Studies (with
a Major of Gender Studies)
M.S. (Pass with Distinction)

2008 **Middle East Technical University, Turkey**
Gender and Women's Studies Master Program
(*left the program to continue my education at Lund
University*)

2006 **Middle East Technical University, Turkey**
Department of Psychology
B.S

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

*September 2013-
present* **Baskent University Department of Public Health,
Medical Faculty**
Instructor

*February 2011-
present* **Baskent University Woman-Child Health and Family
Planning Research and Implementation Center
(BUWCRIC)**

April 2022-present Gender Specialist
Deputy Director

April 2008 - July 2008 **Women's Shelter of Çankaya Municipality / Ankara**
Psychologist

INTERNSHIPS

September 2005 - January 2006 **The Solidarity Association of Patients with Schizophrenia and Their Relatives**
Intern psychologist

June 2005 - August 2005 **Gülhane Military Medical Academy**
Intern psychologist

SCHOLARSHIPS

August 2008 - June 2010 **The Swedish Institute Scholarship, Lund Sweden**

May 28 - 30, 2013 **Women Deliver Young Activist Scholarship, Kuala Lumpur**

PROJECT & TRAINING EXPERIENCE

March - May 2022 **Development of Monitoring Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights Training Module**
Sexual And Reproductive Health and Rights Platform
Turkey (CISU Platform)
Trainer

February - March 2022 **Development of Gender Equality in Access to Health Services Mapping and Monitoring Training Module**
Gender Equality Monitoring Association (CEİD)
Strengthening Participatory Democracy in Turkey:
Gender Equality Monitoring Project Phase II
Trainer (with Prof. Dr. Ayşe Akın)

June - September 2020 **Gender Equality in Access to Health Services Mapping and Monitoring Study - Update (2017-2020)**
Gender Equality Monitoring Association (CEİD)
Strengthening Participatory Democracy in Turkey:
Gender Equality Monitoring Project Phase II
Thematic expert (with Prof. Dr. Ayşe Akın)

July 2017 - December 2018 **Gender Equality in Access to Health Services Mapping and Monitoring Study**
Strengthening Participatory Democracy in Turkey:
Gender Equality Monitoring Project

Thematic expert (with Prof. Dr. Ayşe Akın)

**September 2018 -
May 2019**

Preventing Child Marriages Project: Nevşehir Model
In cooperation with UNFPA, financial support from Sabancı Foundation

Project Coordinator

**4 - 7 December
2016**

Building Bridges of Life for the Women Survivors of Domestic Violence in Azerbaijan- Women's Shelter Staff Training (2) (financed by UN Women)

Azerbaijan Young Lawyers Union, State Committee for Family, Women and Children's Affairs, Azerbaijan Lawyers Confederation.

Trainer

July 2016

Building Bridges of Life for the Women Survivors of Domestic Violence in Azerbaijan- Women's Shelter Staff Training (1) (financed by UN Women)

Azerbaijan Young Lawyers Union, State Committee for Family, Women and Children's Affairs, Azerbaijan Lawyers Confederation

Trainer

**6 May 2016 –
15 June 2016**

Training for Healthcare Professionals in Strengthening Health System Responses to Gender-based Violence (GBV) in Azerbaijan.

UNFPA and Azerbaijan Ministry of Health cooperation
June 6-11 (5 days training)

Trainer

**February 2014 -
December 2015**

Combating VAW through Prevention and Support:

Project for Strengthening Capacity of Women's NGOs in Implementation of Prevention and Support Measures for Combating VAW in Turkey

(financed by the European Union and Republic of Turkey)

Internationale Bund, BUWCRIC & Nilüfer Woman-Child Center

Project Assistant and Working Group Expert

**January 2013 -
October 2013**

Gender Awareness and Strengthening Social and Economic Status of Women Victims of Domestic Violence in Azerbaijan Project

(UNFPA & Azerbaijan Lawyers Confederation)

Trainer

Preparation of guidebook for Staff of Support Center,
Healthcare Services and Law Enforcement

- Training of Support Center Staff (July 15-19, 2013,
Baku).

- Healthcare Professionals Training (September 8-10,
2013, Kachmaz)

- Training for Law Enforcement Officers (September
11-13, 2013, Kachmaz)

COURSES OFFERED

*September 2013 to
present*

Gender ve Violence Against Women
(Elective Course open for all Baskent University
students)

Baskent University Department of Public Health,
Medical Faculty

Term 1:

Gender and Health

Term 4:

Factors Affecting Women's Health and Gender

Violence against Women and Children

Epidemiology of Community Mental Health

Term 6:

Gender, Health and Violence Against Women

PUBLICATIONS

Akın, A. ve **Türkçelik Türkel, E.** (2020). Sağlık Hizmetlerine Erişimde Toplumsal Cinsiyet Eşitliği Haritalama ve İzleme Çalışması: 2017-2020 Güncellemesi. [Gender Equality in Access to Health Services Mapping and Monitoring Study - (2017-2020) Update]. ISBN: 978-625-7666-01-5

Türkçelik Türkel, E. ve Çiçekoğlu M. (2020). Toplumsal Cinsiyet Eşitliği: Gelişmeler ve Sorun Alanları. S. Üner, P. Okyay (Ed.), *Türkiye Sağlık Raporu 2020 içinde* (213-220 ss.). Ankara: Hipokrat Yayınevi. ISBN: 978-605-7874-83-2

Akın, A. , Mihçioğur, S. , **Türkçelik, E.** Demir, C. (2019). Çocuk Yaşta Evliliklerin Önlenmesi Projesi: *Sağlık Aracıları Kaynak Kitabı*.

Akın, A. , Mihçioğur, S. , **Türkçelik, E.** Demir, C. (2019). Çocuk Yaşta Evliliklerin Önlenmesi Projesi: Sosyal Hizmet Sunucuları Kaynak Kitabı.

Mihçioğur, S., Ayvazoğlu Soy, E. H., **Türkçelik, E.**, Akın, A., & Haberal, M. (2019). Gender disparity and the relationship between living donors and recipients in kidney transplants in an organ transplant center in Turkey. *Experimental and Clinical Transplantation*, 17(Suppl 1), 246–249.

Mihçioğur, S., Ayvazoğlu Soy, E. H., **Türkçelik, E.**, Akın, A., & Haberal, M. (2019). Gender imbalance and the relationship between living donors and recipients in liver transplantations in an organ transplant center in Turkey. *Experimental and Clinical Transplantation*, 17(Suppl 1), 131–134.

Türkçelik, E. ve Akın A. (2018). Toplumsal Cinsiyet, Toplumsal Cinsiyete Dayalı Eşitsizlikler ve Sağlık. [Gender, Gender-Based Inequalities and Health]. Akın A, (Eds). Eşitsizlikler ve Sağlık Sonuçları. 1. Baskı. Ankara: Türkiye Klinikleri, p.46-54.

Akın A. ve **Türkçelik, E.** (2018). Sağlık Hizmetlerine Erişimde Toplumsal Cinsiyet Eşitliği Haritalama ve İzleme Çalışması [Gender Equality in Access to Health Services Mapping and Monitoring Study] ISBN: 978-605-64847-8-0

Türkçelik, E. (2014). Türkiye’de Toplumsal Cinsiyet Ayrımcılığı, Sorunlar ve Gelişmeler [Gender Discrimination in Turkey, Problems and Improvements]. *Türkiye Sağlık Raporu 2014 içinde*.

Türkçelik, E. (2012). Türkiye’de Toplumsal Cinsiyet Ayrımcılığı, Sorunlar, Gelişmeler [Gender Discrimination in Turkey, Problems and Improvements]. *Türkiye Sağlık Raporu 2012 içinde*.

Akın, A., Uysal, N. Gündoğan, S., Mihçioğur, S., Tüzel Bayrakçeken, G., **Türkçelik, E.** *Ankara İli Kadına Yönelik Şiddetle Mücadele İl Eylem Planı*. (2011). Ankara: Ankara Valiliği.

INVITED TALKS (RECENT)

TOBB ETU University Gender Equality Student Club

What is this thing called Gender? [Neymiş bu Toplumsal Cinsiyet?], 29 March 2022

Kanal B Television Program-Günce

Çocuk Yaşta Evliliklerin Önlenmesi [Preventing Child Marriages], 7 March 2022

Sexual and Reproductive Rights Platform [CISU Platform],

Monitoring Gender Equality in Access to Health Services. [Sağlık Hizmetlerinde Toplumsal Cinsiyet Eşitliğini İzlemek], 16 November 2021

Polygeia Annual Global Health Policy Conference 2021.

The Promise of SDGs for Gender Equality, 6 November 2021

TED University, Eğitimde Fark Yarat Konferansı, 2021.

Üniversitelerde Cinsel Taciz ve Saldırıya Karşı Neler Yapabiliriz? [What Can We Do Against Sexual Harassment and Assault at Universities?], 10 April 2021

LANGUAGE SKILLS

NATIVE LANGUAGE

Reading
Writing
Speaking

Turkish

English
Advanced
Advanced
Advanced

Spanish
Intermediate
Elementary
Elementary

COMPUTER SKILLS

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS)
LISREL Structural Equation Modeling
Jamovi

APPENDIX O: THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU

(Please fill out this form on computer. Double click on the boxes to fill them)

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

- Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences
- Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences
- Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics
- Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics
- Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : TÜRKÇELİK TÜRKEL
Adı / Name : Ezgi
Bölümü / Department : Psikoloji / Psychology

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English): SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL PREDICTORS OF BYSTANDER INTERVENTION IN THE CONTEXT OF MALE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: Yüksek Lisans / Master Doktora / PhD

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır.** / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide.
2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **two years.** *
3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for period of **six months.** *

* Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir. / A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature

Tarih / Date

(Kütüphaneye teslim ettiğiniz tarih. Elle doldurulacaktır.)
(Library submission date. Please fill out by hand.)

Tezin son sayfasıdır. / This is the last page of the thesis/dissertation.